

**REGULAR MEETING
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE
City Council Chambers**

7:00 p.m.

February 6, 2002

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman, John Rice; Vice-Chairman, David Adams; Rick Becksted, John Golumb, Ellen Fineberg, City Council Representative Joanne Grasso; Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts; Alternates Maija Hibbard and Richard Katz

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

SITE WALK - Saturday, January 26, 2002, at 9:30 a.m. - 39 Mt. Vernon Street

Let the record show that Chairman Rice informed the Board that Public Hearing #3 would be moved to the end of the Public Hearings. Also, Work Session "B" has been withdrawn until the March 6, 2002, meeting. A motion was made to approve the change in the agenda by Ms. Fineberg, and Ms. Grasso seconded it. All voted in favor.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1) Work Session/Public Hearing for Petition of Jean C. Odiorne, owner, for property located at 17 Pray Street wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing garage (and construct an 18' x 11' attached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 037 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

The Commission went into a Work Session. Chairman Rice informed the public that a Site Walk had been done on January 6, 2002, to familiarize the Commission with the application.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE APPLICATION

Greg Odiorne, speaking on behalf of his mother, presented the updated plans to the Board that reflected the suggestions during the Site Walk. Some of the changes discussed at the Site Walk were to move the garage forward 1 ft. so that the roof would be in better alignment, move the entrance door to the side, center the garage door, use Novelty siding, doors will be smooth-star fiberglass, and a Brosco 2 over 2

window to match the house. Chairman Rice asked the Board how they felt about the lites in the garage door. Ms. Grasso asked what the material would be for the garage door. Initially, Mr. Odiorne had mentioned vinyl, but it didn't matter to him if the garage door were to be vinyl or aluminum. Ms. Fineberg asked about other choices. Mr. Odiorne said wood would be too expensive, and the upkeep too difficult to maintain. Also, Mr. Odiorne's contractor does not use wooden doors anymore. Vice-Chair Adams stated garage doors architecturally do not fit in the district, and that he is bothered by the use of aluminum as it does not wear well over time. Mr. Becksted felt if he had to choose between an aluminum or vinyl door, vinyl would have a better visual effect. Vice-Chair Adams asked if there was a window layout for the door. Mr. Odiorne stated his mother would like the glass one-panel down as shown in the plans. At the Site Walk, the Commission members preferred a garage door with no panels. Chairman Rice asked Mr. Odiorne if he had cut sheets of the door with just panels. Mr. Odiorne showed the Commission a door with panels made out of vinyl. Chairman Rice felt that a door with panels, without lites, and made out of vinyl would be a good solution. Mr. Odiorne said his mother would like as much light in the garage as it will be bigger, and she now will be able to walk around the car. Vice-Chair Adams inquired about the window door casings, cornerboards, and wooden trim. Mr. Odiorne responded that he would like to use 2 1/2" aluminum cornerboard to match the house. Ms. Fineberg thought it would look better if the trim matched the garage.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to go into a Public Hearing, and Ms. Hibbard seconded it. All voted in favor.

At this time Mr. Odiorne reviewed all the changes made during the Work Session for his application. The garage door was the only change Mr. Odiorne was uncertain about, whether to go with a door with panels or a flush door without lites. Mr. Becksted asked Mr. Odiorne his preference, and replied his mother's preference would probably be a panel door. As far as the cornerboards, Mr. Odiorne said those would match the existing cornerboards on the garage.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Grasso made a motion to accept the application as presented and modified in the Work Session. Ms. Grasso seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Stipulations:

- That there be a side entrance door;
 - That there be a center overhead door;
 - That Novelty siding be used;
 - That there be two-lite swinging doors;
 - That the overhead door be of single panels without glass;
 - That the trim match existing trim; and,
 - That Brosco two-over-two windows match existing house windows.
-

2) Public Hearing for Petition of Charles and Mary Hoyt, owners, for property located at 149 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add 3' x 11" x 1" transom lite over front door; replace existing corner boards with 5/4" x 6" corner boards with beaded edge, and remove existing chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 014 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE APPLICATION

Charlie Hoyt, owner of the property, informed the Commission of his long renovation project, but only had minor changes to present this evening. The first of three items was that during demolition he had to replace the entire roof structure, which resulted in the removal of the chimney. The chimney had been built back in the 1700's and was primarily used for venting the heating system. The second item Mr. Hoyt wanted to change was the cornerboards. When removing the siding, he discovered one of the original cornerboards with a beaded edge, and he would like to duplicate this style. The third item was to install a transom lite over the front door. Vice-Chair Adams asked if the size of the front door would be changed when installing the transom lite, and Mr. Hoyt replied the additional height would be 11 1/4". Mr. Hoyt told the Commission this building was one of the original jails in Portsmouth. Mr. Becksted asked if the chimney had already been torn down, and Mr. Hoyt replied yes.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve the application as presented. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion. Vice-Chair Adams stated he can't fathom houses without chimneys as being representative of the district. Historic architecture dictates houses are defined by the location of the chimney on a house. Since the applicant is trying to capture the history and charm of the house, not replacing the chimney seems wrong, and Vice-Chairman stated he would not be supporting this application.

Mr. Golumb totally agreed with Vice-Chair Adams that he would not be able to support this application. He has observed the renovations of this project, and felt that the building looked naked without the chimney.

Mr. Becksted agreed that there are a number of houses that chimneys become an architectural feature of the building. If the chimney were still located on the building, he would probably still want it located there.

Mr. Hoyt explained to the Commission that the chimney goes right through his living room.

Ms. Grasso asked Vice-Chair Adams for his suggestions for the applicant. Vice-Chair Adams said it is difficult to say where the chimney should be located in the building. He felt it is a defining element in many buildings, and an appropriate place should be found for a fireplace and a chimney be constructed. Ms. Grasso said she, too, would like to see a chimney on the building. Vice-Chair Adams stated a center chimney is

what a small five-window style of house usually has, but it is not the only chimney that would be appropriate.

Ms. Fineberg stated she would not be supporting this application because she feels a chimney should be located on the house. This is a working home, and it should look like one.

Mr. Katz asked for clarification that the Commission is insisting that this house should have a chimney. Also, he stated the Commission couldn't force this applicant to do a center chimney because it was not existent at the time of the application. Further, Mr. Katz asked if the Commission was requesting the applicant to redo the non-appropriate, not in proportion chimney and one that has no function? Ms. Fineberg stated that the applicant did not come to the Commission to request demolition, but as "fait accompli". Vice-Chair Adams felt this was not a poster project for a chimney, and it was not his intention to be punitive, but the house does need a chimney.

Mr. Becksted asked the applicant what his intentions were during construction when he discovered the chimney was in such bad repair that it had to come down. Mr. Hoyt replied the chimney was in an awkward position, and he was working around it. Its size, 2-ft. x 2-ft. brick square without a hearth, made for a chopped up living room. He stated he could not put the center chimney back as that is where his egress is located.

Chairman Rice stated he agrees with Vice-Chair Adams, and was dismayed when he drove by and saw that the chimney had already been removed. The chimney that had been there was an inappropriate chimney for the current project. A center chimney is more appropriate but it seems to be an extreme request to ask the applicant to rebuild this chimney.

Vice-Chair Adams stated he didn't recall but one center chimney in the last thirty years that had been replaced, because of the amount of space they take up. Chairman Rice felt it is not an unreasonable request to allow the elimination of this chimney considering that the remedies would be costly.

Ms. Grasso asked if it was possible to put a faux chimney on top on the roof. Vice-Chair Adams replied he would feel awkward about this solution. Ms. Fineberg stated that other people have not been as honest as Mr. Hoyt has, but she did not want to be backed into a corner with this application. Mr. Hoyt addressed Ms. Fineberg and said he had been in contact with Roger Clum, the building inspector, on a weekly basis. He felt he had been extremely honest and aboveboard with this project. He has done lots of research at the Library of Congress on this project and has taken special care to make certain the details are authentic. He feels the chimney doesn't belong in this building as it wasn't built there but was added on in the 1900's.

Chairman Rice called for a roll call: Ms. Grasso - no; Mr. Becksted - no; Ms. Paige - yes; Ms. Fineberg - no; Mr. Golumb - no; Vice-Chair Adams - no; Chairman Rice - yes. The application as presented was defeated with a 2 - 5 vote.

4) Public Hearing requested by Sean Caughran, owner, for property located at 552 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an

existing structure (construct addition to shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 019 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE APPLICATION

Sean Caughran, owner of the property, spoke in favor of the application. Mr. Caughran would like to extend his shed and keep it in the exact same style as the existing shed with tongue and groove siding and cedar shakes for the roof.

Chairman Rice said it was an odd addition, but it does add interest and character to a bland shed. Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the roofline would continue in the same slope as it currently is and would it affect the height of the door. Mr. Caughran replied the height of the door would extend out 3-ft. higher. The front pitch of the shed is fairly shallow and steep at the back. Mr. Caughran said the smaller door would have to be made to fit. The actual interior will be big enough to house a lawn mower, weed whacker, and tools. Ms. Fineberg asked why the door was not placed at the end of the structure where it is 5-ft. wide. Mr. Caughran replied this is where his firewood is stored.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Rice made a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Golumb seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

5) Public Hearing requested by Caroline Newman, owner, for property located on 699 Middle Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace small window on left facade of building with same size window and move window up 6") as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 035 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE APPLICATION

Pat Newman, daughter of the owner, spoke on behalf of her mother. Ms. Newman referred the Commission to the pictures and presentation that had been previously submitted.

Chairman Rice asked how the window was going to be moved up 6 inches. Ms. Newman stated the new window will be the same size as the existing window, and the sash will be parallel to the sash on the left side. It will be a double-hung window, and the sash on the existing window will be shortened. Ms. Newman explained to Vice-Chair Adams the header and the molding would be taken off and the top of the window frame made smaller. The window size needs to be changed to accommodate the placement of an antique kitchen sink, and the backsplash of the sink would not fit under the existing window. Vice-Chair Adams asked if the new window would be the same as the one on the left, and Ms. Newman said the trim and clapboards would match in kind.

Mr. Golumb inquired whether the window on the left was a two over one. He also stated that if the owner was trying to match the window on the left, why did she not choose a two over one window. Ms. Newman replied she was trying to match the existing window, and that is why she chose the one over one.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chair Adams made a motion to approve this application as presented. Ms. Fineberg seconded the motion.

Ms. Fineberg, looking at the photos of the house, pointed out windows that were six over six, six over one, two over two, but only one over one window. She suggested the replacement window be a two over one. Vice-Chairman Adams stated this was the only one over one window on that side of the building. Chairman Rice asked if Ms. Newman would like to amend her application to show the replacement window to be a two over one. Ms. Newman said she would have been agreeable to that except she had already purchased the one over one window. She had only been trying to conform to the rules of the Historic Commission by not changing anything.

Chairman Rice said the motion was to approve the application as presented with the suggestion that the window be a two over one, but the motion can be voted against. Ms. Roberts would like the window to match the one to the left of it. Mr. Becksted made the observation that the window Ms. Newman purchased was a Pella brand unit, and a single sash can be replaced. Vice-Chair Adams clarified this further and suggested having the window match the left window and to replace the upper lite. At this point, Vice-Chair Adams withdrew his motion. Mr. Becksted asked Ms. Newman if she was agreeable to amend the application as a two over one window, or would she prefer to table the application. Ms. Newman asked if there were any precedence when coming before the Commission. Vice-Chair Adams replied one does not usually buy the windows before coming before the Commission. Ms. Newman stated that by taking steps to maintain the building exactly as it was, she had failed. Vice-Chair Adams said that by moving the window up 6" was not maintaining the window exactly as it was. He continued by saying that the Commission in situations like this always looks for uniformity, rather than having a new odd-looking window in the house. Ms. Newman stated that since she did not have a choice, could she have the option of replacing the window with a two over one lite.

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the replacement window be a two over one. Ms. Fineberg seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

6) Public Hearing requested by Robert Maranhas, owner, for property located at 39 Mt. Vernon Street wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of a 16'6" x 24'6" two-story addition to be built in the same location as existing barn/garage (rebuild similar structure on the same footprint with full foundation; add six Brosco wood double-hung divided lite windows; add two Velux wood skylights; add a brick masonry single-flue chimney; replace siding with cedar shingles; and add a 4'6" x 14' deck); and to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace single 2

over 2 kitchen window with a mullion two-unit 6 over 6 window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 032 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE APPLICATION

Bob Maranhas, owner of the property, spoke to the petition. Mr. Maranhas would like to take down the 16' x 24' existing barn/garage that does not have a foundation and rebuild it on the same footprint. He also explained to the Commission the exterior changes he would like to make such as adding six over six windows to the side, adding two skylights, reside with cedar shingles, add a single-flue chimney, add a small deck off the kitchen, and change the kitchen window from a two over two to a two over six window. Chairman Rice inquired if there had been any changes since the Site Walk. Mr. Maranhas said the only change was to have clapboards instead of cedar shakes in the ell area. Vice-Chair Adams asked what type of brick would be used for the chimney. Mr. Maranhas replied he would be using standard brick. Mr. Becksted asked about the materials for the wood railings. Mr. Maranhas said he would be using wood railings with the top and bottom rail a simple bevel type. Vice Chair Adams questioned Mr. Maranhas about the drawing for the cornice line, the roof edge trim. Mr. Maranhas would like to keep the same 3 3/8" trim that exists on the house. Vice-Chair Adams stated he would like to see a flat board crown at a 45-degree angle with the shingles instead of a molded crown.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chair Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented with one stipulation. Mr. Becksted seconded the motion. Mr. Becksted asked Vice-Chair Adams to clarify further what the Commission was voting on. Vice-Chair Adams would like to see a flat crown instead of a molded crown. All voted in favor of the application as presented with the following stipulation:

- That the crown be a flat board crown canted at a 45-degree angle.

7) Public Hearing requested by J.L. Coombs, applicant, for property located at 46 Market Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (installation of a 23'6" x 36" fixed canvas awning on front façade of building with a galvanized steel tubing frame) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 031 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

Robert Pearl spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Pearl would like to install an awning to give the store J. L. Coombs, a softer side and also bring out the architectural features. Chairman Rice asked if the awning would be retractable, and Mr. Pearl replied the awning would be fixed. Ms. Fineberg asked where the sign would begin as the awning appears to be steep. Mr. Pearl replied the awning would begin at the top of the Stegman sign. Vice-Chair Adams inquired when looking up inside the awning would there be any additional holes in the wall. Mr. Pearl said the only holes would be the ones to adhere the awning.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chair Adams made a motion to accept the motion as presented. Mr. Becksted seconded the motion. Ms. Fineberg stated she was not comfortable with the application and referred to the applicant's submitted awning example of Café Brioche, which does have end panels. She stated she was not in favor of having a fixed awning for this application and also all the other sample awnings feel much lighter as they are not closed in at the ends as the applicant has proposed. She was also concerned about the steepness of the awning. Vice-Chair Adams asked if Ms. Fineberg was suggesting that the awning have a projection of less than 45-degrees. Ms. Grasso concurred with Ms. Fineberg that the awning comes up too high in the drawing that had been submitted. Chairman Rice did not like that the awning was not retractable. He suggested the application be tabled until the next meeting and a Site Walk be scheduled. Mr. Pearl said efforts had been made to make the awning look much nicer. He does not feel having a fixed awning is a bad thing, and for this environment it would be a good thing as it would be permanent and lend credence to the area. He pointed out to the Commission that the Portsmouth Brewery and the Portsmouth Gas Company both have awnings with sides. He feels that the awning he is proposing covers up a very unpleasant and hardlooking projection.

Chairman Rice stated the Commission is leery of approving an awning that has an institutional look. He recommended a Site Walk to take a closer look at the building, and then come back at the next meeting for a Work Session/Public Hearing. Ms. Fineberg made a motion to table the application to the next regular meeting and to schedule a Site Walk. Mr. Golumb seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A request was made by Chairman Rice to take Item II out of order. Ms. Fineberg made the motion and Ms. Grasso seconded the motion. All voted unanimously to accept the minutes for the meeting of January 2, 2002, and Special Meeting of January 16, 2002.

3) Work Session/Public Hearing requested by Lisa DeStefano for property located on Porter Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction (construct 11 townhouse condominium units with parking at street level) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lots 046 and 038-2 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Lisa DeStefano, architect of the project, presented larger drawings to the Commission of the ones that had already been submitted in their packets. She discussed the changes that had been made since the last Work Session. The site plan had not changed except some planters had been added in between the garage door openings

to provide better access to the building. The Porter St. elevation drawing has remained the same, except from previous Work Sessions, attempts had been made to break down the constant repetition to provide variety in the massing as it faces the street. In the rear elevation, window bays and decks help to break up the repetition of the back elevation. One change from a previous dimension is a recess in the roof to hide mechanical units on the rooftop. A 4-ft. parapet wall has been added to hide any mechanical structure. The last two elevations Ms. DeStefano presented were from Fleet Street, adjacent to the Odd Fellows Building. Ms. DeStefano had met with the property managers of the Odd Fellows Building and reviewed the project with them, and received no objections from them concerning the impact to their building.

Some of the changes from the previous presentation were: 1) Court Street side - clapboards from the previous presentation have been changed to a panel system, MDF (medium density fiberboard); 2) copper gutters and copper downspouts; and, 3) horizontal precast bands to break up the façade.

Some of the materials being used are: 1) a granite precast, which was used on 100 Market Street; 2) solid red brick, waterstruck, without any variations in the brick; 3) 60 H white grout; and, 4) slate (40-year architectural roof shingle).

Vice-Chair Adams inquired if faux slate had been considered. Ms. DeStefano replied she had looked into rubber slates and composite slates, but because of cost and maintenance found the slate worked best for them. A Pella simulated divided lite system with grill patterns will match. A two-panel solid wood door will be used for the entry doors, and there will be custom garage doors. At this time in the presentation, Ms. DeStefano submitted to the Board overall dimensions of the building on each elevation with horizontal and vertical dimensions.

Ms. Hibbard asked Ms. DeStefano to clarify the materials used in the stairs and planters. Ms. DeStefano said the planters would be faced with precast granite and would look like a continuation of the base of the building, and the stairs would be brick with blue-stone cap.

Vice-Chair Adams asked Ms. DeStefano to explain further about the window casings and the slimline frame. Ms. DeStefano stated there will be a masonry opening, and a small 3" trim piece will be placed around the window. Vice-Chair Adams was concerned about the masonry work depending on the time of the year and trying to push the window into an opening that had already been made. Ms. DeStefano replied the brickwork would be a masonry opening. Vice-Chair Adams asked further about the presentation of the window and how much painted trim and caulking would be around the windows. Ms. DeStefano asked if it were preferred for the Public Hearing presentation to give fixed dimensions for how far from the face of the masonry to the face of the wood trim.

Ms. Fineberg inquired which items would be precast and which would be granite. Ms. DeStefano stated the lentils were the only items made out of granite, which were located over the front door and top windows.

Vice-Chair Adams made a motion to go into a Public Hearing. Ms. Grasso seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Tom Kaufhold, of 53 Rogers Street, stated he was opposed to the presentation. He was concerned about the trees shielding the project, as the trees could be dead within a year. Also, the proposed building on 325 State Street, which has not been approved, will block the views. He feels what has been presented is not what really will happen. Every time he drives by 100 Market Street, the faux granite appalls him, as he likes real granite. He stated this would be another project where the first thing one sees is a parking garage at street level. He is opposed to 325 State Street, and feels they shouldn't be presented together.

Vice-Chair Adams said that the first time the Commission had seen this project, we saw the State Street portion first. Although different teams have brought in these projects, the Board has been looking at both projects together, and that is the reason nobody on the Board has squawked. Mr. Kaufhold explained that what was presented was Porter Street, and the view that was presented is not the view the public will have.

John Grossman, representing the Portsmouth Advocates, felt very comfortable with the project, especially with the quality materials that will be used.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF COMMISSION

Vice-Chair Adams made a motion to approve this application as presented with two stipulations. Mr. Becksted seconded the motion, and all voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Stipulations:

- That the architect provides additional window details dimensioning actual proposed conditions; and,
- That the architect provides brick and mortar mock-ups.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by Lisa DeStefano for property located at 325 State Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 001, 006, and 007 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

B) Work Session requested by Larry McManus for property located at 40 Pleasant Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107, as Lot 081 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

This Work Session was withdrawn until the March 6, 2002, meeting as it was advertised incorrectly. Work Session is for property on Market Street.

C) Work Session requested by Steve McHenry for property located at 348 Maplewood Avenue. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 002 (1-5) and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

D) Work Session requested by Charles Thibedeau of CP Management for property located at 500 Market Street Extension (Nobles Island). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 002 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A districts.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the Board acted unanimously to adjourn and meet at the next scheduled meeting on March 6, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry L. Provencher
Planning Department Secretary