

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**November 13, 2019
Reconvened from
November 06, 2019**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; City Council Representative Doug Roberts, Members Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Martin Ryan, and Cyrus Beer; Alternates Heinz Sauk-Schubert and Margot Doering

MEMBERS EXCUSED: N/A

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 57 Salter Street

The request was to re-size some windows and doors, relocate a skylight, and remove a metal chimney stack on a previously-approved outbuilding converting to a residential unit. Chairman Lombardi suggested omitting the shuttered window on the north elevation. Project architect Jennifer Ramsey was present and said the window could be replaced with siding. It was stipulated to eliminate the middle window on the north elevation.

2. 40 Howard Street

The request was to add three garden pergolas to the property, in addition to the two existing ones on the back patio. Mr. Cracknell noted that the abutter submitted a letter of approval.

3. 121 Daniel Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant had already replaced a 12-ft metal stack and hadn't known that it had to be approved beforehand. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the adjustment was an improvement.

1. *Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to approve Administrative Approval Items 1, 2, and 3, with the following stipulation on Item 1: The middle 2nd floor window shall be removed and replaced with siding.*

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

II. CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL - EXTENSION REQUEST (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **163 Deer Street (Lot 4)**, wherein a second 1-year extension of a Certificate of Approval granted by the Historic District Commission on February 14, 2019 and originally granted on February 14, 2018 is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new freestanding structure (construct new mixed-use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17-2 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 06, 2019 meeting to the November 13, 2019 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Tim Phoenix and the applicant Kim Rogers were present. Attorney Phoenix distributed a revised version of the packet to the Commission and said they were requesting an extension because the project was still delayed due to the Foundry Place and Garage construction, and construction costs had skyrocketed. He noted that the building (Building 4) was part of Phase 2.

Ms. Ruedig recalled that Attorney Phoenix had explained when the project was first presented that Building 4 would be the last building constructed. She said she was still comfortable with the approved design. City Council Representative Roberts asked about the financing for the buildings. Mr. Rogers said the financing was good for the first building and was in process for the second building, but Lots 4 and 5 were on hold. Mr. Ryan said he understood the current economic building industry climate and would support the request for extension. Mr. Roberts said he wasn't sure that an inability to get financing was a legitimate reason for the extension request, but he would support it because he liked that building the most out of all the proposed ones. He urged the Commission to not grant further extensions, however.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR, AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the request for extension, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **33-47 Bow Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **35 Bow Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace second and third floor windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 49 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 06, 2019 meeting to the November 13, 2019 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant was not present.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **postpone** the petition to the December 04, 2019 meeting. Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

8. Petition of **Dagny Taggart, LLC, owner**, for property located at **3 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (amendment to a previously approved design to the penthouse) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 31 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Project architect Tracy Kozak was present on behalf of the applicant, along with the project team. She reviewed the changes, which included replacing a louver with a fixed copper panel; increasing the height of the elevator overrun to accommodate insulation and clearances; changing the mezzanine to a fourth floor with two egresses and a stairway and increasing the height by 18 inches; and cutting a hole in the middle of a roof for a recessed pitch.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Kozak said the area's footprint was increased by about 750 square feet and the dome had become the bottom of two-thirds of a dome that would allow the solar panels to be in the middle. She said the eliminated louvers on the sides didn't fit in due to the mechanicals. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said there were a few fan louvers that looked like restaurant types on top of the stairwell, next to the elevator override. Ms. Kozak said they eliminated two roof mechanicals on that side.

Additional changes included:

- a bay of windows was changed due to the structure's location and the stairwell behind it;
- the vertical mullion between the window and the door was eight inches wider;
- the elevator overrun was higher, causing the fascia trim to be carried around at a lower level so that someone on the street would notice the cornice more than the elevator overrun; and
- the copper panel on the transom windows facing the courtyard was changed to solid copper.

The Commissioners commented on the changes. Ms. Ruedig said she was disappointed by the larger size of the new fourth floor because she had been pleased with the original design, which she thought was subtle and an interesting detail that didn't overwhelm the roof and the building's look. She said the larger and taller oval shape was distracting and looked alien to the building. She said she would have liked to see the applicant work within the original footprint and thought the widening and the height pushed it too far. Mr. Ryan said it was a crowning element of the

building. He wished it were in pure dome form but thought it had become an important part of the building and not just a weak little gesture. He said the rest of the louvers and the taller elevator shaft didn't bother him. Mr. Rawling said he was troubled by the increased width and the overlap into the new parapet and thought it was noticeable on the front elevation and seemed to take over the building. He said the original narrower width was far superior. City Council Representative Roberts said he agreed that the new configuration distracted from the front of the building and said he preferred the original footprint. Mr. Beer said he liked the new design because he had thought the building was squat and heavy before.

Ms. Doering said she liked the original design because it was very elegant but saw merit in some of the discussions about the changes. She asked if the stairs could be a different shape. Ms. Kozak said they could not because they would connect with the existing stairwell. Mr. McNabb said the new floor needed two egresses and had other code issues that required two handicap bathrooms and other programming. He said some of the functions on the floor had also increased. He said there were alleys on the side views that would prevent visibility and that corner decks would allow relief. In response to other questions, Ms. Kozak said the glass parapet walls were increased in height to accommodate the roof insulation. She said reducing the beam sizes helped accommodate the rooftop addition's height.

Mr. Ryan said that, as an architect, he could sympathize with any design that went from concept into construction documents and necessitated making changes to make it function and legal. Mr. Rawling said the glass railings looked reduced from the northwest perspective. Ms. Kozak said there was a guard rail that extended behind the elevator overrun where the mechanicals were but that the glass railing was the same product and detail that was previously shown. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he could see both sides of the opposing views of the oval but that it didn't bother him by being 18 inches taller because it was an interesting part on top of the building as well as an improvement. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said the roof addition stood out like a sore thumb and that he preferred to see it the same color as the original building.

Ms. Kozak showed samples of the two colors, emphasizing the mahogany one. Most of the Commissioners agreed that 'darker was better than lighter'.

Chairman Lombardi opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said there were massing discrepancies, noting that the intent was to make the building less visible from the street. He said the metal that went around the top stood out instead of blending. He said the Commission was not supposed to consider financial issues. He said he didn't understand the argument about the added height. He said the dark material was susceptible to light and that some of the new materials might not have the best track record with New England weather elements. He said the building was too wide and too tall.

Mr. Ryan said he didn't know what the financial impacts and emphasized that he talked about constructability, which was a lot different.

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said she was concerned about the height and the half dome.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application with the changes as proposed and with the following stipulation:*

- 1. The siding material on the 4th floor shall be a darker color.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded.

Mr. Ryan said the project would conserve and enhance the area's property values and was compatible with the design of surrounding properties.

Ms. Ruedig said she understood the reasons for the changes but that her concerns were still the same, namely that the building was too tall and too wide and not the elegant, subtle piece that was previously presented as an addition to the historic building.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 5-2, with Ms. Ruedig and City Council Representative Roberts voting in opposition.*

9. (Work Session/ Public Hearing) requested by **Dagny Taggart, LLC, owner**, for property located at **0 (53) Daniel Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new free-standing (4-story, 50,000 ± s.f.) commercial structure as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 27 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Project architect Tracy Kozak was present as well as the applicant Mark McNabb and the project team. She said there were seven revisions. She referred to the HDC design guidelines, noting that the proposed building was a contemporary design but would be compatible with buildings around it. She said the solar panels would be submitted at a later date. She reviewed the changes, which included that the siding went from vertical to horizontal, there were subtle color changes, the wood siding pattern on a façade was simpler, and the copper bands were simplified to a pre-patina copper and were flat instead of overlapping shingles.

Mr. Rawling said the graphics showed diamond patterns and noted that there was a difference between the scale shown in the visuals and the 3D drawings. Ms. Kozak said they could adjust it and would match the scale of the colored renderings. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked if the garage was for the use of the building's residents and tenants. Mr. McNabb said it was for the office personnel but that some spaces would be shared. Mr. Sauk-Schubert asked how the glass would be cleaned, and Mr. McNabb said it would be power-washed.

Ms. Kozak reviewed the storefront window bands. She noted that the Commission previously thought that the building looked too rustic, and she submitted lumber samples for them to consider. In response to the Commission's questions, Ms. Kozak said the lighting would be concealed and the fixture itself wouldn't be seen. Mr. McNabb said the building would not be lit all night and that they were working with a lighting consultant on all the lighting issues. He said the courtyard entrance would be open to the first and second floors and that one floor would come over it. Mr. Ryan said he preferred the original larger doors, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling said that some of the design development gave him pause, especially the towers and the dimensionality of the building. He said he didn't support the flat detailing. He noted that the rough dimensional texture of the building was very prominent originally, and now the towers had been made into glass cylinders which didn't hold the design elements together. He said the entire design was based on a strong horizontal element, particularly with the other exterior parts, with horizontal weaving in and out and so on. He said the corners were originally very strong and dimensional and had directed the horizontal linework but now had been pulled back. He said even though it was on the interior, it wouldn't look like that in the daytime. He said the flat glass slabs that replaced the horizontal weaving made it so that the other elements and shapes became arbitrary. He said the towers had been neutered.

The horizontal and vertical door elements were further discussed. Ms. Ruedig suggested making the main entry door bigger. Ms. Doering said the Daniel Street façade was much busier and suggested removing the 'eyebrow' canopy.

Mr. Sauk-Schubert suggested letting the vertical timbers protrude much higher on the cornice. Ms. Kozak showed samples of the timbers. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested pine timbers like those used in old mills. Ms. Kozak said they were worse for weather. Mr. Rawling said the timbers didn't have to be smooth and thought they should be grainier.

Chairman Lombardi said he was hesitant to do so many stipulations stemming from all the changes and comments, but Ms. Kozak reviewed the stipulations and said they were details that could be accommodated and would not affect the overall images.

Public Comment

Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street said he thought the building was creative, unique, and contemporary but did not think it met the HDC's guidelines, which were to preserve the neighborhood's character. He said the building stood out, especially sited in the middle of the historic downtown next to the Customs House, North Church, and so on. He said he saw no changes from the previous month's work session except for a few tweaks and felt that the building would have a drastic effect on the property values of surrounding buildings.

Esther Kennedy of 41 Pickering Avenue said she agreed that the 'eyebrow' overhang should be removed and thought the banding was too bright for the area. She said the building should be in the north end of town. She noted that there were daylight issues on one façade and a lot of dark

wood and suggested some color, awnings, and trim. She said she was very worried about the building and hoped the Commission remembered its mission and followed its guidelines.

Mark McNabb said he had been going to the HDC for 33 years regarding his eight other buildings in Market Square. He noted that there were no abutters present to speak against the project and said he had met with the building's 30-40 abutters to discuss the design. He said people were looking forward to a contemporary building and felt that it could co-exist with his other buildings. He said the hardest thing was to build a contemporary building as a piece of artwork that worked in context with surrounding buildings.

Esther Kennedy said there had been an abutter who couldn't stay due to the late hour.

Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment and entered the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Project architect Tracy Kozak briefly reviewed the project. She noted that the building was freestanding in the middle of downtown and that all the buildings surrounding it were different styles, heights, and materials. She said it was one big public space, and the building was honest to its use and its time and was a contemporary style in an acceptable approach, as permitted by the Ordinance. She said that one of the Master Plan's goals was not to make carbon copies of old architecture. She reviewed the stipulations and said they were refinements that would be done.

Ms. Ruedig asked for clarification on some material choices. Ms. Kozak showed window samples and the two proposed colors for the wood. It was recommended that the cheek wall siding be turned horizontal and was added as another stipulation.

The Commissioners gave their final comments on the project. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was initially shocked by the building's design because he had a lot of respect for Portsmouth's historic character and preferred that style, but the lot was large and he thought the open concept market was important for the City and needed to occupy that whole lot. He said he wouldn't want to see a 100'x100' three-story brick building or a building cut up to look like separate buildings. He said it was the 21st century and didn't think the design would ruin Portsmouth.

Mr. Ryan thanked the applicant for giving the City genuine architecture that wasn't taking the easy way out, like historically-simulated brick, granite, or cast stone. He said the point of the Commission's guidelines and design principles was compatibility, and he felt that the applicant's building was compatible with the Historic District. He cited parts of an article that he had read about new commercial construction in the heart of Portsmouth and said it was about evolution. He thought the design brought the City forward and thought the project was sophisticated and had a terrific design. Mr. Rawling said it was inevitable that only a large building would be built at that particular site, due to all the modern requirements needed to go into a building. He said the Commission dealt with how to get new buildings to scale and reflect the neighborhoods around them, and he thought the building did that outstandingly because it was scaled appropriately, was comfortable pedestrian-wise, and had a rich surface texture and modulation. He said it would be a warm building and characteristic of the historic buildings surrounding it.

and would also be a strong building. City Council Representative Roberts said the initial design had evolved into a more coherent and handsome building.

Mr. Beer said he found that the building detracted from the architecture and historic character of downtown because the massing was too big and the architectural details didn't match anything in the neighborhood, and he was opposed to the project. Ms. Doering said she supported the project for a lot of the reasons discussed and thought there were elements in the building that were the modern equivalent of historic elements on the street. She said it was a little hard to see, but she thought it should be respected and given credit for being compatible with the street's history.

Ms. Ruedig said her overall view hadn't changed. She said the massing was fine for a contemporary building and felt it could go in that location and that there were a lot of things about the project that were great. However, she thought there was a variety of contemporary styles and design choices and agreed with Mr. Beer that there weren't enough parts of the design that more clearly reflected their surroundings. She said she didn't hate the building but felt that the design didn't meet her interpretation of the Historic District and what should go in that location. She commended the applicant for all their thoughtful details and quality materials. Mr. Sauk-Schubert explained why he first thought the building was overwrought. He said he liked some aspects more than others but felt that nothing was perfect.

Chairman Lombardi said he had been looking for contemporary architecture in Portsmouth that wasn't just a box. He said he had been to many cities that had old architecture close to very modern buildings. He said history was dynamic and if new buildings just replicated what was around them, there would be 'no history for our life period'. He said it was important for Portsmouth to have architecture of 'this century, this decade, this year'. He said he was a fan of the building from the beginning and of the refinements.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR, AGAINST THE PETITION

Rick Becksted said the decision had been made and that the public's reaction would be one of shock and awe and in the future people would ask how that building got there. He said the project in the middle of the protected downtown Historic District would end up being weighed the same way the urban renewal project was.

Esther Kennedy said she was concerned about that particular area and thought the building should complement it. She commended the Commissioners who she felt stuck to the review process and their mission to protect the historical benefits of the Customs House and the gray buildings across the street. She said the applicant's building could have been in the west end and everyone would have celebrated and called it a day.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulations:*

1. *The size of the diamond tiles on the horizontal bands shall increase from 1' to 2'.*
2. *The railings from behind the 3rd floor cornices shall be aligned to the back of the cornice.*
3. *The (2) courtyard entry doors shall be recessed with a freestanding column in between them.*
4. *The front main entrance glass door shall fill the entire opening between the timbers that surround them.*
5. *The vertical timbers on the rounded corners shall be further extended, above the roof line.*
6. *The Pella windows with concealed screens shall be used.*
7. *The cheek wall siding shall be horizontal.*
8. *Items (#1-6) shall be submitted for Administrative Approval.*

It was noted that all the stipulations would be submitted for administrative approvals except for the Pella windows.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Mr. Ryan said the project would promote the education pleasure, and welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors and would be compatible with innovative technologies and surrounding properties.

The motion passed by a vote of 5-2, with Ms. Ruedig and Mr. Beer voting in opposition.

V. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **John J. Roes Revocable Trust of 2016, John J. Roes Trustee, owner**, for property located at **14 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the partial demolition of an existing structure (removal of additions and 1 chimney), new construction to an existing structure (relocating house to new foundation and adding a 1-story addition), and exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, windows, and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the October 02, 2019 meeting to the November, 2019 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Architect Lisa DeStefano was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced the property owner Jim Copeland. She noted that all the chimneys would be kept. She reviewed the petition and said they were leaning toward a wood siding of organic material and a natural wood color but had chosen a vertical siding at that point. For the north elevation, she said they would restore the existing home's front entry, simplify the glass connector and reduce its height, and add the second-story horizontal band to the addition. She said the addition would have lower roof heights and material changes and would be stepped back. She said the window patterns were the same scale and size as the main house but were simplified. Regarding the projecting balcony

issue, she said the bay was pulled out from the kitchen below to put the building more in context with Mechanic Street and the existing house.

Ms. Doering said she liked that the banding was brought across as well as the east and west elevations and balcony support but was concerned about the interrupted roofline and the discrepancy between the two roofs. She said the very large windows in the connector read just as a connector instead of an architectural piece itself. Ms. Ruedig said it was a very historically-sensitive location, with the Point of Graves cemetery that was one of the oldest spots in town. She said the amount of glass would create a fishbowl and might put the house on display, especially in its location near Strawberry Banke and all the historic properties and all the visiting tourists. She said the project should have more traditional detailing and didn't think a metal frame and a bronze or steel structure was appropriate for the location. She suggested more wood and other traditional materials that would soften the structure but not make a reproduction out of it. Mr. Ryan agreed and said visitors would have an instinct to go to the house to buy tickets for some event. He said he didn't mind the south elevation proposal but didn't think the columnaire commercial glass opening read like the applicant thought it would – as a non-element so clear that people wouldn't see it. He suggested a solid mass in the connector and putting the transparency in the back. He said the addition as abstract historic architecture relating to the main house worked fine but thought the breezeway connector and the Mechanic Street elevation would not read appropriately for the streetscape.

Mr. Rawling said the changes in scale and massing worked well and that he supported the change of materials but would never give his support for clear casement windows in that area because he thought the heart and soul of the building was stripped from it and that the building looked unfinished. He had concerns about what the addition would look like at night, especially the back sides of it with all that glass, saying that it would like sheets of light and very uncharacteristic of anything in the neighborhood. He said the details needed to be more traditional and that a huge tempering was necessary to be sympathetic to the neighborhood's context. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the size and massing were fine but that he could not support the connector on Mechanic Street, nor the east elevation where one could see the glass opening up, not the elevation in the back. He agreed with Mr. Ryan that someone would want to buy tickets to Strawberry Banke, and he also thought it looked like an office built onto a building. He said it had no residential characteristics whatsoever and couldn't support it if it continued to go in that direction. City Council Representative Roberts said he agreed with the comments, noting that when he thought of Portsmouth and the historic buildings in the south end, it all started at that corner. He said the amount of glass and non-traditional materials were out of place and recommended putting the glass on the back if glass was necessary and using more traditional materials to meet the neighborhood's context.

Ms. DeStefano said she would return with options but thought it was important to make the setbacks understood so she could be allowed to continue her work on the project. She noted that the project would need a variance due to the property's uniqueness.

Chairman Lombardi agreed with Vice-Chair Wyckoff that the location needed a much more traditional look. Ms. Ruedig said the setbacks and massing were fine.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the work session to the December 04, 2019 meeting, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded.*

VI. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **100 Islington Street Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **100 Islington Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of an existing structure (two-story commercial building) and to allow the construction of a new 2 ½- story multi-family residential building as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 137 as Lot 25 and lies within the Character District 4-L2 (CD 4-L2) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Project architect Carla Goodnight was present on behalf of the applicant. She noted that the building had multiple condominium owners. She reviewed the petition, noting that the parking would be located under the building. She said they wouldn't exceed the maximum footprint and hoped the buildings could be connected so they didn't have to be standalone. She said they would meet the parking requirement once the building was fully established. She said the maximum building height would not exceed 40 feet. She reviewed the area context.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff referenced the former Atherton furniture/Old Port City Traders lot, noting that the owners started out with two identical 3-story buildings in the front that didn't work, and he said the applicant was starting in the same direction because the building read as two structures joined in the back. He suggested that the applicant come up with more diverse ideas. Ms. Ruedig said the massing seemed too large for the lot in relation to what surrounded it and that the structures looked like two identical buildings. She said she preferred to see the façades of the building brought up to be in line with the Federal buildings next to it rather than being set back a bit. She suggested moving the massing around and away from the neighbors, especially the rear of Summer Street. She said the building had to respect the amount of space that surrounded the existing buildings and their context.

Mr. Beer said he liked that the parking would be underground and that the house would be brought out to the street, but he thought its size was way too big for the neighborhood. He said buildings that were meant to be broken up and look like smaller buildings never worked because they always looked like one huge building trying too hard. City Council Representative Roberts said people would go by and think it was a large building, and he recommended decreasing its size. Mr. Rawling said the applicant did a good job of breaking up the footprint but had conceptually taken the one building and spread it out all over the site. He suggested doing variations and modulations, like side porches and stoops and more vertical elements, to break up the overall scale. Ms. Doering agreed with the massing comments and thought the proposed structure went too far back on the lot and would cause the trees to die. She said the back side of

the huge building would be seen from Islington Street as well as other locations. She said the front design's uniformity created the mass and made it look too big. She suggested making the structure look like pieces that were built at different times by different architects. Mr. Sauk-Schubert agreed, noting that reproducing identical things make it look like a developer's job.

Public Comment

Demetrious Viannacopoulos of 211 Summer Street said the building would be in his backyard. He agreed with the Commission's comments. He said there was an elevation eight feet back from Islington Street that was a drop into wetlands and that his house as well as his neighbors' houses often had water in the basement. He asked how an underground garage could be built.

Don McPherson said he owned one of the condominiums and thought the property was very non-compliant. He said he and the other owners had reached out to the applicant and that they were excited about the project and in support.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the December 04, 2019 meeting.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 11:22 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary