

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**February 14, 2018**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Vincent Lombardi; City Council Representative Doug Roberts; Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea, Martin Ryan; and Alternate Cyrus Beer

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Vice Chairman Jon Wyckoff, Molly Bolster

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....  
Chairman Lombardi stated that Work Sessions D and E were requested to be postponed by the applicants, and he read them into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **postpone** the two work sessions to the March meeting.*

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. January 3, 2018
2. January 10, 2018

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **approve** both sets of minutes as presented.*

**II. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL AND  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPROVAL**

1. Requested by North End Master Development, LP (HarborCorp, LLC), Deer and Russell Streets and Maplewood Avenue (Maps 118, 124 & 125, Lots 28, 12, & 21) expires on May 25, 2018.

Chairman Lombardi acknowledged the receipt of letters from Attorney Jerry Zelin, Roy Tilsley, and Chris Thompson of North End Partners LP and stated that the applicant requested an extension of time. Chairman Lombardi said the project was thoroughly reviewed by the Commission and the process was upheld through appeals that had gone to the Supreme Court. He said there were no changes made to the approved design and that there were significant delays resulting from the appeals, and he recommended that the Commission consider the extension.

Mr. Shea stated that the Commission had always granted an extension of time if the project was previously approved by them and if the applicant had a reason that they couldn't build the structure within that amount of time. He said he was in favor of recommending extending approval for the project. Mr. Cracknell briefly reviewed when the change in zoning was enacted, emphasizing that the project had been excluded because it was vested under the previous zoning. It was further discussed.

*Mr. Shea moved to **grant** the Request for Extension of Certificate of Approval and Certificate of Conditional Use Permit for one year. Mr. Rawling seconded.*

Mr. Ryan abstained from the vote.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 6.0*

### **III. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

#### **A. 244 South Street**

Mr. Cracknell briefly reviewed the request for door, window, and lighting changes. The project architect Anne Whitney was present to speak to the request and said there was an original egress window that could not be removed per the Building Inspector's directive. She said that a 4-light window was switched to a 6-light one on the rear elevation, there would be aluminum gutters and caps for the back elevation, and the first-floor framing would be replaced.

#### **B. 55 Lafayette Road**

Mr. Cracknell said the request was for a front door entryway replacement and that the applicant proposed two options. He asked the Commission to stipulate their preference. The Commission agreed that the second option, the 3-light door, was the better one because it was more in keeping with the modern 1950s style, and it was stipulated that the second door option (3 light) was the preferred door.

#### **C. 245 Middle Street**

Mr. Cracknell said the request was to replace the front door of the Margeson apartment complex with a sliding door. Mr. Rawling said it was in keeping with the style of the original building.

#### **D. 13 Salter Street**

Mr. Cracknell said the request was to replace the chimney with Morin restoration brick and add dye to the mortar. The project architect Joseph Almeida was present and said it was a functioning chimney that would have fireplaces and he showed the Commission a sample of the brick and two samples of the mortar. The Commission stipulated that the lighter mortar (SGS70H) would be used.

**E. 1 Webster Way**

Mr. Cracknell said the request was to remove an existing single French door and replace it with a double French door. Mr. Shea noted that the two windows above the door had different casings and recommended choosing the casing that looked the most original. Mr. Cracknell stipulated that the door trim would be the flat casing with a band or whatever was the predominant trim on the house, and that a wood door would be used rather than the clad.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the administrative approvals and related stipulations, and City Council Representative Roberts seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Petition of **Scott A. and Sara Bess Lupkas, owners**, for property located at **33 Blossom Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace five windows on detached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The project architect Anne Whitney was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant and stated that the applicant wanted to use the finished garage as a guest space. She reviewed the petition, noting that an egress window was required and that the two double hung windows would be changed. She said a fiberglass Integrity window would be used and the front elevation windows would be awning Marvin Integrity painted to match existing.

In response to the Commission's questions, Ms. Whitney said the screens would be on the inside, the new windows would be sized to match the existing ones, and the jambs would match the trim color. Ms. Whitney asked whether she could install dark combination storms on some of the other windows and was told that they had to be wood storms. Mr. Rawling recommended painting the flange to match the trim color so that the dark color echoed the sash color.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public hearing.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Shea moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) A Harvey combination three-track storm window shall be used.*
- 2) The flange shall be painted to match the trim.*
- 3) The frames of the Marvin Integrity windows shall be painted to match the trim and the sash shall match the existing sash.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

2. Petition of **James C. and Amy M. Baker, owners**, for property located at **75 Humphrey's Court**, wherein permission was required to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear addition and dormer) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new rear addition and dormer, remove, replace, relocate misc. windows and doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Ms. Ruedig recused herself from the petition.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The project architect Jennifer Ramsey was present on behalf of the owners and reviewed the petition in detail. She said that the neighbors signed a petition supporting the application and the metal roof.

Mr. Rawling said he didn't think the applicant needed as many casement windows as requested and thought they were inappropriate for the style of the house. He recommended making the end double hung windows casement windows and said the gable windows could be casements. It was further discussed. He said he was opposed to the metal roof because it wasn't in character with the houses in the District. Mr. Ryan confirmed that the main house would match the garage structure and said he supported the metal roof, given the structure's age. Mr. Shea said he felt that the 1950s house was being modified to look more like a Nantucket-style home. He said he could support the metal roof because some of the neighbors had metal roofs and the house wasn't on a main cut-through road.

Mr. Rawling verified that all the signatures were in support of the metal roof for the shed. Mr. Ryan asked whether the main roof would match. Ms. Ramsey said it would be a contrast of metal and white materials. Chairman Lombardi said he still had a problem with the metal roof and felt that there were a lot of changes on the 1950s house. Ms. Ramsey said they were trying to tidy up the previous changes to make them more consistent.

### **SPEAKING TO FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Rawling moved to **deny** the granting of the Certificate of Approval because he felt that the metal roof was not in character with the neighborhood. The motion was not seconded, so the motion did not carry.*

*Mr. Shea moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) Wood siding and wood trim shall be used.*
- 2) The metal roof color shall match the garage roof color.*

*Mr. Ryan seconded.*

Mr. Shea said the project was compatible with innovative technology of surrounding properties and that the metal roof was more innovative than asphalt shingles.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 4-2, with Mr. Rawling and Chairman Lombardi voting in opposition.*

3. Petition of **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **163 Deer Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17-2 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Ms. Ruedig resumed her seat.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The project architect Tracy Kozak was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. She said there were no substantial changes since the last work session but that more detail was added. She distributed graphic change handouts and showed some material samples. She also noted that the previous elevation drawing handout was missing some of the brick but that it was all brick, and she showed the correct brick color. She reviewed the petition in detail.

Mr. Shea said it was a nice building that felt a bit different from the other recent architectural projects in Portsmouth. He said he liked the industrial notion based on the old railroad station. He asked what the light quality of the exterior sidewalk lights would be. Ms. Kozak said they would go into greater depth during the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process but said they would target a warm LED tone and that the street poles would match the City's standard. Mr. Shea said that he felt the building was more successful because the massing was broken up, but he thought the recesses could be stronger. He said the building looked like a 3- and 4-story building and thought the height was appropriate in relation to the buildings across the street.

Mr. Rawling said the treatment of the upper stories that were meant to appear as smaller buildings would not be perceived as such, and he didn't find the design appealing because he didn't think that plain metal boxes on the tops of the roof were effective. He said the metal part of the building brought the building down and would dominate the skyline, and that he didn't think the building was ready for the approval stage. It was further discussed. Mr. Rawling said he didn't think the masses were broken up because they ran with the same floor plate window heads and sills. Ms. Ruedig said she supported the design and thought it was successful in creating a contemporary building using traditional materials and themes. She said the metal was

an appropriate use in the design, with refined details that didn't look like one massive brick block. She noted that there were several examples of massive historic brick buildings in Portsmouth that had one consistent floor plate and said she didn't agree with making one big building look like different little buildings. She said there was a lot of contemporary architecture in the area and thought the building design was simple and consistent. She said she appreciated the wide sidewalks and pedestrian activity and thought the building was a good example of what she'd like to see continue to happen in Portsmouth's north end.

Mr. Ryan said he liked the design, especially the railroad imagery, and thought it was a simple clean concept that related well to what was currently being built in the City. He said there was a lot of interest on each side of the building, the drive-through was handled successfully, and the use of materials was well done. He said the building was a great but simple statement and he supported it. Chairman Lombardi said he also liked the building and wished that the other buildings were more like it.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Beth Goddard of 110 Court Street asked what the second and third floors would be used for. Ms. Kozak said it would be all commercial and office space.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to grant the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and advertised with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The burnt almond brick shall be used.*
- 2) Kolbie or Pella windows shall be used.*

Ms. Ruedig said the project would conserve and enhance surrounding property values and thought it would change the area in a positive way. She said it was hard to assess any historical significance since there wasn't any. She noted that the Commission didn't address the demolition of Eastern Bank, which was built in 1985, but that it wouldn't alter the Historic District. She said the building was well designed using new construction and reflected the industrial history of the area. She said it was a traditional design and a contemporary building.

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Rawling voting in opposition.*

## **V. WORK SESSIONS**

A. Work Session requested by **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **161 Deer Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use

building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17-3 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The project architect Tracy Kozak was present on behalf of the applicant. She noted that the Commission had given her previous feedback on massing changes and the tower that she would address. She noted that they were pursuing the workforce housing incentive. She emphasized that the tower had a tilted roof and that they got rid of the metal band and changed the window sizes to make them bigger. She said the materials were simpler, the base material was narrower, and the tower was a few feet higher due to the tilted roof. She reviewed the other changes.

The Commission's comments were as follows:

Mr. Rawling:

- The bays are nicely detailed, solid, and substantial; with brackets that set them off perfectly;
- The view of the building on page 2.1b still seems stark;
- The building is successful until it gets to the metal boxes on the roof, which are prominent and appear unfriendly;
- The tower is improved and plays well off the bay detailing, but feels very lightweight and thinks that the most substance should be on the tower, and the bays should be secondary; has support for the extra height but questions the sloped roof;
- Has concerns about the metal top floors throughout the building.

Mr. Shea:

- Likes the play of the tower roof and suggests more of that at the top of the building;
- The pg. 2.1b elevation isn't as interesting at the top and would look like a flat-roof 5-story building from afar but thinks the other elevations are more successful;
- The roof isn't cut back to the right of the pg. 2.1b elevation and reads like a big 5-story wall that feels like the back of the building;
- Struggles with the overall height of the building.

*Mr. Cracknell said 50 feet was allowed and up to 60 feet was allowed if a public benefit was provided, community space or workforce housing. He said the applicant was proposing workforce housing. Ms. Kozak said the workforce housing would be mixed throughout the building and would be a ratio of 10%, or five affordable units out of 45 units.*

- Doesn't feel that it's enough of a percentage to warrant an extra floor and that there's no interest in the varying heights;
- There are new projects in the area with lower buildings and feels that bringing the five stories to one side wasn't right from a massing standpoint and instead should step down.

Mr. Ryan:

- the project's massing is the way to make good urban spaces;
- has no problem with the extra height;
- likes that the tower is tilted up and thinks it would support the big intersection;
- the bays are successful but feels that the corner also needs a bay to make it distinctive;
- the thin corners look curved and rounded and are a nice detail;
- the brackets don't seem to do enough;

- the view on pg. 2.2a is nice, the corner is distinctive, and the building is broken up nicely.

Mr. Beer:

- Prefers the earlier tower version and doesn't like the top window being wider than the one under it because it looks out of balance;
- The top window's sill looks like a fake divider between two windows, and the windows on the side where the top casing is angled looks like a window that isn't square.

*Ms. Kozak explained that the top of the windows sloped and paralleled the slope of the roof.*

Ms. Ruedig:

- The bay windows are interesting and have simpler materials, but doesn't see a lot of Portsmouth in the building other than the red brick and cast limestone;
- The design is on the bland side and isn't that dynamic;
- The pedestrian experience looks like it would be successful;
- Can't fully support the design because it's not the spectacular one that the corner needs.

City Council Representative Roberts:

- The design seems too busy due to the number of facades in and out, and too ornate;
- He asked what the thinking was behind the window pattern

*Ms. Kozak explained that the project started out with square windows but that they went more vertical and required two window sizes instead of one. She said they grouped them so that they were more symmetrical.*

Chairman Lombardi:

- Five stories are too many;
- Thinks Mr. Rawling's comments about the prominent metal fifth story is part of why he thinks it's inappropriate;
- Still feels that the location calls for a four-story building and that the corner next to Building 4 is the best corner in the building;
- Finds the tower awkward and the steel on the bays and base very heavy;
- The base (2.1b) dominates the brackets under it and makes them look foolish
- The back of the building is a prominent view coming into Portsmouth and not the typical back-of-the-building on an alley

### **Public Comment**

Beth Goddard of 110 Court Street said that the project was too big and didn't emit the City's vibe to people entering from Maplewood Avenue.

Jon Sobel of 49 Sheafe Street said the location was perfect for a big building and thought the fifth story was very acceptable in terms of massing. He said the tower should be bigger and thought the 'cargo shipping containers' on the roof were wouldn't hold up architecturally.

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said she still hadn't figured out the difference between workforce and affordable housing. She agreed that the roof structure did look like a cargo



container and thought the tower looked like an airport tower. She said the building should be a special one because it was at the entryway to the City.

No one else spoke, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*City Council Representative Roberts moved to **continue** the work session to a later date. Mr. Shea seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote 7-0.*

B. Work Session requested by **KC Realty Trust, owner**, for property located at **84 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing cinder block rear addition) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new rear addition, renovate storefront) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 77 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the January 10, 2018 meeting to the February 7, 2018 meeting.)*

The project architects Steve McHenry and Jeremiah Johnson were present on behalf of the applicant to discuss the petition. Mr. McHenry reviewed the packet and discussed the two massing options. He noted that the applicant and the abutters preferred the scheme with the flat roof and asked the Commission for their feedback.

Mr. Rawling said the storefront was an immense improvement but suggested two alternate versions, one of which was to get rid of the transom bar on Louie's storefront because it still seemed short and out of proportion. He said the other version was complicated and felt that the first version was the better choice. He said he liked the way that the back of the building was broken up with brick and other materials and thought the bay element gave it dimensions.

Mr. Shea said he agreed that removing the transom band would lighten up the window and match the second-floor window more. He said he had a hard time accepting the back addition because it took no elements of the clapboard building and wasn't subordinate. He said he preferred looking at it as a separate building, with different details that would connect to the old structure. He said he liked the elevation and recommended that the new building be tucked into the side of the old building, with clapboards instead of brick. Ms. Ruedig agreed, noting that the flat roof structure on the back was fine. She said the simple design for the back by breaking it up echoed the massing of the building and the neighboring Times Building. She suggested making it solid instead of using three materials. She said she liked the storefront on the front but was disappointed with the total replication of the door surround on the right-side entrance and thought the previous solution was better because it set it apart. Mr. McHenry said he would go back to the previous version.

Mr. Ryan said he thought the storefront worked and was scaled beautifully, and he liked the back. He asked whether the doors were operable at the base. Mr. McHenry said the only door at the rear elevation was the green one. Mr. Ryan said he felt that the urban windows didn't go well

with the rest of the façade. Chairman Lombardi said he thought the project was coming along well and that he liked the Commission's comments.

### **Public Comment**

Paige Trace of 27 Hancock Street said she agreed with Mr. Ryan's comments. She said the clapboard on the side made a lot of sense, especially if the owner didn't know what the other owner's plans were. She asked that the project move quickly so that Louie's could return.

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said the back of the building was confusing and that he was concerned where the dumpsters and utilities would be. He said he heard rumors that previously there were dumpsters from other restaurants as well. Mr. Johnson replied that the City previously mandated that the restaurants could do a communal dumpster on Court Street but that it would have to change.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **continue** the work session to a future meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **77 Daniel Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **77 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct third floor addition and mechanical screening to rear of existing building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 10 and lies with the CD4 and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the January 3, 2018 meeting to the February 7, 2018 meeting.)*

Josh Sheets and Chris Greiner, owners of the Press Room, and the project architect Michael O'Brien were present to speak to the petition.

Mr. Sheets said they addressed the Commission's previous comments on design, massing, materials, and context, and focused on more traditional details. He said they also worked with the neighborhood to incorporate their feedback into the new design.

Mr. O'Brien noted that they tried to reduce the massing and set back the third-floor extension to consolidate the mechanical equipment, introduce more traditional materials, and extend the party wall. He reviewed the new floor plan, details, windows and building profile. He said the panel system have contemporary material.

Mr. Beer said he thought the project fit in with the neighborhood more. City Council Representative Roberts agreed and thought it was a big improvement. He asked about neighbors' concerns regarding the decks. Mr. Greiner said the building would be pulled back eight feet and that the penthouse portion would step back. He said the third-floor deck neighbor would not be

affected by the project's decks from a noise standpoint because the neighbor was higher. Mr. O'Brien said they would disburse the equipment by bringing it down to the second floor's mechanical deck and placing two rooftop elements on the third floor.

Mr. Shea said he agreed with the Commissioners' comments and said he looked forward to seeing the finished details. Mr. Ruedig said it was an attractive design that fit in nicely with the neighborhood but felt that there might be concerns from the neighbors. Mr. Rawling said he was very supportive and thought the project had improved immensely.

Mr. Ryan asked about the materials. Mr. O'Brien said it was clapboard and that no mechanical units would come out of the clapboard. Mr. Ryan suggested that the top stairway rail match the second-floor rail because it stood out and seemed clumsy.

### **Public Comment**

Sue Friedrich and Matt DeAngelis said they owned the third floor of the Custom House and were representing the Custom House residents. Ms. Friedrich said she and her husband had the deck that looked out over the top of the Press Room. She said the project would take away the light and view from their apartment and that the shared deck would be in a tunnel three stories down, with no light. She said the Custom House abutters preferred that the current plan remain and that they would rather look out over the mechanicals instead of the brick wall, which would change the whole feeling of the community. She presented photos of sample of views from their deck.

Jon Sobel of 49 Sheaf Street said he was an abutter and felt that there were still massing problems. He asked whether anyone had detailed the distance of the back of the building to the abutting houses and explained why it was an important measure. He said the contemporary details on the third-floor addition changed the area's historic nature and suggested that windows be placed at street level so that the neighbors didn't have to look at a massive wall. He said the abutters' quality of life, light, air, and property values would be affected.

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said she was worried about the massing and thought that the previous design made more sense, and said she was concerned about the bottom floor because it had three windows and then was blank. She said it wasn't really the back side of the house because it was a very social neighborhood.

Cindy Hatch of 79 Daniel Street said she was concerned about the massing and that her third-floor deck would lose the view and light. She said the deck was part of her building's charm and why she lived there.

Paige Trace of 27 Hancock Street said the project changes were a step in the right direction but that adding the third floor would affect the original Custom House and everyone in that immediate area. She said the project was right in the middle of the District and felt that it wasn't right to take all the light, air, and views from the neighbors.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Shea said he would consider the abutters' points and see what the right point was for the build-out. Chairman Lombardi agreed that the neighbors had strong arguments, and he encouraged the project to work with them. City Council Representative Roberts said he wanted more of a sense of exactly how much impact the building would have on the neighbors in terms of mass, light, and decks. Mr. Cracknell recommended that the applicant put the project into the 3D model and show it to him and Public Works before the next meeting so that they could evaluate it. He gave the project team some suggestions on how to reduce the building's mass.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **continue** with a work session/public hearing at the March meeting.*

D. Work Session requested by **PNF Trust of 2013, Peter N. Floros, trustee and owner**, for property located at **278 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovation of an existing structure (to discuss rehabilitation options for 278 State Street and its relationship to future reconstruction of 266 & 270 State Street) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 80 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the December 13, 2017 meeting to the January 10, 2018 meeting.)*

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **postpone** the work session to the March meeting.*

E. Work Session requested by **James C. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, James C. and Kimberley A. Lucy, trustees and owners**, for property located at **127 & 137 High Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear additions to both structures) and allow a new free-standing structure (construct single family dwelling at rear of #137) and allow for renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations to both structures) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the CD 4-L1, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **postpone** the work session to the March meeting.*

F. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Savings Bank/Bank of New Hampshire, owner**, for properties located at **333 and 340 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (restoration and repair of existing wood windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 5 and 10 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The project architect Michael Finch and the window representative Tim Patch were present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. Mr. Finch said the Commission had not liked the replacement windows that were previously proposed, so they were proposing bi-glass conversion for most of the double-hung windows and would restore the leaded glass and special-shaped windows. He reviewed the windows in detail and showed a window sample.

Ms. Ruedig said she was pleased with the window solution and thought it would be effective. She asked whether the glide system would be retained. Mr. Patch explained how they would do a hidden balance. Mr. Shea said the product looked good for the building's era. He asked whether all the storm windows would be removed. Mr. Finch agreed.

The drive-through building's windows were discussed. Mr. Rawling suggested more flexibility toward a replacement window in that building. Chairman Lombardi noted that the drive-through was a newer building and less important.

There was no public comment.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*The applicant indicated that they would return for a work session/public hearing at the March meeting.*

At that point in the meeting, Ms. Ruedig recused herself.

G. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Housing Authority, owner, and Ed Pac, LLC, owner**, for properties located at **140 and 152 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (partial demolition of building at 152 Court Street) and allow a new free-standing structure (construct a new free standing residential structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 37 & 38 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

The project architect Carla Goodnight and Director of the Portsmouth Housing Authority Craig Welch were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Welch said they had an opportunity to develop badly-needed workforce housing in Portsmouth, and he explained what the Housing Authority was governed by and how many developments they managed, how they used a housing tool for tax credits and also did historic preservation. He said they wanted to do a privately-owned, non-profit, mixed-income project and that the challenge was the scarcity of tax credits that they would have to compete for. Ms. Goodnight said they would define the building within those parameters. She reviewed the site plan and elements of diversity, history, and architecture and presented some building style options to the Commission.

The Commission commented on the project. Mr. Rawling said he liked the connectedness features of the site plan and thought the liner buildings on Court Street were fine for scaling on the streetscape. He said he was supportive of the project and thought it would enhance the downtown area. He said he preferred the more transitional structure because it was more in context with the surroundings and would soften elements of the Feaster Building. Mr. Shea said

he supported the project and thought the concept of diversity in housing and income levels was wonderful but was concerned how it would affect the historic neighborhood in mass, context, and features. He said he didn't care for the alternative building styles because they didn't speak of Portsmouth, and he was more in favor of a New England style. He said he would struggle with the six stories, suggested breaking up the roofline so that it wasn't another Portwalk building, and was glad that the old historic house would be featured. Mr. Ryan said he agreed with all the comments but didn't know if the block could be split in two. He said the surrounding place-making was terrific and had no issues with the demolition. City Council Representative Roberts said it was a great spot to do that type of housing. He said he preferred the most modern version of building style. Chairman Lombardi thought the time for workforce housing in Portsmouth had come.

### **Public Comment**

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said she thought the building was too tall for the historic neighborhood and that the community needed to know what percentage of the building would be workforce housing.

Paige Trace of 27 Hancock Street asked how many units would be housing other than market value and who would own the development. She said that most of the general public didn't know about the project and assumed that the entire building would be workforce housing.

Beth Goddard of 110 Court Street said she had reservations about another large affordable housing unit in the District and felt that the six-story building, along with the Margeson and Feaster buildings, seemed like a dense population of affordable housing and would change the quality of the neighborhood.

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street noted that Portsmouth had a higher median income than Dover or Rochester. He said there were no other buildings on that part of the street with that type of mass and suggested that it the building be located outside the District. He also asked whether the metered parking lot would become part of the purchased land. Ms. Goodnight said the parking issue would come into focus as the project further developed.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (6-0) to **continue** the work session to a future meeting.*

### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

*At 11:25 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on March 7, 2018.