

**MINUTES OF MEETING
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**April 29, 2015
reconvened from April 1, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig; Alternates Vincent Lombardi, Richard Shea

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; George Melchior

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

*The Board's action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

I. DESIGN GUIDELINES PRESENTATION – Dominique Hawkins, Preservation Design Partnership, LLC

Mr. Nick Cracknell stated that Ms. Hawkins' would present a draft of five of the twelve chapters of the forthcoming document. Mr. Cracknell noted that the project was on the City website for public viewing. He asked that any comments from the public and the Commission be sent to him so that he could forward them to Ms. Hawkins. He hoped to have a completed document by the end of summer so that a joint work session could be held in the fall to formalize the document.

Ms. Hawkins stated that one of the reasons for the guidelines was to address troublesome issues within the community. Ms. Hawkins stated that the guidelines were split into two tracks, one of which was information to encourage people to take care of their historic buildings in a positive way. The other was interventional.

Section #1, Maintenance. Ms. Hawkins addressed the benefits of maintenance, saying that she had a series of checklists addressing various building components and flagging things when something was wrong so that owners would know when repairs were needed. The Maintenance section included the roof, chimneys, building exterior and interior, and site management. She showed a diagram of a house with the components labeled and possible problems noted.

Section #2, Roofing. Ms. Hawkins showed drawings of various roof forms and materials as well as roof decks, chimneys, dormers, skylights, and downspouts and said that information was provided on how to choose options. The section also included an HDC Criteria for Review page, which Ms. Hawkins noted was included in each section throughout the guidelines. She said that focal buildings would need the greatest care, while the non-contributing buildings could be more flexible. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the

Commission should use as criteria when they discouraged the permanent removal of wood shingles and slate roofs. Ms. Hawkins pointed out the section in the HDC Criteria, saying that the level of discouragement on focal properties was much higher. Mr. Lombardi noted that the Commission often received petitions to remove chimneys and construct faux chimneys and also questions about relocation. Ms. Hawkins said she had not covered relocation issues but would do so and would also address thin brick chimneys.

Section #3, Exterior Woodwork. Ms. Hawkins noted that there was more cladding in Portsmouth and discussed wood trim elements, common types of shingles and various siding, saying the section included information on how to manage deteriorating woodwork. It also discussed condensation, artificial woodwork, PVC trim vs. Hardiplank, and performance. She noted wood was preferable to vinyl. The section would provide information on how to make a better preservation decision. It would focus on contributing and non-contributing properties and infrastructure, and Ms. Hawkins asked whether the information should be in all the sections. Mr. Shea said that he felt it was okay to use those materials on new construction as long as they were prepared properly by doing things such as concealing the fasteners and painting it in place after installation. Mr. Wyckoff stated that if the building was historic, it should have a historic siding, and he mentioned the touch test, saying that if it was close to the sidewalk, it should have wood siding. Ms. Ruedig suggested cross-referencing Section 3 with the section of new construction. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would do so because she didn't want the document to be repetitive. Mr. Lombardi noted that the Commission needed guidelines for solar panels due to several requests for them. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would include the panels and would also include snow guards and widow walks in the document.

Section #4, Windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that windows caused the most consternation. The section addressed the basics of operating a window and architectural styles. She noted that some people found her diagram confusing but she thought it was important to have all the pieces and parts. Chairman Almeida said the final draft would be in color, which would make it less confusing, and he suggested that certain elements be shown in different colors for clarification. Ms. Hawkins said she would need guidance on which colors were appropriate. The chapter included information addressing historic window problem-solving for issues like drafts as well as historic materials like wood and composite aluminum. It also had information on replacement window options, shutters, and door types. She noted that the materials in the section would be cross-referenced with new buildings and multi-family construction. Mr. Wyckoff remarked that the panel wood door components shown on the drawing were not indicative of what was really seen in Portsmouth and that the transom window made no sense. He suggested that another drawing of a classic door surround for Portsmouth that included showing pilaster and bed moldings instead of crown moldings for a more classic shape. Mr. Shea requested that the document include information on deciding whether to replace or repair a window. He noted that there were three options indicated, but none of them denoted what kind of window replacement would be allowed. He felt that the Board should be more specific on focal homes with historic windows. Chairman Almeida agreed, saying that the section on windows was the one that the Commission needed and used the most. Mr. Wyckoff stated that the full window replacement should be the most strongly discouraged one.

Chairman Almeida asked for public comment. Ms. Kerry Vautrot, Chairperson of the Portsmouth Advocates, asked if there could be an additional resource section regarding historic window preservation and whether there would be reference to the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Ms. Hawkins replied that the preservation resource section would be in the introduction and that the document would reference the Standards. Ms. Vautrot asked whether it would relate to residential or would branch out to other buildings. Ms. Hawkins said it would branch out.

Section #5: Porches, Stoops and Decks. Ms. Hawkins stated that the section covered historic entrances and decks and also included maintenance information. It included cross-referencing and information on

when a HDC review was not required. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a cross-section of a traditional porch, noting that if someone built a new porch they would know about column placement, soffits and rails and would also understand the Commission's comments. Ms. Hawkins said she usually did that with a photograph rather than a diagram. Mr. Wyckoff felt that the objective was to be able to point out the proportions, the posts and the moldings and that it would help to have it on the drawing. Ms. Hawkins said she would address it. Mr. Rawlings said they needed to address design alternatives in the differences in current height requirements by code and what was typical for historic railings, for example, installing 42" high railings on a house that originally had 30" high railings. Ms. Hawkins said she had to be careful about putting things in the guidelines that were against code.

Chairman Almeida asked for public comment. Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street addressed the code and said it was 36" per floor and 32" above the second floor. As far as replacement in kind, he had a late model Victorian and had re-used what they had, but if he had changed it, they would have had to use the 36" standard. He further explained the standards.

Ms. Hawkins said she encouraged comments from the Commission as to what they wanted in the guidelines and would like them as soon as possible.

*It was decided to **meet again** in June or July to discuss the Design Guidelines.*

Chairman Almeida then read all the Requests to Postpone and asked for a motion.

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **postpone** the applications B, C, E, & G to the May meeting and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

Chairman Almeida also noted that Work Session F, 180 Islington Street, was withdrawn.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. March 25, 2015

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **approve** the March 25, 2015 minutes. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

III. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 35 Salter Street

Mr. Cracknell noted that the following three items had changed: 1) a smaller window was inserted on the first floor, 2) a full fixed panel pine door was replaced with a window on the rear elevation bump-out, and 3) the applicant wanted to replace the vertical siding on the dormers with cedar shingles. The first two items were completed, and he wasn't sure if the shingles were on yet. Mr. Wyckoff said that the dormer replacement made sense.

2. 41-43 Market Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the modifications were to the approved façade restoration plan and also noted that cast-iron posts had been uncovered under the brick piers and that the façade would be restored to its 1880 condition.

There was no public comment on either petition.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **approve** the two Administrative Approvals. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

IV. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Michael Brandzel and Helen Long, owners**, for property located at **39 Dearborn Street (also known as 39 Dearborn Lane)** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove various sections of the structure, remove chimney) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct misc. additions, dormers, decks, and shed) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace remaining windows, doors, siding, and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 140 as Lot 3 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

The architect Mr. Robert Rodier and the owners Mr. Michael Brandzel and Ms. Helen Long were present to speak to the application. Mr. Rodier told the Commission that the BOA approval had been received the previous week. He showed photos of the front and rear views, surrounding houses, and elevations. He said that the owners wanted to increase the volume on the second floor, so they were requesting a shed dormer connected to a gable dormer. He said the side of the enclosed porch would be infilled so that it would look like an integral form and would also be the new entry. A small deck would be carved into the new roof and the existing piece would be torn down to install a new kitchen. Chairman Almeida asked how old the building was, and the owner Mr. Brandzel replied that it was an 1820 house. Mr. Rodier added that the original chimney was torn down due to structural reasons and that there was no need to replace it.

There was a simple shed dormer on the back for a bathroom, and they were also proposing two skylights on the rear elevation. Chairman Almeida said it looked like the sills were different window heights. Mr. Rodier replied that those particular windows would be part of the kitchen and that the other two windows were lower because they were in an adjacent bathroom.

Ms. Ruedig asked what was under the vinyl siding, and Mr. Brandzel replied that it was asphalt and sheathing. He said the front of the house was the side porch and had the original front door of the house behind it, which they wanted to make the front door again. Mr. Wyckoff noted that it was built out of beam and sat on cement and he thought it would be problematic because the house was a traditional Cape. Ms. Ruedig asked about the house's history. Mr. Brandzel said he knew it wasn't a 1700s house because he had seen writing on one of the beams and had the land surveyed. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked how old the front structure was. Mr. Brandzel asked his neighbor Mr. Michael Stasiuk to approach and address the question. Mr. Stasiuk stated that his house at 31-33 Dearborn Street and Mr. Brandzel's house were on the 1810 City Map.

Chairman Almeida said the issue had to be addressed because the house was a very early Cape. Vice-Chair Gladhill thought that if the Commission approved the design, the additions would cover up the house's history. He wanted to preserve the Cape's integrity. Mr. Rodier asked whether volume could be added to the Cape. Mr. Brandzel added that they would preserve the original structure on the inside but it would not be seen on the outside. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that was the issue because it was the flip side of what the Commission normally did. Chairman Almeida said he would not have an issue with

additions but that the owners needed to be sympathetic to the historic Cape. He preferred to see a restored Cape than a different style of house. Ms. Ruedig agreed and suggested a site walk. She thought there could be a way to renovate the Cape instead of turning it into something different. Mr. Wyckoff thought that the addition looked like the place for improvement, and they further discussed the bump-out and the footprint. Mr. Shea preferred to see the original front façade and suggested a bigger dormer on the back with nothing on the front. It was also suggested that a shed dormer across the back of the house would give a lot of space and not affect the front. Mr. Rawling agreed and thought that a gable roof on the bump-out would work. Chairman Almeida said that there were several elongated Capes in Kittery and suggested that they consider that form.

Vice-Chair Gladhill was concerned about the 100-foot buffer. Mr. Brandzel replied that the house was not in the buffer. Mr. Cracknell thought they could pull the structure towards the water if the design needed to be adjusted. Ms. Ruedig suggested making the side addition bigger. The wetland issue was further discussed.

Mr. Cracknell summarized that the Commission presented two ideas, to elongate the Cape or have a taller form in a different plane on the water side. Mr. Wyckoff added that there was Mr. Shea's third option, which was to keep the Cape and have a shed dormer on the back of it. They could remove the bump-out and enlarge the kitchen entry on the deck. He thought that was the best option because it maintained the Cape style, although there could be a problem with the cube on the front because it blocked the front door. Mr. Rodier suggested a second dormer to balance it. Mr. Brandzel noted that no one except for the neighbor would see it from the side, but Vice-Chair Gladhill said it would be seen from Mill Pond, which was a public way. Chairman Almeida said the Commission was amenable to the large shed dormer to provide relief. Mr. Brandzel said he had photos of the second chimney and there was no fireplace on the inside, but he had salvageable bricks that he would use to resurface the kitchen area.

Chairman Almeida asked for public comment.

Mr. Stasiuk stated that the shed was discussed at the BOA meeting and that he wanted to reinforce it because the details mattered to him. There was a mitigation issue with the shed, and he had received a view easement in exchange.

Mr. Cracknell suggested a site walk before next week's work session and felt that the shed could be discussed after the house was sorted out. Mr. Wyckoff thought that the shed looked reasonable for the Historic District. Mr. Cracknell said he would circulate the Letter of Decision from the BOA regarding the shed's location and the dormers to the Commission members.

It was agreed that a site walk would take place on Wednesday, May 6, at 6:00 p.m. before the work session.

B. Work Session requested by **44-46 Market Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **44-46 Market Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (change exterior cladding, replace doors, windows) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct one story rear addition, construct small additions on second floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 31 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March meeting to the April meeting.)*

C. Work Session requested by **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on

Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business A and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March meeting to the April meeting).*

D. Work Session requested by **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct three story mixed use building with below grade parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the March meeting to the April meeting.)*

The architect Mr. Steve McHenry and the project architect Mr. Brendon Holben were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry stated that the package would focus on the preferred option. (He noted that Page 8 was missing and said that it was an elevation view of the model that Mr. Holben would show later on). Mr. McHenry highlighted changes, site plan topography, code and zoning compliance issues, contextual buildings, and points of view from around the building. He noted that there were new CAD drawings of elevations and that some detail elements had been refined. He showed the overall scale of the building in relation to the property line and also showed a typical Portsmouth storefront that was used as an inspiration for their storefront. He noted that there were boiler plate issues for product choices and detail sketches, door and window types, exterior siding materials, and the general roof plan. He stated their goal was to come back for a public hearing in June.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked why there was so much glass on the garage door, and Mr. McHenry said it was an example of a product sheet but that they would look at the 3D model. In answer to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. McHenry said the material on the third floor was Hardi panel and a glazing system, and that a 2-story sky-lit section for the residential unit was above the transom area. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the storefront systems were wood. Mr. Holben replied that the infill was aluminum and the rest was wood. Mr. McHenry stated that they would bring in samples of the material. Mr. Rawling complimented Mr. McHenry on the storefronts' dimensionality, saying it would be a meaningful component to the building. He asked if there could be different colors between the two different parts of the building, and Mr. McHenry agreed.

Ms. Ruedig thought the project was moving in a positive direction and applauded the architect for the contemporary materials and designs that allowed the fenestration pattern to respect the surroundings. She said she was disappointed in the mansard roof because it was a traditional form that didn't relate to anything close to it, and she thought it would be helpful to see more wood to relate with its immediate surroundings. Mr. McHenry replied that they had focused on the front elevation, and the other elevations had more composite board, which they further discussed. As for the mansard roof, Mr. McHenry said they had looked at lots of options in order to decide on one building type. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that there was a lot of glass in the center of the building and was concerned about the amount of light emitted at night, and he asked whether it could be controlled. Mr. Holben said they were doing window treatments. Mr. McHenry pointed out that there were also deck railings. Mr. Shea asked what the v-groove dimension was, and Mr. McHenry said he would clarify it.

Mr. Lombardi asked if the sidewalk was a consistent width along the street and also asked about the fence at the back of the building. Mr. McHenry said that the sidewalk was parallel to the curb, and Mr. Holben said the fences were for privacy. Mr. Lombardi asked the distance between the abutter's house and the rear of the building, and Mr. Holben said it was around 30 feet but would confirm it. Mr. Wyckoff had no critical comments and felt that the proper mass and scale had been achieved. He liked the overall design and the wood storefronts.

Chairman Almeida asked the applicant to address the demolition of the structure on the site before they went into the public hearing so that they could present it. He thought the building was not encroaching on the Buckminster House as invasively as before and also thought the Buckminster's cupola seemed to tower over the development. He asked Mr. McHenry to bring in more detail on the casement windows for the next meeting. He said he appreciated the amount of depth on the storefronts. Chairman Almeida said he felt confident that every element of the Commission's evaluation form had been discussed and that they would check the items off at the next meeting. He thought they were ready for a public hearing.

Public Comment

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street noted that the Buckminster House residents were not present, which said a lot. He thought the building was much better and, even though not everyone liked the mansard, he felt that it was a perfect complement that did not tower over the Buckminster House. He asked if the siding was a smooth or grainy finish, and Mr. Holben said it was a composite. Mr. Becksted said he was pleased that they were going to use wood and also thought that the demolition structure was ready to come down. He commended everyone and said he looked forward to the building's development.

Chairman Almeida stated that a public hearing would take place in the near future.

E. Work Session requested by **Hayscales Real Estate Trust, owner**, for property located at **236 Union Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure to construct two family residential home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 22 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March meeting to the April meeting.)*

F. Work Session requested by **Ronald C.J. Cogswell, owner**, for property located at **180 Islington Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow a discussion concerning the existing 2 story structure and options for site (including demolition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 19 and lies within CBB and the Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March meeting to the April meeting.)*

G. Work Session requested by **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue (46-64 Maplewood Avenue)**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, 3 ½ to 5 story structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March meeting to the April meeting.)*

H. Work Session requested by **HarborCorp LLC, owner**, for property located **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use building containing hotel, conference center, condominiums, supermarket, and parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 21, Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the March meeting to the April meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida confirmed the receipt of a letter from Delmira Pirini Morse that discussed the North End.

Mr. Chris Thompson, Ms. Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects, Ms. Susan Duprey, and Mr. Travis Meadows of Platz Associates were present to speak to the application. Mr. Thompson stated that they were glad to be back for the final work session and that they would discuss materials and the changes since the previous meeting. He also noted that they had pedestrian views of the project. Ms. Goodknight said she would go through the samples on the table and then locate them in context. She reviewed three roofing materials, which included faux slate for the hotel near the Sheraton bridge, asphalt shingles on the retail at Maplewood, and flat seam panel metal roof on the hotel on Green Street. She reviewed the three samples of brick types. One was a heavily-flashed dark brick that was similar to the brick on the Sheraton and would be used on the hotel across from the Sheraton. The Old Port blend would be used on the Whole Foods and conference center, and the lighter brick would be used on the Maplewood Avenue retail and at the terminus on Green Street. She added that buff mortar would be used for all brickwork and Woodbury Gray granite in all granite locations. A wood-clad window would be used extensively on most of the buildings. The storefront materials were discussed. Ms. Goodknight noted a new green product called Boral siding for replacing plastic PVC moldings. She said the siding was 70% recyclable materials that would not expand or change color. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it was field painted, and Ms. Goodknight said it was.

Ms. Goodknight said she met with the Italian community to discuss memorializing their community, and she introduced Ms. Shari Young, who described how inscribed bricks and a historic placard on the plaza would tell the Italian story. She envisioned that would draw people and said there would be an internal exhibit of archived photography. Ms. Goodknight said the heavy timbers would have a Farmers market feel to them. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether she was specifying Douglas Fir, and Ms. Goodknight said she was.

Mr. Meadows reviewed the parking garage materials and discussed how it would be prefinished, would have a 30-50 year life span, and could have regular maintenance. Ms. Ruedig asked about the color. Mr. Meadows said that there was a range of colors to choose from but that green was a popular choice. Vice-Chair Gladhill thought that the green color would have previously fit in nicely with the Memorial Bridge. but since the new Memorial Bridge was gray, he thought a gray shade would fit in better. They discussed it further, and Chairman Almeida thought it was important to get a variation of colors. Ms. Ruedig suggested making sure that a differentiating color was simple and would not look dated. Ms. Goodknight discussed the form liner for a retaining wall along the service drive, which consisted of heavy wood plank impressions. She also discussed the two options for privacy fencing and the two variations of light fixtures. Mr. Thompson showed a photo of the 'waterfall explosion', which consisted of wind fins, and how it connected to the building. Chairman Almeida asked whether the reflectivity would be intense, and Ms. Goodknight said that the artist would test it.

Ms. Goodknight said there were changes made to some elements discussed at the previous work session. She discussed the retail details on Maplewood Avenue and pointed out that they added the art, took out some awnings and canopies, and also unified the Whole Foods element by carrying the brick over. The materials on the conference center changed to those of the storefront with a glass canopy over the entryway. She showed how the brick base came across and activated the area. Vice-Chair Gladhill felt that there was no need for the awning due to the art piece and potential clutter issues, but he still would have liked awnings on a few sections on the back of the garage to break it up a bit. Chairman Almeida said he had been against the awnings because they were so high on a tall building, but it made more sense to bring them down to provide protection. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked how the garage would be broken up. Mr. Meadows said they could change the grillwork and add expressions that didn't increase the height but would give it skyline appeal.

Mr. Rawling thought that the rails at the end building needed to provide screening and privacy on the terrace levels and also noted that the condominium tower looked like it was trying not to be a tower due to

its shadowy top. Ms. Goodknight attributed it to the varied rooflines. Mr. Rawling was bothered by the continuation of the horizontal banding and by the truncated top of the tower on the conference center because it looked like it was just knocked on. He didn't think the towers were welcoming and also did not think the two garage patterns were compatible. He felt that the garage entrance section and the retail section would be better broken into two different bays to get a vertical expression of each of the different functions. Continuing the masonry base on the garage would be better expressed by bringing more steel down to identify itself as the entrance to the garage. He had concerns about the tops of the building and the way the parking garage touched the other towers.. Ms. Ruedig thought that a better visual break of the building would help and suggested opening up the garage or connecting it to the other side. Mr. Shea thought the brick made it heavy and asked if the arch could be done in steel. Ms. Goodnight said she didn't want it to look like a hodgepodge of forms. Chairman Almeida discussed the concept of actually having it open so that people could be brought through the arch instead of finding ways to make it look like it was open. Vice-Chair Gladhill questioned bringing people to the other side of the building because it would not be lit well and would be unsafe. Mr. Rawling commented on the garage's corner entrance and the way the different façade treatments were used. He thought the bay near the garage entrance had an openness that changed when it got into the brick masonry. He suggested that the steel expression come around and tie into the condo building and continue. He also thought the different façade treatment on the levels above it contributed to the building's two-dimensional nature. Continuing the brick piece along the length of the building contributed to the massiveness of the building, and he thought changes in materials or colors of the masonry would break it up.

Ms. Goodknight showed the view from Deer Street and noted the changes that had been implemented, such as the added awnings at street level, the breaks in the planting area, and the development of the rail detail. Ms. Goodknight then showed the rendering the inside of the plaza, the dining, additional glass and railings, the green roof, and some art. Mr. Rawling noted the way the windows were broken up and said he liked the detail of the mullions on the first and second floors. Ms. Goodknight showed the development of the roof line, saying they added the transition piece to accept the bridge. She reviewed the hotel forms, the conference center entryway, the clad windows at the top and the faux slate roofing. Mr. Rawling said that he liked the design of the second floor better than the previous version because it was simple, and he suggested that more texture be added by the bridge. Mr. Lombardi felt that the two large square set-in dormers stood out like television screens stuck on the building, making it an uncomfortable part of the roofline and façade. Ms. Ruedig noted that the design of a section of the conference center was becoming interesting but the large expansion of it looked very dark. Mr. Wyckoff said the Commission needed to more detail on how the bridge interacted with the Sheraton. The exposed arch seemed to come into a structural element of the new building, and he asked if it went into the Sheraton and died or whether it had supports underneath it.

Public Comment

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said that he was impressed with the arguments about the archway and the garage. He felt that the boutique got squeezed in at the last minute and suggested opening up the Deer Street side to create a pedestrian area and place relics in. Since the green park on the second floor would be controlled by events, he suggested that something be at street level so that pedestrians could take advantage of it, otherwise there would be no benefit to the residents, and that was what the CUP was all about.

Mr. Jerry Zelin of 70 Kensington Road thanked the Commission for their hard work and questioned the fact that the public hearing was scheduled for May 6 because everyone was still waiting for a close-up look of the back of the building and the promised walk down Maplewood Avenue at pedestrian level using the 3D software. He thought another work session was needed. He discussed how the angle was misleading on a part of the building because it wasn't a true view and masked the building's massiveness.

He also suggested an architectural version of a waterfall similar to Michael's Gate in Slovakia, which he showed a photo of.

Chairman Almeida stated that the applicant was not ready for a public hearing because the Commission still needed information. Vice-Chair Gladhill suggested reviewing two facades at a time instead of all at once. Ms. Goodknight said there would never be a consensus because there were advocates for modern elements and advocates for historic replicas, and she felt they had addressed everyone's concerns. They had modern, light elements as well as more traditional elements. She said they were ready for a public hearing. Mr. Cracknell strongly felt that another work session was necessary because there were several issues to clarify and agree on. Chairman Almeida said they would have to decide specific topics to discuss at the next meeting to be more effective.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street said she lived at Portwalk but thought that the HarborCorp project was ten times better and felt that there could be ten more meetings and people would still want little changes. She liked the art work and the bridge and thought there would be plenty of space for the public to gather if the restaurant at the hotel end was fenced off.

Mr. Thompson showed the Commission a video indicating what the pedestrian view would be walking around the building.

*It was agreed that a **public hearing/work session would be held at the May 6, 2015** meeting and that the work session would be held after the public hearing so that other issues could be discussed.*

V. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 11:35 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on May 13, 2015.