

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

7:00 p.m.

July 13, 2005

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman John Rice, Vice Chairman David Adams, Member, John Golumb, Alternates, Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** City Council Representative, Joanne Grasso, Planning Board Representative, Ken Smith, and Member, Ellen Fineberg

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

---

**I. OLD BUSINESS**

1. **Petition for Peter Rice, owner** for property located at 196 South Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (add shed dormer to the third floor on the rear of the existing house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 67 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

*This petition was tabled at the July 6, 2005 meeting.*

Vice Chairman Adams moved to remove the tabled petition and Mr. Golumb seconded.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Peter Rice spoke on behalf of the petition and submitted additional materials to the Commission. As a result of the last meeting, Mr. Rice provided the missing elements (i.e. Dimensions). He stated that he changed the windows to Brosco, wooden windows and the shakes to clapboard to allow for a 4 inch reveal. The molding and trim would match the existing.

Chairman Rice asked if the windows had true divided light and permanently affixed grids.

Mr. Rice answered yes.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve as amended and presented and Ms. Dika seconded.

Vice Chairman Adams felt the changes that were proposed represent improvements and he liked the sashes chosen. He also was pleased to see the rear elevation and recognized symmetry and balance with the windows.

Mr. Katz concurred with Vice Chairman Adams comments.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion and the motion passed with a 5–0 vote.

---

## II. WORK SESSIONS

**A) Work Session for RRJ Properties, Limited Partnership, owner and Martingale Wharf, LLC, applicant** for property located at 99 Bow Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (addition to an existing building creating a mix-use building composed of restaurants, street level retail, offices and residential components) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A districts.

- John Merkle of TMS Architects presented
- Intent to place additions on the east and west side and will be modifications to existing building
- Working with it on several issues
- Original building built around 1855
- Presently 14 residential units
- Mixed-use building with leased units and not all condos, retail on street level, businesses and restaurants with a couple of units for residential
- Design approach consistent with the City's Master Plan
- Additions would be about 4 and a half stories in height and the Martingale building would be altered to remove the brick and add retail to the lower floors
- Pitch of the roof would change to accommodate additional half floor
- Materials along Bow Street would be consistent with other materials in the district
- First floor could be recessed back to allow for better sidewalk access
- The new building on the water side would be 4 and a half to 6 stories high
- Buildings intended to be more in the character of the industrial waterfront
- The glass areas consisted of multiple materials and clear, non-reflective glass
- Would use non-masonry spandrels similar to Harbour Place
- Void between the floors would not be brick
- Ten feet deep for the offset
- They've elected to keep it simple
- Two access points for public access on both east and west sides
- There was a 12 foot wide dock existing and wanted to add another thirty feet to it
- Chairman Rice thought it was a lot to digest and a radical change to Bow Street
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission if they felt there needed to be such attention to the riverscape
- Ms. Dika thought it was massive and the glass troubled her, it was a vast change to what is existing in Portsmouth
- Mr. Golumb thought there was a lot of different designs that compete with themselves, too much glass that takes away from the project
- He also thought Bow Street was too simple for what they proposed
- Vice Chairman Adams thought Bow Street was a tough mold to follow and he was nervous about the hodgepodge windows along the ground level
- He also thought there's a sense of more brick than glass in Portsmouth and he thought it was too massive
- He thought it was a great idea to fill in on both sides but it was a little much
- Mr. Katz didn't have a problem with the massing
- He thought the building shown from the waterscape he thought it jumped out and took center stage

- He thought it should live with the other buildings but blend as well
  - Mr. Golumb thought it was an exciting project and he felt that it overwhelmed Bow Street
  - He thought it was massive and thought they needed to be sympathetic to Bow Street
  - He thought it was a floor to high
  - Chairman Rice looked at the front of the property and thought the roof treatment needed to be repetitious and thought what was proposed was a radical change from the existing streetscape
  - Mr. Katz asked them to consider designing one story less
  - Mr. Golumb suggested a site walk
  - Chairman Rice applauded them to be the first application to create some interest deliberately on the river side
- 

**B) Work Session for Dennett-Prospect Realty Investments, LLC, owner** for property located at 69-73 Prospect Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (exterior renovations to primary structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 142 as Lots 28 and 29 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

- Steven McHenry and Mr. Bob Dennett presented
  - Passed out plans and presented a site plan
  - He explained where the property was located in relation to other properties
  - Two properties, one old main house and an accessory building on a separate lot
  - Would be a long-term process
  - In existing main building, 6 apartments
  - Accessory building used for storage
  - Plan was to stabilize the existing main house, which was in disarray and repair and renovate the exterior and reduce the number of units
  - He noted the existing additions that were added on in the past
  - Want to take off the second level porch
  - He thought some of the windows had original sashes and wanted to try to restore them
  - Accessory building was currently one story, L shaped with two stories in the rear corner
  - Wanted to keep the footprint the same and try to recreate the building as a carriage house
  - Could've been built back in 1925
  - Designs were not meant to be finalized in any way and were just concepts
  - Chairman Rice stated that the Commission was one hundred percent for it
  - Vice Chairman Adams thought that there should be a feature over the door on the accessory building
  - He thought they should reduce the height and keep the roof low on the accessory building
  - Mr. Golumb was on board and loved it
- 

**C) Work Session for Richard W. Edgerly, owner** for property located at 154/156 Fleet Street wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure and erect a new free standing structure (demolish existing two and a half story apartment building and rebuild new three or four story building with retail on first floor and residential units above) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 6 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

- Julie MacDonald of DeStefano Architecture presented
- Chairman Rice noted the site walk the Historic District Commission took on the subject property and pointed out that the current condition of the subject property was in very bad shape
- Ms. MacDonald handed out the packet to the Commission

- She went over the plans
- First sheet was the locus with context photos on pages 2, 3 and 4
- The fifth page depicted the elevations
- Building to be four stories vs. the three previously proposed
- Flat roof to house mechanicals
- Front of building would have grouping of windows, smaller windows do not have muntins (i.e. two pairs on either side of the center)
- Center windows more narrow
- Vice Chairman Adams didn't think that was something the Commission was concerned with the size
- He was more interested in seeing muntins on all windows
- Heavy cornice as precast
- Precast detailing from the storefront up at the continuous bands, at the cornice and the parapets
- Bricks for the lintels
- Vice Chairman Adams if there was a particular reason for that
- Ms. MacDonald said they liked the way they looked
- Chairman Rice asked if they were going for a more simple look
- Ms. MacDonald replied yes and she said that they wanted to bring some color into the building
- She said they were considering contrast and rhythm
- Store front level would have aluminum store front with recessed paneled base built up to look like wood
- MDO
- Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions or comments
- Mr. Golumb asked what the height of the proposed in relation to the existing
- Ms. MacDonald guessed about thirty-two feet to ridge for the existing and forty plus for the new
- Mr. Golumb asked what the height of the new building would be in comparison to the building across the street
- Ms. MacDonald said 61 feet and theirs at 48 feet and up
- Mr. Golumb was very unsettled with the design
- He could not pin point what it was exactly but it was just something that was unsettling
- Chairman Rice thought it was a textbook design, very simple
- Vice Chairman Adams was uncertain as to how the transition between the proposed cementitious siding and the brick façade would take place
- He was hesitant and uncomfortable with the chosen mix
- He thought the verticals were still important for the windows
- He thought the front of building on the site was very important
- He liked the four story and was pleased with the floor to floor height
- He thought it was a great addition to the street
- Mr. Katz asked if the choice for the cementitious siding was cost related
- Ms. MacDonald answered primarily yes
- She said didn't think that it was a building that would be viewed from all sides
- Mr. Katz was more comfortable with a ten foot on one side and wanted more of a setback than four inches between the brick and the clapboard
- He thought it would look more like it was planned
- Ms. MacDonald argued that four inches was a large recess
- She walked the Commission through the other sheets of the plans
- Sheet 6 showed the elevation coming from the Congress Street side
- Residential on upper three floors
- Vice Chairman Adams said he wasn't too familiar with aluminum clad french doors

- Ms. MacDonald said they had presented them before and that they would be just like the windows they approve
- Wood body, profiles the same
- Sheet 8 from Hanover side
- Showed panelized suedo window locations and they did not want to have windows on that side besides the fact that they can't since they are too close to property lines
- She noted that they were very careful to show property lines on the plans
- Vice Chairman Adams liked the faux panels instead of a blank wall
- He thought architecturally it made more sense than a blank wall
- Chairman Rice thought the design was charming
- Ms. MacDonald said they were dropping the parapet on the back of the building and there would be roof decks
- Sheet 11 was the roof plans
- Chairman Rice asked the public if they had any comments or questions
- An abutter asked if the view from page 8 was the view from Hanover
- Ms. MacDonald said yes
- He asked if they were windows
- Ms. MacDonald said no they were panels and they were just there to break-up the elevation so it wasn't a blank wall
- He asked why they did not have any windows
- She said they weren't allowed since they were so close to the property lines
- He thought it looked terrible
- She said they were allowed to build to the property line
- He thought they should ask for a variance because he thought it looked inappropriate
- He was also curious about the siding and the mechanicals
- He noted that clapboard was lower-class construction and that the proposed building was in a higher class section of town, so he said to put clapboard on that building was not a match for the community
- He said his tenants would be looking at the exposed HVC and asked for wooden fences to disguise the mechanicals
- She said there were some around the mechanicals
- He also mentioned the setbacks and asked how they would be able to build it
- Chairman Rice said that was a site review concern
- Chairman Rice said that the Commission should take another walk to view the building to rethink the siding
- Vice Chairman Adams would be much happier with a fifteen percent reduction in plan to see what the windows would look like and find out how much that would damage their plan
- Chairman Rice said that might have been what was unsettling to Mr. Golumb
- Mr. Katz had some discomfort with the cementitious clapboards
- He thought it was inappropriate for a building of that design and style to incorporate clapboard into the design
- He thought it should be a brick building
- Chairman Rice agreed
- Chairman Rice asked how he felt about the rear wall
- Mr. Katz didn't have a problem with that
- Ms. MacDonald asked how he felt about the detailing getting lighter and asked if he wanted to carry around the big heavy cornice
- Mr. Katz said no, he thought that aspect of design was in their purview because the design features were off the front

- Those design features could be at that area but the materials he couldn't get away from and that she should carry that around on both sides
  - Mr. Golumb concurred with Mr. Katz's comments and suggestions
  - He felt it needed to be full brick
  - Chairman Rice thought it needed to be brick on all sides since that would be out of character
  - Vice Chairman Adams added that someone may not know that they were looking at a brick building from the rear view
  - Another member of the public said that there would be more foot traffic and thought that the existing building was different and unique and thought if it were to be replaced it would need to be replaced with something unique as well
  - Mr. Tony Farina had some concerns about the lighting
  - Chairman Rice said that it was a valid concern and issue but that it was a site review concern and not under their jurisdiction
  - Chairman Rice asked if there was anything else
  - Ms. MacDonald passed around some glazed tile to be added to the front façade and wanted the Commission's input on that material
  - Mr. Katz didn't have a problem with it since he had seen it before
  - Ms. MacDonald thought it would be very subtle and just add some color
  - Vice Chairman Adams asked if it would be sprinkled on the building
  - Ms. MacDonald said yes, at the top and all across, the ends, the middle and at the entry at the bottom of the doors
  - Ms. Dika liked the detail very much
  - Chairman Rice asked if there would be another work session on the proposed project
  - Ms. MacDonald indicated that there would not be and that they would try to make the public hearing in August
- 

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

At 8:52 PM, a motion was made and seconded that the meeting be adjourned to the following month's Historic District Commission's meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina V. Staples  
HDC Secretary