

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

7:00 p.m.

May 4, 2005

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman John Rice, Vice Chairman David Adams, City Council Representative, Joanne Grasso, Planning Board Representative, Ken Smith, Members, John Golumb, Rick Becksted, Ellen Fineberg and, Alternates, Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**ALSO PRESENT:** Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

---

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve the March 30, 2005 and April 6, 2005 minutes; Mr. Golumb seconded.

Vice Chairman Adams noted the correction to be made to the April 6, 2005 minutes that the word “vestibule” on Page 12 was meant to be “vestigial”.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion to approve the March 30, 2005 and April 6, 2005 minutes and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

---

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**1. Petition for Daniel McKenna and Greenway Financial, LLC, owners** for property located at 79 Daniel Street wherein permission is requested to allow modifications to an existing approval (amend previous application approved on October 6, 2004 to remove one left side elevation attic window previously approved by HDC) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 9 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Steven McHenry of McHenry Architecture spoke on behalf of the petition. He explained the handout submitted to the Board. The first page depicted the approved left side elevation. He noted the gable and on the second, third and fourth stories there are a series of windows. He stated their intentions were to change one of the windows on the top floor in that, they wanted to remove the window entirely as depicted on page 2. He stated the reason for removing the window was due to

structural framing which was interfering with the inclusion of the left upper window and therefore, the owner requested it to be removed. He remarked that the drawings were deceiving as the position of the building is very close to the building next door and therefore, the windows and side elevation of the building are not visible from the street. He further noted to the Board that his firm was not the original contracted architect for the job as that architect has since left the area and thus, Mr. McHenry's firm took over. He asked if there were any questions.

Vice Chairman Adams wanted to know if the window proposed to be removed was off skew; it did not appear to be centered or not aligned with the gable.

Mr. McHenry answered that the drawing makes it appear that way but that is not the case on the actual building.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public who wished to speak to, for or against the current application.

There being no further speakers, the public hearing was closed.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve the application as submitted and Mr. Becksted seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

---

**2. Petition for Parade Office, LLC, owner and Dowling Corporation, applicant** for property located at 195 Hanover Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (install a 12" x 10' exhaust vent on roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

## **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Bob Marshall, representing the contractor, Dowling Corporation, spoke on behalf of the petition. He felt that the packet submitted to the Board was self-explanatory and stated that he was to there to answer any questions the Board had.

Chairman Rice asked if the proposed exhaust pipe was a foot in diameter and 10 feet tall.

Mr. Marshall answered that was correct.

Chairman Rice asked where exactly on the roof the proposed pipe would be positioned.

Mr. Marshall said 22 ft in from the edge of the roof, which runs parallel with Maplewood Avenue. He had someone hold a pipe on the top of the roof and took picture to see how visible it would be from the street.

Mr. Golumb asked about the pipe being attached with four guy wires and how high up on the stack it would they be.

Mr. Marshall said they would be connected anywhere on the top three feet of the stack or could go down as low as 6 or 7 feet.

Mr. Golumb asked if that was for weather conditions.

Mr. Marshall stated that was correct.

Mr. Becksted asked if it was safe to say that the guy wires would be no higher than 6 ft above the surface.

Mr. Marshall agreed and stated that he wanted them to be below the level where they would be visible.

Mr. Becksted asked what type material would be used for the pipe; if it would be typical white PVC pipe.

Mr. Marshall stated that it would actually be a schedule 40 PVC tinted grey pipe.

Ms. Fineberg asked Mr. Marshall what else was on the roof currently.

Mr. Marshall replied that there were four other exhaust stacks about fifteen feet behind their proposed exhaust pipe but that they are a little shorter and only visible from one elevation on the Library side.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public wishing to speak to, for against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Becksted moved to approve the application with the amendment that the guy wires attached to the exhaust pipe be no higher than 6ft above the roof deck and Councilor Grasso seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

---

**3. Petition for Federal Row Condo Association and 38 State Street Realty Trust, owners and G. Brandt Atkins, applicant** for property located at 38 State Street, #1, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (replace existing clapboards of entry alcove with raised panels to match existing entrance to residential units, add display shadow box with backlight and replace existing steps with granite to match existing steps on residential entrance) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 10 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

G. Brandt Atkins spoke on behalf of the petition as the president of the Federal Row Condominium Association and the owner of 38 State Street Realty. He went over the photos of the existing conditions that were submitted to the Board. He noted that the current door as shown in the pictures is the original door that he had sought and gained approval to replace but hasn't as of yet due to his current request to fix the stairs. He went over the left and right views of the entry alcove, which are currently sided with clapboards in need of repair. The current stairs are made of plywood covered or lined with indoor/outdoor carpet. He noted to the Board that he wanted to improve the alcove by mimicking the look of the residential entry, which has raised panels on either side of the alcove. In addition, he wanted to add display boxes on both sides of the alcove, both of which would be recessed into the wall to display listings and provide some light in that area for the ladies of the office when they leave at night to make them feel more safe. His intent was to not have overpowering light in the display boxes but subtle illumination. He then explained the current state of the steps being a set of three and unusually long. He said that he wanted to bring the top step to the foot of the door to make a landing and add two shorter steps that would be contained within the alcove and not go onto the sidewalk. He noted that he was unaware of the current state under the steps whether it will be ground, etc. but that they plan to use a plywood base as the underneath support and lay the cap of granite over it with concrete backer board.

Mr. Becksted questioned the idea of laying the granite over a plywood base.

Mr. Atkins felt that it would be properly sealed off from the elements and would not have any exposure to lead to deterioration.

Mr. Becksted asked rhetorically why something so permanent and pervious as granite would be chosen to lay over a plywood.

Ms. Fineberg asked what the traditional way to install it would be.

Mr. Becksted noted that using a granite overlay onto plywood would be subject to much deterioration and suggested using brick or some sort of masonry underneath; something solid to wear the weather.

Mr. Atkins replied that the plywood would be treated and that the current steps are plywood with just indoor/outdoor carpet overlay and there is no visible deterioration.

Mr. Smith wanted to clarify that the stairs would be contained within the alcove and not go onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Atkins answered that was correct.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Atkins to describe the display boxes he was proposing to install and how many there would be. He also wanted to know how the light would shine, whether it be backlit like an xray or hidden at the top shining down.

Mr. Atkins answered that there would be a total of two display boxes one on each side of the alcove and that the light would shine down as well as be hidden.

Mr. Katz commented on the steps and remarked that the applicant was essentially building a shower base.

Mr. Golumb suggested brick or concrete for the base for the granite to lay over.

Vice Chairman Adams asked Mr. Atkins if he meant that there would be ventilation due to cellar access.

Mr. Atkins stated that was correct and that he could view the steps to see if there was any noticeable deterioration.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if he would remove the existing steps and rebuild them.

Mr. Atkins answered that was correct; he would build a landing and two steps.

Vice Chairman Adams asked about the granite overlay Mr. Atkins was proposing and what type of surface it would be whether rough or polished.

Mr. Atkins answered rough not polished.

Chairman Rice asked about the door that had been mentioned earlier and why it had not been replaced when he got approval.

Mr. Atkins replied that he found the current steps to be too awkward to install the door and wanted to wait for approval on the steps before he installed it.

Chairman Rice asked if it has been over a year since the approval of the door.

Mr. Clum told Chairman Rice that it was ok if it has been over a year.

Mr. Clum stated that the current application would tie into the door approval and therefore would extend the time to install the door.

#### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve the petition as presented with the amendment to extend the approval previously given on the door. Mr. Becksted seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

---

**4. Petition for Michael Vitale and Janine Contillo, owners** for property located at 442 Marcy Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (remove two existing side windows and replace two existing back windows with one window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 78 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A districts.

### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Janine Contillo, co-owner of the proposed property, spoke on behalf of the petition. She informed the Board that they are currently trying to renovate their kitchen, which is very small with limited space and low ceilings. She further noted that in order to make as much room as possible for the cabinets and counter space, the existing two back windows, which are very low, would need to be replaced which they found gave them two options to choose from. Option A would replace the existing back windows with one smaller, more square window or Option B would replace the existing back windows with two smaller, more rectangular windows. In addition, she noted their desire to remove the two small windows on the side of the house to install more cabinets.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions for the applicant by the Board.

Vice Chairman Adams stated that he leant more towards Option B versus Option A due to the shape of the windows proposed in Option B. In that, they were more similar to the other existing windows on the house, but he was concerned about the window frames and the exterior features of the window because they seem to be different then the other windows on the house.

Ms. Contillo said that the contractor put together the cut sheets and did not know how to answer his question.

Mr. Becksted asked if the existing windows have large sills and if the new windows would be installed to simulate what was there now.

Ms. Contillo said yes.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if there were any divisions on the windows; whether there were permanently affixed grids glued to the exterior of the window or if they could be removed or if the panes/grids were between the glass.

Mr. Becksted noted that Anderson provides an option for exterior permanently affixed grids and told the applicant that was the option she needed to request.

Ms. Contillo agreed.

Ms. Fineberg asked if anyone had strong feelings one way or another about the removal of the side windows.

Mr. Smith and Chairman Rice both answered no.

Mr. Smith asked the applicant once the side windows were removed would they be replaced with clapboard to match.

Ms. Contillo said yes.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the clapboards used would match the existing.

Mr. Becksted noted it would need to look like the windows were never there.

Ms. Contillo agreed.

Chairman Rice asked the public if there was anyone else who wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Becksted moved to approve the application as submitted with the following amendments:

- The windows used will be trimmed out with sills and trim to closely match the sills and trim on the existing windows on the house; and
- The windows installed will have permanently affixed grids on the exterior/outside of the glass; and
- The windows used for the replacement of the two existing windows on the rear of the house will be Option B as set forth in the application; and
- To match the existing clapboards; have them toothed in to make the removal of the windows invisible and the reveal to line up.

Vice Chairman Adams seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

---

**5. Petition for Parade Office, LLC, owner** for property located on 100 High Street wherein permission is requested to allow modifications to an existing approval (amend previous application approved on January 5, 2005 to allow cementboard siding in place of previously approved E.I.F.S., to allow dumpster enclosure to be finished in split block in place of previously approved E.I.F.S.) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 30 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

## **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Dennis Mackenrow from DeStefano Architecture spoke on behalf of Parade Office, LLC. He first handed out sheets to aid his presentation. He explained to the Board that the "EIFS" mentioned in the application was a type of finish material similar to that of stucco. He stated that the first sheet depicted where they wished to remove the EIFS from the horizontal band down and replace that material with the siding noted in the handout. In doing so, he said, they will have to add window trims along that area in order to match the exiting windows that are above the band. The second portion of the building they were proposing to remove the EIFS from was the dumpster area. He

stated they want to replace the EIFS with split faced block due to its durability and the second sheet gave sketches of what that would look like. He further noted that they would match the existing color approved on the residential area.

Mr. Golumb asked why they were changing the product.

Mr. Mackenrow answered that they opted to change the material due to new proposed material's durability, it would match the siding above it and it would be consistent; keep it all one material.

Ms. Fineberg asked if they were continuing to use the EIFS material on the extreme left part of the hotel.

Mr. Mackenrow replied that was stone.

Ms. Fineberg noted that they looked the same.

Mr. Mackenrow clarified that the EIFS was scored to match the masonry.

Ms. Fineberg asked if one would look like wood and the other stone.

Mr. Mackenrow said it would look the same with different exposure.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the materials would be the same color and texture.

Mr. Mackenrow answered it would be the same texture.

Mr. Mackenrow stated that the owners want the backside to be all one material.

Vice Chairman Adams clarified that the dumpster area would be more of an internal part of the building; not open to public access or viewing.

Vice Chairman Adams said that the drawings provided depicting the proposed material changes lost a sense of sturdiness to the base to the building due to the removal of the EIFS. He felt that it lost some of its appearance but that the siding change has a significant impact.

Mr. Clum asked Vice Chairman Adams if he was clear on what exactly EIFS was and clarified that it was basically stucco over styrofoam.

Vice Chairman Adams stated yes.

Chairman Rice suggested possibly changing the exposure size.

Mr. Becksted thought what they were suggesting were the widest that they make.

Vice Chair Adams noted that another part of that were the windows that would be inserted would have to have trim on them, which would be very contradictory.

Mr. Katz agreed with Vice Chairman Adams about the illusion of a solid base before using the EIFS



material and what was proposed seemed like a step backwards.

Mr. Becksted also agreed and thought that it weakened the façade.

Councilor Grasso suggested for him to come back to the following week's meeting since they would be meeting anyhow.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Smith made a motion to table the petition to the following week's meeting. Vice Chairman Adams seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion to table the application to the following week's meeting of May 11, 2005 and it was approved 7-0 vote.

---

**6. Petition for Parade Office, LLC, owner** for property located on 77 Hanover Street wherein permission is requested to allow modifications to an existing approval (amend previous application approved on January 5, 2005 to change window manufacturer from the previously approved Weathershield to Quaker and other minor detail revisions) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 29 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

## **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Dennis Mackenrow from DeStefano Architecture spoke on behalf of Parade Office, LLC. He noted that they wanted to change the window manufacturer from the previously approved manufacturer, Weathershield to Quaker and pointed out the window schedule on sheet four.

Chairman Rice asked him what the difference was between the two.

Mr. Mackenrow answered that the Quaker windows were approved on the hotel portion of the building and the owner wanted to use the same manufacturer since the look is the same as Weathershield.

Mr. Becksted noted that the windows proposed would be shortened in size.

Mr. Mackenrow said that it would be made up in length and there are very minimal changes to the dimensions; mostly two to three inches with no loss of any glass.

Mr. Smith asked why the windows were being changed.

Mr. Mackenrow replied that again, the owner did not inform him but he felt it was probably due to the approved Quaker windows on the hotel.

Mr. Golumb suggested to table the application and Mr. Smith agreed.

Mr. Smith asked the applicant to provide more information on the windows at the next meeting.

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Golumb made the motion to table the application to the following week's meeting and Mr. Smith seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the application to be tabled to next week's meeting of May 11, 2005 and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

---

### III. WORK SESSIONS

**A) Work Session for Paul J. Carney, owner** for property located at 54 Rogers Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations and perform new construction on an existing building (addition to the rear of existing house to convert from a two story to a three story, add shed dormers at roof level, add new front landing, add a second floor to existing garage/barn/carriage house and remove the existing aluminum siding and replace with clapboards) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 44 and lies within the Mixed Residential O and Historic A districts.

- Paul J. Carney, owner and Glen Johnstone, the architect
- Mr. Johnstone handed out packets to the Board showing the house and proposed changes
- The house has aluminum siding
- Previous addition on rear; one story
- Want to replace aluminum with clapboards
- There are existing clapboards underneath that they want to match as closely as possible
- Want to add out over the one story on the rear
- Carry lines of existing house further
- Want to add onto the garage for storage and turn it into a carriage house
- The garage also has aluminum siding which they plan to replace with clapboards
- Chairman Rice asked if the trim would be changed
- Mr. Johnstone replied that they want to match everything as closely as possible
- The intent was to bring back as much of the original detailing as possible
- Anderson windows proposed with the permanently affixed grids on the exterior
- Intent is to keep the changes to the home to term or period
- Chairman Rice asked Mr. Johnstone to go over page by page of the handout
- Front elevation, they want to pull off the enclosure around the stairs to expose the existing entry
- The stairs go down to the sidewalk and they would like to add a landing
- They want to remove the chain linked fence around the house
- Clean-up front appearance
- Expose the brackets that hold up the canopy and a want to add a small balcony piece to the side elevation that would have similar brackets as on the front to carry over the detail
- Side by side elevation, the side that faces the school next door, they want to add a dormer there and change the window
- Add the balcony piece with french doors

- The dormers 4<sup>1/2</sup> x 12 to add more light
- The rear elevation, the roof deck would be cut back behind the gable to keep 3 feet of roof on either side to make the appearance of the gable stronger
- Covered porch with the access into the backyard
- Remove one window in the stairway to allow for more room and a linen closet
- Install divided light windows
- Match existing roof trim on the extensions
- Chairman Rice noted that they have a lot happening
- Vice Chairman Adams noted the roof pitches are more of a New England style home
- Chairman Rice asked about the garage addition if it would be attached to the house
- Mr. Johnstone said they would be essentially about 1 inch apart with the corner of one touching the other
- Chairman Rice asked to turn to page 8 and asked the Board if they had any heartburn with that elevation
- Vice Chairman Adams answered absolutely; He stated that he wanted to take a visit to the home and wondered why the dormers weren't the same, in that one was staggered and the other one was not
- Mr. Johnstone replied that one was staggered due to the stairwell
- Mr. Johnstone said that currently the stairs go up to the third floor and are like captain's stairs in that they are very steep and set in the center of the building; more like a ladder
- Vice Chairman Adams thought there needed to be some symmetry with the dormers
- He asked Mr. Johnstone for more views/perspectives in order to help the Board understand the roof and the loss of the symmetry
- Ms. Fineberg asked if the panes of the proposed windows were too much being six over six and offered two over one or two over two; she thought the six over six didn't fit with the period of the house
- Mr. Smith thought it made it look a little busy
- Chairman Rice stated that they have a very simple home that they are trying to make into something much more elaborate thus essentially changing the character of the house
- Chairman Rice asked if they wanted to tackle the garage
- Ms. Fineberg wanted the doors on the garage to look more like barn doors and the dormers on the garage seemed like they were too much for such a small building to carry
- Vice Chairman Adams agreed and offered the suggestion to balance the needs of the homeowner by making the garage taller
- Ms. Fineberg suggested adding windows to the garage if they would like more light
- Vice Chairman Adams mentioned a home on Albany and Cass Street for the owner and architect to look at for ideas on the construction of the garage doors
- Ms. Dika thought the dormers on the house were very distorting
- Ms. Fineberg loved the front door and landing
- Mr. Johnstone asked about the windows
- The Board suggested two over two
- Chairman Rice asked the Board to go to page 9; the balcony
- Chairman Rice said that it was very uncommon for a house in the Historic District to have balconies
- Mr. Johnstone stated that the front corner of the house has the best views down to the water and the placement of the balcony is off of the master bedroom to take advantage of it if possible

- to create an extension of the room
- Vice Chairman Adams wanted to discuss the dormers
- He felt that they could get the type of mass they are looking for if they had some sort of featured dormer; a unique gabled dormer
- Vice Chairman Adams didn't like the mulling of the five windows together
- Mr. Smith asked about the pull down fire ladder attached to the balcony
- Mr. Becksted asked Roger Clum if that was allowed
- Mr. Clum asked if it would be like a fire escape
- Mr. Carney said it was more for decoration than use
- Mr. Clum replied that if it is not a required exit then the City would allow it
- Ms. Fineberg asked if the rear door would be a solid door or if it would have lites
- Mr. Johnstone said whatever the Board wished
- Chairman Rice had the Board move onto page 10, back of the building
- Chairman Rice asked if the garage could have a window added to it since they are going to make it taller
- The Board thought the changes made to the house on page 11 was a vast improvement
- Mr. Katz commented that he wasn't crazy about the balcony proposed for the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor but that he liked the third floor balcony because he didn't think it stuck out like the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor
- He wanted the dormers on the front elevation to be reduced slightly and he understood the problem with the staircase on the opposite side affecting the size of the other dormer
- Mr. Johnstone asked if there was one preference or another
- Vice Chairman Adams suggested A-frame dormers since they tend to work well with odd spaces and odd lengths
- Mr. Smith noted that there would be no need to install a faux chimney in the place of the one being removed since they would be adding another chimney in a different location
- Vice Chairman Adams suggested another work session

**B) Work Session for Deer Street Associates, owner** for property located at 165 Deer Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (addition of a porte cochere and windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

- Julie Macdonald from DeStefano Architects
- This property was formerly the Genip Tree
- Second floor is currently a yoga studio
- Seeking change in use on the first floor into a Centrix Bank
- Work is primarily on the exterior, first floor with some minor above
- Focusing most on the front, make it look more like a bank
- Pages 4-7 are existing, there is brick veneer on front and the balance of the building is vinyl siding
- Page 8, adding a covered entry at front and porte cochere for the driveup and the existing drive-up window will be converted into more teller-like window
- Owner wants to use PVC and MDF over the use of wood with fiberglass for the column material
- Ms. Fineberg noted that the HDC has approved fiberglass columns before
- Chairman Rice asked if the windows would be true divided lites

- Julie answered yes
- They would be taking out the storefront, adding windows, toothing in masonry to match
- They would be adding detail to the overhang to dress up a bit and adding casing to the windows and doing a larger exposure vinyl to bring down the scale/mass
- The columns are on masonry piers, brick to match
- The second sheet shows the side elevation where proposed porte cochere would be
- Mr. Smith suggested wood for the stairs' enclosure since the appearance of wear and damage would be more prominent if it were vinyl
- Vice Chairman Adams suggested using 12" hardy wood plank for the porte cochere and dormer
- Mr. Katz suggested using the material on the stairs as well
- The Board suggested a Public Hearing

**C) Work Session for Nina Shore, owner** for property located at 18 Mt. Vernon Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (redesign roof, add dormer and windows to the rear of the house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 27 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

- Bob Maranhas for the owner
- He stated that the roof line stops half way across the house and there are two dormers that come out from that point which they currently have problem with water and leakage
- The second story is 6 ft to the ridge at best, so they would like to have a full second story on the house
- They want to carry the roof line up on the same pitch and then bring it back out, it hits the chimneys and it hits the back of the foundation
- They want to bring up the main dormer so it is the same pitch as the front and carry it out all the way across the back to eliminate a flat section
- Instead of the peak dormer on the other side they want a shed dormer
- All new windows would be 6 over 6, wood sash
- Chairman Rice reiterated that they would be removing the gable and replacing with a shed dormer as they carry the roof across
- Mr. Maranhas noted that one window would be eliminated on the first floor in the back which is currently a bathroom window since the bathroom is being relocated
- New addition proposed would have french doors
- Chairman Rice asked if there would be any lites in the doors
- Mr. Maranhas noted that there could be
- Chairman Rice noted the size of the skylight; very large
- Mr. Maranhas said that was what the owner wanted
- Chairman Rice said a smaller skylight would be more appropriate
- Mr. Smith suggested to reduce the amount of windows on the back to two or smaller sized windows
- Councilor Grasso thought there was too much glass
- Vice Chairman Adams thought everything looked great
- The Board suggested a Public Hearing

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:30 p.m. a motion was made to adjourn the meeting and to meet on the following Wednesday, May 11, 2005 in order to complete the Agenda. The motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina V. Staples  
HDC Secretary

/Cs