

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

7:00 p.m.

September 7, 2005

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Golumb

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Building Inspector

Let the record reflect that the Chairman of the Historic District Commission read aloud a statement on behalf of the Commission in reference to a "site walk" on the property 99 Bow Street.

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Smith moved to approve the minutes of the August 3rd meeting and Councilor Grasso seconded.

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition for City of Portsmouth Police Department, owner and Captain David Ferland, applicant for property located at 3 Junkins Avenue wherein permission is requested to erect a new free standing structure (install a wooden shed adjacent to existing garage at rear) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 1 and lies within the Municipal and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Capt. David Ferland spoke on behalf of the petition. He explained the request was to construct a shed adjacent to the existing garage for the purpose of storage of cones, signs, etc. as well as for the added security of their property.

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

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the petition as presented and Ms. Dika seconded. Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed via a unanimous vote.

2. Petition for Elisabeth Blaisdell, owner for property located at 77 Newcastle Avenue wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (restore and expand existing two-story porch at the rear) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 50 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Elisabeth Blaisdell spoke on behalf of the petition. She wanted to restore and expand the existing lower deck and upper deck on the rear of the house. She wanted to cover up the exposed soil area/dead space in her backyard as well as to permit her to put a table and chairs under cover from the elements on the proposed rear lower portion of the deck.

Chairman Rice asked if there would be any change in fenestration.

Ms. Blaisdell answered no.

Ms. Fineberg asked what IPE wood decking was.

Ms. Blaisdell answered that it was basically like mahogany but more durable with a longer life span.

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

Mr. Harold Whitehouse of 58 Humphreys Court spoke as an abutter to the petition and shared that he was in support of the same.

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

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Dika made a motion to approve the petition as presented and Councilor Grasso seconded.

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

3. Petition for Middle Street Townhouse Association, owner and Charles LeMay, applicant for property located at 774 Middle Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (installation of gutters to Unit #2) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 153 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Charles LeMay spoke on behalf of the petition. He explained that he wanted to add gutters to the only remaining unit that did not have any. He pointed out that he would be using aluminum seamless gutters similar to the ones depicted in the other picture contained in the packet submitted to the Commission.

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

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

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

4. Petition for Thomas Heany, owner for property located at 816 Middle Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocation of existing detached garage to new location on site) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 152 as Lot 44 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Thomas Heany spoke on behalf of the petition. He explained that he had gone before the Planning Board for the same request and that part of the approval stipulations was for him to obtain the Historic District Commission's approval of the same.

Mr. Smith asked when he was to relocate the garage whether he would repair the chimney.

Mr. Heany said it would be eliminated completely.

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 approve the petition as presented and Mr. Smith seconded.

Vice Chairman Adams didn't have any problems with the relocation of the detached garage. He was concerned about it being backed and skewed off the street. He was pleased to have the opportunity to review the application.

Chairman Rice agreed.

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

III. OTHER BUSINESS

1. **One Year Extension request by Harold Henry** for property located at 235-245 Islington Street (*prior approval awarded on November 3, 2004; extension request from November 3, 2005 to November 3, 2006*). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 45-2 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

Mr. Smith made a motion to grant the one-year extension and Councilor Grasso seconded.

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

IV. WORK SESSIONS

A) **Work Session requested by Martingale Wharf, LLC, owner** for property located at 99 Bow Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (additions to an existing building creating a mixed use building composed of restaurants, retail, offices and residential units). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A districts.

- Mr. John Merkle of TMS Architects presented
- He explained that they created a definite distinction or separation between the buildings to create a smaller scale or less massing effect
- They removed the glass and eliminated most of the veil from the Martingale
- The materials have been adjusted from the first submission; more brick and less glass
- They reduced the massing significantly
- Chairman Rice asked about some glass on the rear depicted in the drawings
- Mr. Merkle answered that it was darkened glass to depict the transition between the new and the old and a realistic view of the glass when the sun beat down on it
- They made more of an effort to have more continuity with the materials
- Mr. Wycoff asked what would happen with the finish of the Martingale, if they would be painting it again
- Ms. Fineberg asked if the glass was made to be dark
- Mr. Merkle answered that it was meant to be clear glass
- Ms. Dika asked if the glass sections would be flush with the masonry
- Mr. Merkle answered no that they would protrude out
- Chairman Rice asked if they were ready for the comments of the HDC
- Mr. Wycoff thought it was a big improvement and he liked the fenestration better on the Bow Street façade
- Ms. Fineberg agreed, she thought the scale of the windows on the Bow Street façade and was within the scale of the existing windows on the other buildings on Bow Street
- She thought the water side of the building was too disconnected from the front of the building and wasn't consistent; too busy on the water side

- She also thought the massing was still too much in comparison to the other buildings on Bow Street and wasn't sure about the glass on the first floor of Bow Street
- Mr. Smith liked the front side of Bow Street but on the river side, he felt the connector pieces were throwing off something
- Vice Chairman Adams had a concern with the roof and asked Mr. Merkle to explain
- Mr. Merkle explained that glass was always considered as a soft connection between the new and the old; He explained that the glass did not go all the way to the roof
- A representative from TMS drew out a sketch to better show the same to the Vice Chair
- Mr. Smith said it could've been the coloring of the glass and materials used in the new presentation
- He asked what material would be used under the windows
- Mr. Merkle answered copper
- Mr. Smith didn't seem to receptive to that choice
- Attorney Malcolm McNeill asked Mr. Smith if he was suggesting masonry
- Mr. Smith answered no, more like wood and he gave examples of other buildings on Bow Street using the same fenestration; he thought overall it was a beautiful project and great drawings
- Ms. Dika wanted to see a three-dimensional model; the Commission seemed receptive to her suggestion
- Ms. Fineberg asked where on the building the mechanicals would be placed
- Mr. Merkle answered that the depths of the roofs would allow the center sections to place the mechanicals so they would be veiled and hidden
- Ms. Fineberg asked if the project met all height variances
- Mr. Merkle answered yes
- Mr. Katz liked the copper materials chosen for the roof but he wasn't crazy about the roof treatment on the new additions, primarily esthetic not historic, otherwise he was very supportive
- He thought the two roofs might need a little more work, he understood their need to utilize the space but he thought it needed to be reworked
- Overall, he was very supportive
- Ms. Dika was uncomfortable with the two new roofs, she thought it dwarfed some of the smaller buildings along Bow Street
- She was comfortable with the design itself but thought it could be a little more graceful
- Chairman Rice was uncomfortable with all the copper treatment, he thought it was too high-tech and not in keeping with the rooftops of the existing buildings on Bow Street
- He did not like the change in the roof lines from gable to hip since it reminded him too much of 100 Market Street, which he thought was too institutional for a look within the Historic District
- He felt the massing was down significantly but wanted to see some kind of more interest than the banding proposed
- He also stated that the little bay window was too awkward and out of place
- He thought the framing of the windows were too similar to the post office and he felt the same with the copper material proposed, which had been carried over onto the Bow Street side, was too institutional
- He didn't think it as designed belonged in the Historic District
- He didn't think that their guidelines had been adhered to with the windows as the windows should get smaller as they go up the building
- Chairman Rice thought it was a move in the right direction
- Vice Chairman Adams was concerned about the feature windows, he thought the scale was the issue, he felt that it appeared to be a unit

- He felt the water side was edgy, in particular, the multi-design in the roof
 - He recognized that they were mere elevations but he did not think the connection was appropriate
 - He stated it was still too tall and too massive but overall was very pleased with it
 - Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak
 - Mr. Georgopoulos thought they did a nice job and that the buildings would be a great addition to Bow Street
 - He did feel however that his building would be dwarfed in comparison to the project and thought the massing of the project was too much for Bow Street
 - He also stated that he would've liked to see a rendering of their building from the Bow Street façade to see what their property would look like in comparison to the proposed project
 - The Commission recommended another work session
-

B) Work Session requested by Seacoast Properties, owner for property located at 117 Bow Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replacement of existing windows and entry doors). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 57A and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A districts.

- Mr. Steven McHenry, of McHenry Architecture presented
 - He went over the plans and explained the direction and desires of his client
 - The cover page showed the water view and a sloped ramp where at the top of that it appeared to be a three-story structure, which is the building in question
 - He pointed out on the second floor of that building a series of three double tall windows which were installed a few years ago
 - On the riverside the intent is to recreate windows like those but slightly shorter on the floor above and aligned with those
 - He went over the existing conditions and noted the overall goal from the inside out was that the owner was exploring the idea of putting in an intermediate floor and the new proposed windows would accommodate both floors
 - He noted the front entry and stated that those doors would be replaced as well
 - Mr. McHenry went over the type of windows proposed to be used and stated that they would be a metal clad window
 - Mr. Smith asked what type of material they would be using for the transition between the windows
 - Mr. McHenry said it was a solid wood painted panel
 - Vice Chairman Adams was concerned with type of material proposed
 - Vice Chairman Adams asked Mr. McHenry if there was something about the building that he felt was the nexus of the tension of what he was doing
 - Mr. McHenry stated that the building was a tough one since there was no flow and didn't look like one whole building so he explained that their goal is to make the whole building look more uniform
 - Ms. Fineberg liked the proposed and thought the changes would be an improvement and make it look less industrial
 - Chairman Rice recommended another work session
 - Mr. McHenry stated they would be back with more changes to the building
-

C) Work Session requested by Ron Cogswell, owner for property located at 180 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (construct second entrance, second and third floor deck on rear and three small dormers on third floor). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 19 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

- Charles Hoyt, designer for the project and Ron Cogswell, owner presented
- He went over the drawings and explained that the owner wanted to leave the first floor of the building as his business and convert the second and third floor into his residence
- He explained that the entryway into the business would be renovated into Mr. Cogswell's entrance into his residence and that there would be another entryway created for a separate entrance into the business
- They wished to add dormers to allow for more room and light into the residence
- They would remove all of the existing metal trim on the entire building and replace with pine
- Mr. Wycoff asked if anyone had removal the vinyl siding off of the building since he recalled the building was covered by asbestos siding and then they went over that with the vinyl
- Mr. Hoyt believed that it had been removed and they would be using cedar clapboards
- Mr. Wycoff asked if they would be using a 4 inch reveal
- Mr. Hoyt agreed and stated they just wanted to bring it back to its natural historic state
- The Commission seemed receptive to that
- Mr. Hoyt continued to explain that they wished to build a deck off the rear of the house with access to the back yard
- He explained that currently the roof was flat, sort of hip style roof which he planned to demolishing that and putting on a gable roof
- Chairman Rice asked if there was any reason behind the stairs on the balcony
- Mr. Hoyt explained that the owner just wanted another means of escape
- Mr. Cogswell explained that there was a courtyard out back and it would enable him to access the back yard
- Vice Chairman Adams asked what was the motive behind tearing the existing roof off and raising it
- Mr. Hoyt explained that it was his experience in renovation work when there is that much extensive work on a roof it is easier to do that way
- Vice Chairman Adams asked what the proposed height would be
- Mr. Hoyt answered 6 inches higher than the existing
- Mr. Hoyt explained that the existing windows were a combination of vinyl, wood and metal and asked the Commission what they should do with the replacement of the same
- Chairman Rice thought it would unreasonable of the Commission to request all wood windows when there already is vinyl there but he wanted to see the type of window they were proposing to install
- Mr. Wycoff stated that it seemed to him with such an extensive renovation project that they would just want to replace all of the windows
- He asked if they had considered doing anything with the storefront windows; he suggested maybe splitting them up six panes of glass something other than the existing plate glass
- Mr. Hoyt stated he didn't know what to do with the windows but with the business downstairs it might serve to be better for the business to leave them as is for display reasons
- Mr. Smith was happy to see the vinyl to be taken down

- Ms. Fineberg asked about the little building on the left hand side of the building and whether that would be resided as well to match the main building
 - Mr. Cogswell said that was correct
 - The Commission kept hearing “Phase One, Two and Three” from Mr. Hoyt and Mr. Cogswell and asked if there would be significant periods of time between each phase
 - Mr. Cogswell answered that Phase One and Two would most likely occur back to back however he would need to build up a budget for Phase Three
 - Ms. Fineberg reminded the owner that the Commission can only approve what was initially applied for as well as only have a year to enact and commence construction from the date of approval
 - Mr. Hoyt stated that Phase Three would be an exploratory process meaning that they wouldn’t know what they would proceed with until they further get into the project
 - Chairman Rice noted that they would need to reapply for the changes associated with Phase Three
 - Ms. Fineberg thought a site walk was worth while
 - The Commission agreed and referred Mr. Hoyt to Christina to set that up
-

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:45 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