

MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2004 HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

**PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE
City Council Chambers**

Site Walk – September 8, 2004 – 6:30 p.m. to 293 Marcy Street

Site Walk – September 8, 2004 – 6:45 p.m. to 138 Congress Street (rear Flatbread Pizza)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman, John Rice; Vice-Chair, David Adams; Rick Becksted; Joanne Grasso; Kenneth Smith; John Golumb; Ellen Fineberg; and, alternates Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

7:00 p.m.

**SEPTEMBER 1, 2004
reconvened on
SEPTEMBER 8, 2004**

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

9) Petition for Cynthia and Lew Harriman, owners, for property located at 57 South Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (re-roof with asphalt textured shingles with the gable ends of roof to extend 2" further than existing roof to improve rain protection as well as molding added to the gable edges) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 050 and lies within the General Residence and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Harriman, the owner of the property, stated there is too much water inside the walls because of the deteriorated shape that the shingles are in. We are proposing to use GAF Architectural shingles.

Vice-Chairman Adams inquired how the 2" over hang will be achieved? Mr. Harriman replied the boards will be replaced that will allow the shingles too overhang 2"; the molding will be replaced of the overhang.

Vice-Chairman Adams inquired what will the molding look like. Mr. Harriman replied that 2' x 4' straight cut wood will be used showing a 2" molding with crown.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented; Mr. Smith seconded. The motion passed with a 7 – 0 vote.

10) Petition for Greenway Management, North, LLC, owner and William Dogan, Architect, for property located at 79 Daniel Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (a 3-1/2 story masonry structure with commercial on the first floor and residential on the above two floors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 009 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Bill Dogan, the Architect for the project, stated based on the previous two work sessions and two site walks, we have made adjustments to the plans. We decided not to raise the existing ridge line and maintain the existing ridge line creating a dormer structure at the rear. The rear second floor addition has been cut back from 14' to 8' based on the abutters concerns. The next level is cut back from 8' to 5' and have re-arranged the interior to make the units work. The units would work out to be less square footage than the applicant had intended; however, based on abutters comments, we feel this will work.

Chairman Rice inquired if the addition would go up any higher than existing, Mr. Dogan replied "no". We have pulled the addition in from the sides of the building and the roof will be almost flat.

Rick Becksted inquired if the front elevation would change. Mr. Dogan replied "no".

Chairman Rice asked if there was any pitch to the roof in the rear. Mr. Dogan stated that the pitch would stay at the existing ridge 8'9" and at the rear wall it will be 7'6" so there will be a slight pitch.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated this proposal requires new doors in the rear and asked if there were any cut sheets. Mr. Dogan replied we are proposing Marvin units that have been approved previously by the Commission and are in the members packets.

Ms. Fineberg asked which windows were new and which windows exist? Mr. Dogan illustrated on the plan where the new windows and doors would be placed.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the masonry wall would be removed. Mr. Dogan replied that we will not remove that wall; however, on the inside of the building, the wall will be removed but not on the outside.

Mr. Golumb stated that in between the alley there is a wall with clapboards, and inquired if that would be repaired. Mr. Dogan replied that the plans include to strip the siding over the clapboards and repair the clapboards underneath.

Vice-Chairman Adams inquired if they were proposing to extend the roof out passed the corner board. Mr. Dogan replied that a vertical corner board will be used.

Ms. Fineberg inquired if the oculus would be maintained on the roof and added it was not shown on the plans. Mr. Dogan replied that originally there was a skylight on the roof over the staircase and caused the roof to sag; however, at this time he would like to rebuild the roof correctly.

SPEAKING IN OBJECTION TO THE PETITION

Ms. Tracey Lynch, an abutter at 73 Daniel Street. stated that the addition, even though the ridgeline has been changed, her view has not been improved and it is obstructed. She presented

photographs to the Commission that indicated this. The owner made a comment as to how much he paid for the building, but that is no reason to build such a monstrosity. She does not understand why something this large has to be constructed since it will de-value her property values and would rather maintain what she has.

Ms. Maryka Ford of 61 Penhallow stated that this addition is too high and destroys the view from her kitchen window and blocks light and air into her unit. It is out of character for the neighborhood and feels it will set a precedent in the area for future requests like this coming before the Commission. This is our neighborhood and we are not happy with developers coming in and changing the whole appearance of the area. The back area does need to be cleaned up and be made a little bit neater looking. She also presented photographs showing the view from her property

Ms. Erika Dodge, an abutter at 175 State Street, stated her concern was that there were no spec sheets on the windows and is concerned about the massing of the addition. This addition is not in-keeping with other buildings built in this area.

Mr. Emilio Maddaloni, a direct abutter, stated that there is no sun on this side of the street and because of the fact that the existing building is high as it exists, there is no air or light. He had to replace soffit and fascia board because the wood does rot away without any sun. During the winter months the snow and ice just sits and is concerned about the mass of the structure because it will block air and light.

Mr. George Dodge, an abutter at 175 State Street, stated we all agree that the rear of this building is not in great shape. But the massing of the addition and the scale is just too much for this neighborhood and is out of character since it will be the largest building in the area.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve as presented; Ms. Grasso seconded for discussion.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to **table** your application to the October 6, 2004 meeting to allow the massiveness and the height of the addition to be addressed. The Commission felt that the addition would be out of character with neighborhood because of the scale and massing of the addition.

Ms. Dika stated that she appreciated how the applicant and the Architect have tried to work with our concerns. However, standing on Penhallow Street, the addition is very awkward and out of character for the Historic District area and added that she cannot support the motion.

Ms. Grasso stated that she has no problem with the addition until you get to the top floor and it bothers her when standing on Penhallow Street because of the height being bulky and out of character for that area; therefore, she will not support the motion.

Mr. Golumb stated he also appreciated what the architect has done in trying to tie in our comments made at the work session. But after taking a look around Penhallow Street, it is out of character for the whole neighborhood and will be the tallest and highest roof. The massing is not in-keeping with the area and will not support the motion.

Mr. Becksted stated he will not support the application and added it does not make any architectural sense.

Ms. Fineberg stated she will not support the motion and agrees with her colleagues about the scale and the massing of the addition and the fact that it is not in-keeping with other buildings in the immediate vicinity. There have been some changes in the final design that addresses our concerns; however, the roof structure is too large and too tall for the neighbors as well.

Mr. Smith stated he will support the motion because it will clean up the back of the building. He liked the fact that the addition is pulled in on the sides and the roof does resemble a dormer.

Mr. Katz asked the Commissioner's if the third floor addition was the problem. Mr. Becksted stated that was correct.

Chairman Rice stated in this particular case, he feels the same way as all the negatives and added that he could be supportive, but is very uncomfortable with the dormer addition.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he applauds the applicant and Architect for their efforts; however, he finds the view from Penhallow Street awkward and out of character for the neighborhood. He feels very little of it is architecturally significant or compatible with the structures that surround the building. He feels that removing the masonry wall would be a negative thing and added that he had no issue with the general outline and form of the decks and entry vestibules on the back of the building.. To re-clapboard the gable end would be an improvement.

Chairman Rice asked the applicant if he would be willing to table this application to be brought back in another form at the October 6, 2004 meeting. The applicant agreed to this condition.

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to table the application to the October 6, 2004 meeting to allow for the massiveness and height of the structure to be addressed. The Commission felt that the addition would be out of character with neighborhood because of the scale and massing of the addition.

Mr. Golumb seconded and the motion passed 7 - 0 vote.

II. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by Hal Henry, owner, for property located on 235-245 Islington Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 045 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. (construct a two-story building with garage underneath on the "panhandle" section of the lot for residential use)

- Mr. that some of changes we have made were taken from the last from the last work session;
- Make the door entry simpler from the last elevation drawing shown;
- Put window fenestration on the side elevation;
- Would like to discuss our plans to put in a gable roof over the front door and bay windows over that;
- The Commission inquired if there was a sketch available to show this because normally a gable end is not placed over the front window.

- Chairman Rice stated his biggest concern was the garage underneath the building because this would set a difficult precedent and it is only a temporary solution;
 - Mr. Golumb inquired if a carriage house had been thought to be used for a garage;
 - The surrounding buildings have been there since the 1980's; therefore the proposed building would not be within keeping of the area;
 - Ms. Fineberg suggested that if the issue is the garage on the front façade, why not put the front of the structure on the side façade; that would create a larger façade on the front; it would look better and the right scale could be matched;
 - The applicant stated that in theory this sound like a good idea
 - Vice-Chairman Adams stated it is not the garage, but an entryway to a building;
 - A discussion took place on "vinyl windows vs. wood windows";
 - The proposed windows can be aluminum or wood clad with simulated divided lights;
 - The applicant discussed using Anderson windows with mullions on the inside and the outside.
 - The Commission members agreed this would be acceptable;
 - Another work session will be scheduled for the October 6, 2004 meeting. The applicant and the Commission members agreed.
-

B) Work Session requested by Paul B. Head, II, option holder, for property owned by Lynne V. Schurman located on 347 Maplewood Avenue. Said property is located on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 025 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts. (expansion and residential renovations)

- Mr. Paul Head, stated he is the owner of the property and just passed papers on the property this past week;
 - He then walked through his plans with the Commission members;
 - A rendering was shown on what the structure looks like today and another rendering was shown on what it would like after they get through the process with landscaping;
 - There is a walk-out basement;
 - The structure was built in 1836 and is a post and beam building. In 1901 the addition on the rear was put on that has a 6' height;
 - The roof structure is thick and has a slight slope to it;
 - The goal is to try and have a residence and a garage or carriage house for cars;
 - Space above the garage would be for a master bedroom.
 - Mr. Katz asked if the roof line would be raised on the addition:
 - Mr. Head stated we are changing the window fenestration and the connected carriage house will match the fenestration on the front of the building;
 - We are also proposing 2-1/2 baths as well as a true 1/2 bath;
 - Chairman Rice stated he feels the addition will make the existing property massive and too large for a single family residence. The addition is not within the character of the neighborhood;
 - Chairman Rice suggested that perhaps the garage should be ditchedl
 - Mr. Golumb feels the wood railings on the front façade seem to detract from the house;
 - Mr. Head stated the berm will stay in tact;
 - The Commission liked the proposal; however, they requested another work session be scheduled.
 - Mr. Head stated he would schedule a work session for the November meeting.
-

C) Work Session for property owned by Norman Nardello, owner and John Meehan, d/b/a Flatbread Company for property located at 138 Congress Street to allow a tall brick masonry parapet wall to be constructed on the garage roof to conceal the HVAC unit as stipulated by the Historic District Commission. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126, Lot 010 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to **grant your solution to have the unit painted by an artist to simulate a red brick as presented on page 1 of your presentation.**

III. OLD BUSINESS

1) Amendment to original approval given on January 7, 2004 for the petition of Smith, Minch and Frost, owners and Sumner Davis, Architects, applicant, for property located at 159-165 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow the windows on the rear elevation be replaced; install three over three and six over six windows at basement level on East, West and South elevations; and, location of gas meters) as plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 46-3 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 1, 2004 meeting to the reconvened meeting on September 8, 2004.

Mr. Smith made a motion to take the application off the table; Mr. Becksted seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Davis, the Architect for the project, stated he went to the site to measure the windows and glass sizes. The openings are the same as were approved. There are 40 windows that will be replaced.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he wanted to make sure all the rectangle glass would be going the same way. Mr. Davis replied that they will be.

Mr. Davis stated he would like to have the screening completely across the alleyway.

Chairman Rice stated the Amendment the approve for the location of materials pending.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that your request be **approved** as presented and advertised with the following stipulations:

- that the windows on the third floor be three over three;
 - that iron screening fence be used across the alleyway between the two buildings with 3-1/2" square posts and 3/4" square pickets every 4" on center and be 6' tall;
 - replace the fence that is existing
-

2) Petition for Christopher Muro, owner, for property located at 293 Marcy Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (the erection of a vinyl fence between 287 and 293 Marcy Street; and, replace rear deck with modifications.

Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 047 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 1, 2004 meeting to the reconvened meeting on September 8, 2004.

Mr. Smith made a motion to take the application off the table; Vice-Chairman Adams seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Muro, the owner of the property, presented a sample of the cedar fence that he would like to use that had lattice on the top. The proposed are for the fence is very moist and does not have any sun and anything that is used just rots and deteriorates.

Mr. Muro presented an updated plan for the deck. He added that he has changed the railings There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that your request be **approved as presented and advertised with the following stipulations:**

- that cedar fencing be used rather than vinyl;
 - that guardrails be used for the deck and that the caps be as large as the posts; and,
 - that the proposed lattice be diagonal rather than vertical.
-

) **Work Session/Public Hearing for Charles and Susan Lassen, owners and McHenry Architecture, applicant**, for property located at 34 Salter Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a full width one and a half story addition to the front façade of the structure creating a saltbox shape; and, add a granite stoop) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 034-A and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 1, 2004 meeting to the reconvened meeting on September 8, 2004.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that your request be **granted as advertised and presented with the following stipulations:**

- that the gable end windows on each side of the structure be taller;
 - that ventilation louvers be used at the peaks on the gable ends; and,
 - that a rustic brick be used.
-

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting and meet at the next scheduled meeting on October 6, 2004 and passed with a 7 – 0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Long
Secretary

/jml