

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

7:00 p.m.

August 3, 2005

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve the minutes of the July 6th meeting and Mr. Golumb seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote with Councilor Grasso abstaining.

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 13th meeting and Mr. Golumb seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote with Councilor Grasso, Ms. Fineberg and Mr. Smith abstaining.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition for Basil Richardson, owner for property located at 142-150 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (repair fire damage with new clapboards, replace fire escape, remove rear wall and replace 7 windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 60 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. *This petition is for HDC reapproval of previously approved plans due to a lapse of the approval time period.*

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Basil Richardson spoke on behalf of the petition. He reiterated that he had let the previous approval lapse and would like to obtain another approval for the same.

Chairman Rice asked if the approval would be for another year.

Mr. Richardson said yes.

Mr. Smith asked if he was changing anything.

Mr. Richardson replied no.

Ms. Fineberg asked since there were no door schedules if he was reusing the existing doors.

Mr. Richardson said if they didn't they would replace them in kind, same number of panes, etc.

Ms. Fineberg asked if he would use the same materials.

Mr. Richardson said yes.

Mr. Katz said he didn't have to use the same materials as long as the door configuration remains the same and read aloud the ordinance to the Commission to clarify that was so.

Chairman Rice asked if anyone else had any questions.

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 Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to reapprove the petition as previously approved and presented and Mr. Smith seconded.

Vice Chairman Adams added that not much had changed in the neighborhood and he therefore, did not have any problems with reapproving the previously approved plans.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote.

2. Petition for Paul J. Carney, owner for property located at 54 Rogers Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (addition to rear of existing house to convert front two story to three story, add second floors and rear level, add new front landing, add second floor to existing garage and remove existing gable roof 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 Office and Historic A districts.

3. Petition for the City of Portsmouth Police Department, owner and Captain David Ferland, applicant for property located at 3 Sunnys Avenue wherein permission is requested to erect a new free-standing structure constructed 8' x 12' wood shed as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 1 and lies within the Municipal and Historic A districts.

4. Petition for Betty Morton Belcher, owner and Brad Hawthorne, applicant for property located at 205 Market Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (replace all windows on rear of building (Ceres Street)) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Brad Hawthorne spoke on behalf of the petition. He reiterated what he was trying to do and accomplish and asked the Commission for their approval.

Ms. Fineberg asked if he was going to replace all the windows and the ones on the side that already have the same profile as the ones chosen to install.

Mr. Hawthorne said he would be replacing all of the windows on the rear of the building.

Chairman Rice said that the windows looked like true divided lites.

Mr. Hawthorne said yes, simulated true divided lites.

Chairman Rice said that meant they were glued to the exterior.

Mr. Hawthorne yes and on the interior and that they were wood interior and aluminum clad exterior.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if he would be doing any reclapboarding or changes to the masonry openings.

Mr. Hawthorne said no but he hoped to do some spot repointing on the brick sills.

Chairman Rice asked if there any further questions.

Hearing none, Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone who wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

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

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve as presented and Councilor Grasso seconded.

Mr. Smith was happy with the replacement.

Mr. Katz thought it would be a great improvement to the appearance of the building and Ms. Dika agreed.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote.

5. Petition for March 22 LLC, owner for property located at 58 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (relocation of doors, windows and chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lots 6 and 12 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. *This petition is for HDC reapproval of previously approved plans due to a lapse of the approval time period as well as some amendments to the same.*

FIRST PART-REAPPROVAL OF PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of DeStefano Architects spoke on behalf of the petition. She stated that due to the lapse of the approval they were back for the reapproval of the previously approved plans. She asked if there were any questions on that segment of the plans on the previously approved application/plans.

Mr. Katz remembered that there were a number of work sessions and site walks on the property and the plans and so he was comfortable with approving the same.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else.

Hearing none, 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 that portion of the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Grasso made the motion to reapprove the previously approved plans and Mr. Smith seconded.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote.

SECOND PART-AMENDMENTS/REVISIONS

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of DeStefano Architects spoke on behalf of the petition. Ms. Ramsey explained that there was a change in ownership, which lead to the amendments before the Commission. She further explained the packet contents to the Commission. She said that each front page would reflect what was previously approved and the following page would be the amendments or revisions to what was previously approved. Ms. Ramsey went onto explain the revisions. She went over the first page of the plans and stated that was the site plan as approved in 2004 and the following page was the revisions. She pointed out that the bays on the building had shifted slightly and they indicated the dimensions as to how they shifted, which were actually centered on the building different from the Asymmetrical alignment as previously approved. She further stated that there was a new entry off of Court Street, a new curved deck on the second floor, a fenced in yard between the two buildings and a new garage door access on the 58 State Street building. She asked if there were any questions in regard to the site. Hearing none, Ms. Ramsey continued going over the plans. She moved onto page 3 which was what was previously approved and then page 4 which depicted the windows on front elevation shifted slightly and the dimension strings all 7 feet indicated the new centerline of the windows. It also showed the new front entrance on Court Street as well as the curved deck that would protrude slightly beyond one foot six from the window bays.

Mr. Wycoff asked if the entrance detail was premanufactured entry or custom built.

Ms. Ramsey said it was custom.

Mr. Wycoff said there was no indication of depth of the pilasters on the entry.

Ms. Ramsey said that there was some detail on the next page but that they had left the depth detail out.

Chairman Rice asked if that detail satisfy his question.

Mr. Wycoff answered no since it would be custom built and he wanted a dimension.

Chairman Rice asked Ms. Ramsey to provide them with a dimension for that.

Ms. Ramsey gauged the furthest piece out would protrude about 4 inches off the building.

Chairman Rice asked if she would commit to that.

Ms. Ramsey said she would commit to that.

Vice Chairman Adams said Mr. Wycoff was on the right track but asked for the thickness of the pilasters. He suggested a full inch and a quarter.

Ms. Ramsey agreed to commit to that.

Vice Chairman Adams clarified that all of the moldings would wrap around them.

Ms. Ramsey said yes.

Vice Chairman Adams also asked Ms. Ramsey if she would commit to the projection on the cap piece to be five inches.

Ms. Ramsey agreed.

Vice Chairman Adams asked her to explain why the windows that were moved were so unnaturally pushed together.

Ms. Ramsey said that the window locations were driven by the plan changes on the interior as requested by the client. She further stated that they had made efforts to align the first floor with the third and center the new entry door underneath the two windows above it.

Vice Chairman Adams didn't think it had as much balance as they previously did in the other drawings. He said it didn't strike him but that there was something awkward about the windows on the gable end.

Mr. Katz didn't have a problem with the windows. He felt that sometimes the Commission has to allow exterior appearance to be dictated by interior considerations.

Ms. Fineberg asked if making the second floor windows larger would help give the side of the building a little more weight.

Vice Chairman Adams thought the suggestion was an improvement.

Ms. Ramsey clarified if Ms. Fineberg was asking to make the second floor windows the same size as the first floor.

Ms. Fineberg said yes.

Chairman Rice asked if that was possible.

Ms. Ramsey said that could be accommodated and changed.

Ms. Ramsey continued with the remainder of the plans. She went over page 5 of the previously approved plans and then went over page 6 with the amendments and explained that the chimney locations were changed to be pulled in and centered on the building flanking the centerline of the building, there were requesting single french doors on the balconies versus the two previously approved, they decreased the window in size in the center of the building on the third floor, the dimension line ran through the building which depicted the centerline of the bays (centered on the building), there was a new window on the first floor on both the front and rear of the property, the size and shape of the garage doors stayed the same however they have been reduced from four to three and were shifted to the middle of the building, they fenced in the yard between the two buildings on the property.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if that was just a board fence.

Ms. Ramsey answered yes. She continued on with the final change depicted on page 5 of the plans, which was the fourth garage door that appeared in the previous application was moved to the 58 State Street building and was centered with the two windows that were above it.

Chairman Rice asked if the Commission knew where the garage door was located that they were looking at.

The Commission acknowledged that they did.

Ms. Ramsey went on explaining the remainder of the plans. Page 7 was the previously approved north elevation, which was the rear of the building on Court Street. Page 8 was the detail of the new entry, the curved deck, new window locations similar to the front of the building as the windows were pulled into the center of the building slightly, seven feet off of the corner board, fenced in yard and a new door out to the yard from that property.

Mr. Golumb asked about the curved deck and what type of material it would be.

Ms. Ramsey said it was the same deck that was previously there, a wood deck and said that they had taken the deck and given it a soft curve to it. She reiterated that the materials were the same as approved before. Ms. Ramsey continued with the presentation and moved onto page 9, which was the previously approved west elevation and she noted that nothing had changed. Page 10 was the previously approved perspective sketch looking up Court Street and page 11 depicted the new front entry door. Page 12 showed the window and the door schedule.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any further questions on the amendments.

Ms. Fineberg asked Ms. Ramsey to explain why they chose to use the particular garage door façade.

Ms. Ramsey explained that garage door was located underneath a Porte Cochere with a deck above which was not visible from State or Court Street and being that, they went with a simplified door and additionally, across the courtyard there was a similar door to that and that door essentially mirrored the other door across the courtyard.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else.

Hearing none, Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone who wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

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

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to approve the amendments as presented with the stipulation that the second story windows depicted on page 4 of the plans be changed to match the first floor window size.

After discussion, this motion was ultimately withdrawn.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve as drawn and presented and Mr. Katz seconded.

Mr. Smith added that the inch and a quarter dimension of the pilasters and the five inch projection of the cap piece on the doorway mentioned earlier be added as a stipulation to the motion.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a vote of 6-1 with Vice Chairman Adams voting in opposition.

6. Work Session/Public Hearing for Richard 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 four story brick/cementitious siding multiuse building with retail on first floor and residential units above with wooden decks at rear) 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.

WORK SESSION

Ms. Julie MacDonald of DeStefano Architects spoke on behalf of the petition. She stated that they wanted to start in a work session forum since they had so many comments from the previous work session that they wanted to have a chance to review with the Commission and discuss prior to the public hearing. She took some photos of buildings mostly on Congress Street and also on Fleet Street to show why they chose to continue with the brick on the side elevations of the building and to show different end conditions and facades in the downtown area. Ms. MacDonald went over the drawings. The first sheet was the site plan, which depicted the dimensions from property lines and other buildings as well as some context photos, mostly taken on Fleet Street. The second page was the Fleet Street elevation, which depicted the tile detailing at the corners and the end pilasters at the base as well as the cornice and continuous band details. She went onto the side elevation, which faced Congress. The front was all brick and the rear had the cementitious siding.

Mr. Golumb asked Ms. MacDonald about the aluminum clad doors whether that was a new treatment or not.

Ms. MacDonald said it was on the previous plans.

Mr. Wycoff asked if the six inch exposure on the clapboard was only on the first floor.

Ms. MacDonald answered yes and above that it went to four.

The Commission wanted to know why.

Ms. MacDonald replied for some interest, they thought it broke-up an otherwise blank wall.

Chairman Rice thought a four-inch exposure would be more appropriate.

Ms. MacDonald said that was fine.

Mr. Golumb asked Ms. MacDonald to make sure with the cementitious siding that the smooth side was on the exposure and not the rough side.

Ms. MacDonald said that was not a problem. She continued on with the plans. Page 4 depicted some of the brick detailing and they were adding some detail at the base with a special brick piece that corbelled out which gave a thicker base for the brick. The upper detail showed the stepping of the parapet wall as well as the tile detail. The middle detail was the precast parapet, which was located at the front and the side.

Mr. Golumb liked the tile detail.

Ms. MacDonald went over the rear elevation, which depicted the detail of the porches.

Chairman Rice reiterated that they would like the four-inch exposure again on the rear.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if that was the elevation that they would see the end of the masonry.

Ms. MacDonald answered yes, the brick would wrap twelve inches and then there would be a step back where it would change to the clapboard. She then moved onto page 6 which was the elevation facing Hanover Street with the abutters building dashed in below. It was pretty similar to what was presented at the prior work session with the exception of the full masonry and the eighteen-inch return of the nice detailing of the façade with an expansion joint.

Chairman Rice asked if they were going to recess two false window openings.

Ms. MacDonald clarified that there would be four. The roof plan was similar to the plan seen at the prior work session. It depicted the detail of the fence enclosure used to house the mechanicals.

Vice Chairman Adams noted three separate stairwells.

Ms. MacDonald explained two were private for the penthouses and the other was for utility. Page 7 was the perspective and page 8 was the window and door schedule.

Chairman Rice asked if there was any comment on the plans.

Mr. Wycoff said it was a nice looking building.

Ms. Fineberg had a concern with page 6's elevation and how the side of the building would look coming down the street since the abutting building was not shown.

Ms. MacDonald reiterated what was noted at the prior work session, they were building right up to the property lines so they were unable to put windows in on the side elevations. She further stated that the

perspective view sketch nicely depicted the side of the building and how it would look coming down the street. Ms. MacDonald felt that the four recessed masonry openings complemented that façade.

Mr. Katz commended Ms. MacDonald on a great job and further noted that it was a great example of an early twentieth century small-city architecture. He was pleased with the removal of clapboards on the sides of the building and he was fully in favor of the project.

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to move to the public hearing and Councilor Grasso seconded.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. MacDonald of DeStefano Architects spoke on behalf of the petition. She stated that she just wanted to go over the materials chosen and colors selected for the project since everything else had been discussed and reviewed by the Commission at the work session. She then handed out samples of the brick, the French door cutsheets and the color samples to the Commission.

The Commission reviewed the samples and discussed the same.

Mr. Golumb asked Ms. MacDonald about the mortar sample whether they had selected one or not.

Ms. MacDonald replied no but said there could be a mock-up performed on site.

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

Hearing none, the Chairman asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Mr. Michael Delacruz expressed his concern about the view from the Hanover Street side.

Chairman Rice replied so noted.

Chairman asked if there was anyone else 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 BOARD

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve as presented and amended with the four-inch reveal and brick and mortar site mock-up and Councilor Grasso seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote.

7. **Petition for Karl M. Belilah, owner and Kate Hobbs, applicant** for property located at 254 Newcastle Avenue wherein permission is requested to erect a new free standing structure (erect a fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 38 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Kate Hobbs spoke on behalf of the petition. She said that she wanted to install a simple Board Fence in the rear of the house to keep in her dogs and referred to the picture submitted in the packet.

Chairman Rice asked if it was a custom fence.

Ms. Hobbs said yes, that it was from Upright Fence. She said the house was right on the street and it seemed like it was the most fitting with the neighborhood.

Chairman Rice asked if she was just fencing in the back yard.

Ms. Hobbs answered yes.

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

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

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

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Smith moved to approve as presented and Mr. Golumb seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote.

III. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:30 PM, a motion was made and seconded that the meeting be adjourned to the following month's meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina V. Staples
HDC Secretary

/Cs