

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

**7:00 p.m.**

**March 1, 2006**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Members, Ellen Fineberg, Richard Katz, and Alternates Sandra Dika and John Wyckoff

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** John Golumb, City Council Representative Ned Raynolds

**ALSO PRESENT:** Lucy Tillman sitting in for Roger Clum, Building Inspector

---

Chairman Rice called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of February 1, 2006 – Vice-Chairman Adams moved to approve the minutes as presented and was seconded by Mr. Katz. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

---

**II. OLD BUSINESS**

A. Petition of **Judith Tausch, owner** for property located at **110 Penhallow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (insertion of light tubes into roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 19 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Tillman stated that she had information from the owner that she would not be at the meeting tonight and it was the Department's recommendation to table this indefinitely. She stated that when they come back with a plan with more information it would be advertised and scheduled for a public hearing.

Ms. Fineberg motioned to table and Ms. Dika seconded the motion.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor to table to a time indefinite and the motion was passed by a unanimous vote.

---

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Petition of **Michael P. Rainboth and Annemarie Howe, owners**, for property located at **122 Newcastle Avenue** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (a two-story addition, a bay addition, and a deck) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate two windows and add a skylight); and a new free-standing structure (a two-story addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 27 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Rice announced that Public Hearing number 1. was withdrawn.

2. Petition of **Harbour Place Group LLC, owner** for property located at **1 Harbour Place** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add recessed balconies & modify existing windows on fifth floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A Districts.

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

Mr. Dan Batting, architect, spoke in favor of the petition. It is their intent to convert the 5<sup>th</sup> floor level of this building to residential use and do some recessed balconies and convert some fixed windows into \_\_\_\_\_ **06.06** which was discussed at the work session a month ago. One concern was detail of the railing. He showed some samples of railing system they intend to use. He stated that they would be at the balcony openings they would create. The top railing were 2" in diameter and the intermediate rails were approximately 1" in diameter. There was discussion at the prior work session over concern for the heaviness of the railing. From a strength standpoint, this system was best for their needs.

Chairman Rice asked if it was discussed at the work session what the openings would be like.

Mr. Batting indicated that behind the balconies there would be some store front, comparable sliding doors and some fixed glass. Pretty much in keeping with the trim detail and existing coloring evidenced by the photographs. He stated there might also be some stucco elements.

Chairman Rice asked if there was some balcony elevation.

Mr. Batting stated there was.

Chairman Rice indicated they need a clarification on the plan at the Planning Department. There was one labeled A-3 and one labeled A-4.

Ms. Tillman stated that they both appear to be the same plan. One was submitted by Attorney Pelech and one came with the set of plans.

Mr. Batting stated he was not familiar with what Mr. Pelech submitted. He asked if it came in with the building permit application.

Ms. Tillman indicated that it came in with the 5<sup>th</sup> floor layout. One is designated as A-3 that he submitted and the other is designated as A-4 but they appeared to be the same plan. There was a slight difference in the unit sizes.

Mr. Batting asked if the one Attorney Pelech submitted showed circular stairs?

Ms. Tillman stated no we got rid of that one, which started the problem, then they brought in the Plan with A-4 on it.

Mr. Batting stated that the one they submitted with A-3 should be the correct plan.

Chairman Rice indicated that he had an A-4 that has the exterior of the building on it.

Ms. Tillman stated that that one was gone.

Mr. Batting stated that in the process of this project several plans got submitted and there was one that shouldn't be there.

Vice-Chairman Adams indicated that he was familiar with the 5<sup>th</sup> floor construction. He noted that it is one wide with brick with some type of structural back-up.

Mr. Batting stated that it was and the top 3 floors were added in the middle 80's. The structure for those top 3 floors is a structural steel frame.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked when removing the current glazing would there be a space between the one wide brick and the interior wall surface.

Mr. Batting indicated there would be.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that it would be seen obliquely on the side of the window openings and as you look up on the under side of the arch. He asked what that surface would be.

Mr. Batting indicated that it would probably be a stucco finish and interior surface as well, ceiling and some portions of wall area; whatever those materials were.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked Mr. Batting if he was going to use ethos in his proposal.

Mr. Batting indicated that it would be some type of trim detail to complete the surface so you would not see the gap.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if Mr. Batting's proposal was to strike the final 6" space with interior stucco finish.

Mr. Batting said that was what he proposed.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any further questions for the applicant, hearing none, Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Heather Neville, an attorney with Boynton and Waldron at 82 Court Street, who represented 10 State Street, LLC, stated she had an objection to the balcony because it did not fit in to the historic nature of that area.

Ms. Fineberg asked where 10 State Street was.

Ms. Neville stated it was across the street from the site.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else 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 application as presented and the motion was seconded by Mr. Katz.

Chairman Rice stated that he appreciated the comment of the attorney, but he personally disagreed.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that this was not a historic treatment for windows but does not believe it was architecturally harmful or damaging to the integrity of the historic district. He felt it to be an appropriate use of space. Vice-Chairman Adams asked Ms. Fineberg if there were any concerns regarding the roofing of windows selected or recessed balcony which was mentioned during a work session. He found no rhythm to the recessed window openings and was unable to decide if they were inappropriate or not, however was willing to go with what was proposed.

Chairman Rice agreed. He stated that the Board often talked about too much glass and there was a lot of glass going away on this project.

Mr. Wycoff indicated he had a little trouble with the arches being finished with ethos instead of brick. He felt it would be very visible from down below. The ceiling and side walls are recessed and higher than the arch which may be a little awkward. He was not sure how to address that because there were no details. He stated that when the glass system was taken away from the arch you would have unfinished space.

Ms. Dika felt that this would be an improvement after studying the building.

Mr. Katz felt that this did not detract from the rhythm of the windows; it might add a little interest to them. The glass behind is close to 5' away from the opening and the impact would be minimized. He also understood that it would be difficult to come up with a solution for the gap left by the window. He would like to see something other than ethos. He felt this could be approved on principal and should state that the gap must be filled with appropriate materials and would like to be apprised of this when the time comes. He stated he would like that as a stipulation.

Chairman Rice asked how would he amend the motion.

Vice-Chairman Adams and Mr. Katz had additional discussion on brick and ethos stating that it should be a compatible material.

Mr. Wycoff stated that a good compromise would be to simulate brick.

Mr. Katz asked the applicant if he had anything to add to this concern.

Mr. Batting stated that he would not know until they remove one. They could possibly put some additional brick to complete the arch. He would be happy to study it and present a final detail for that issue.

Chairman Rice told him to take that part out of the application and he could come back with specific detail.

Mr. Batting stated that was fine. He was most interested in being able to move forward so he would submit more detail.

Chairman Rice asked for a motion to approve the application as presented with the exception of the arch detail which would be submitted at a later time.

Ms. Fineberg moved to approve the application as presented with the exception and the motion was seconded by Vice-Chairman Adams.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a vote of four in favor and one opposed.

---

3. Petition of **Martha M. Eckman 1991 Trust, owner** for property located at **326 Marcy Street** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (air conditioning compressor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 74 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

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

Gerald Eckman, owner, spoke in favor of the petition. Mr. Eckman referenced the site plan and requested to put an air conditioner/compressor outside the building 10' 1" away from property line. He referred to the pictures which showed that it was not visible from the house behind it. The compressor would go where the shrub is underneath the window. It would not be seen from any location, abutter or from the road.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public speaking to, for or against this application.

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

#### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Vice-Chairman Adams moved to approve the application as presented and the motion was seconded by Sandra Dika.

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

---

4. Petition of **Jonathan P. and Cheryl G. Booth, owners**, for property located at **19 South School Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (two-story addition, one-story addition, and roof overhang) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace and relocate 7 windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 73 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

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

David Witham, architect, spoke on behalf of John and Cheryl Booth. He apologized for the owners not being there that evening because of school vacation. He stated that they did have a work session on it last month. He stated that there were 3 areas of improvement which referred to previous additions to the home that occurred in the 70's and 80's. The original structure of the home was not going to be affected and the additions were all behind it. The 3 areas of improvement included two minor additions and one roof overhang. The reason for one of the additions was to try to get a set of stairs to extend space to the other areas. The other addition was to gain family room space. The roof overhang was to provide protection over the main side of the house.

He stated he would like to walk around the 3 sides of the building affected by the changes. He also stated that all of the windows are all true divided light as noted in packet. One door was a clad unit SDL where the interior grill and exterior grill were attached. All materials for those areas were made out of wood.

The first item he wanted to discuss was the right side elevation. To the far right of the page was the rear additional to the house which was 12' by 6'. He stated it was a one-story addition. He pointed out the addition and described that it had one window on it that would match the size of the existing windows on that level of the home. The clapboard and corner board would be the same size. **31:44** The base and freeze dimensions would all match the existing conditions of the home. He noted it would have a hip style roof to take the body of the house down and it would tilt back in on the front of the house. The roof above the door he was proposing was going to be 6' wide and would provide protection over the landing and stairs. A side elevation showed what the back would look like. It would be a very simple shed roof. He noted that they wanted to clean up some of the windows. He noted the rear elevation and took into account what was received at the work session and took down the corner board and put in some flush minor trim board which was 5¼" by 5" which defined the corner. The 16' wide addition comes off the face of the building 6' towards the rear and the windows match the existing side windows. **33:31** ??? sounds like water table.

On the rear elevation you see the roof overhang over the stairs with a slight forth flow pitch to it about 3' and it had a 4' by 6' plank to support that which would be mounted to a 24" by 28" trim board. He felt it would be understated by the nice looking roof.

On the right side you see the 6' wide addition and can see the alignment of the water table and eave details which all tie in with the existing house the pitch at 3'12". He noted the rear addition with a hip roof, and indicated they wanted to clean it up to show some symmetry on that wall by spreading the windows out. He indicated that he did respect the comment at the last work session about glazing in that a door of this size isn't typical for this district but felt that the grill pattern matches the windows. He stretched things a little with this door, but felt that with this grid system it would be appropriate.

He summarized that those were the areas he was talking about and asked if the Commission had any questions.

Chairman Rice asked if the back doors had true divided light or simulated divided light?

David Witham answered that they were simulated.

Chairman Rice felt that it was a very neat and logical plan.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else 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 moved to approve the application as presented and the motion was seconded by John Wycoff.

Vice-Chairman Adams felt that the doors were not appropriate; however still voted for it.

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

---

5. Petition of **Strawberry Banke Inc., owner** for property located at **92 Marcy Street** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (relocation of existing shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

### SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Rodney Rollins, president of special projects of Strawberry Banke spoke in favor of this petition. He stated that this application was to relocate an existing structure that is currently located in front of the Dunaway Restaurant. He indicated they wanted to relocate it 150' or so down Marcy Street in a south direction next to the historic wharf site. The building had been used in the past as a ticket booth for Strawberry Banke. He stated that they wanted to move it back to where it used to be. It would be used as a joint project with the Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce as a visitor information booth. He noted the proposed and existing locations on the photographs indicating the different views.

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

Martha Hubbard of the Greater Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce stated her support for this proposal. She also stated that she currently has the visitor information center at 500 Market Street and in the Kiosk in Market Square. She felt that by using this shed as a visitor information center it would enable them to reach out to Prescott Park and Strawberry Banke visitors and encourage them to spend more time in the Portsmouth area.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if she required any modifications to the building.

Ms. Hubbard indicated that only internal modifications would be made. The intent was to have a door open and encourage people to come inside where they could browse the information on racks. It would be staffed by volunteers. It would be open at the beginning and latter parts of the season and open weekends and in the busy time 7 days a week depending on volunteers. The only outside changes would be some signage to encourage people to enter.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else 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 moved to approve the application as presented and the motion was seconded by Ellen Fineberg.

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

---

6. Petition of **6-16 Congress, LLC, owner**, for property located at **6-16 Congress Street** wherein an amendment is requested to a design previously approved by the Historic District Commission (recess two storefront entry doors and replace one window with recessed exit door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said

property is shown on Assessor Plan 117, as Lots 37, 38 and 39 and lies within the Central Business A, Downtown Overlay, and Historic A Districts

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

Steve McHenry, architect, stated he had been before the Commission several times regarding this issue. They have added a couple of drawings to the application in order to clarify it. He noted the top sheet of the drawings showed the north elevation of the building surrounded by more detailed drawings. In that north elevation there were two swinging doors that were necessitated by the tenant that was moving into that space, where they were combining the two entrances to one because the tenant is occupying two spaces. It was a requirement of the Commission that the doors do not swing out into the street so they were required to recess the doorways.

He noted that in the detail on the top sheet you could see the configuration of the doorways and the glazing. He also noted that the detail to the right showed the surface of the building which showed the transit window and brick around the edges and a column in the center. In the lower right hand corner of the drawings he noted the elevation of the doors which were recessed back on the side of the building. In the upper right hand corner of the section on the drawing it showed the placement of the doors, the side light windows and the transom window. To make the bottom of the transom window more sturdy they doubled the thickness so that it has more weight and acts as a solid transom as you enter. This treatment was carried through on the second page of drawings where the left hand side showed the east elevation. On the first floor there was a series of 4 windows and a center bay with a notation that stated "change from window to door". In one of those previously approved window openings they plan to place an exit door and the drawings show the detail of how the door was achieved. He noted that the sidewalk was narrow and the door can't swing out so they recessed the door back. They would have the same treatment as the north elevation and it noted that the transom window remains and the outside face was shown in the lower right hand section of the drawing.

Mr. Wycoff stated that he appreciated what he was doing underneath the transom window and asked if he was just doubling the metal that extruded.

Mr. McHenry stated yes, it would be 4½" thick only spanning the area where the door opens.

Mr. Wycoff questioned if there should be some sort of reveal between the two elements rather than two identical pieces on top of each other.

Mr. McHenry stated that at 4" it would not be too great.

Mr. Wycoff stated that it should have some look of a structural element to it. He also noted that on the side elevation the lintels over the windows are shown as the windows and realized they were not structural lintels so to speak

Mr. McHenry stated that they were actually all of the lintels and sills were granite and were spanning. It does go into the brick and they were not proposing to change it.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Ms. Dika moved to approve the application as presented and the motion was seconded by Richard Katz.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a vote of four in favor and one opposed.

---

7. Petition of **Kevin McDevitt, owner (Riveredge Owners Association)** for property located at **117 Bow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (rebuild parapet) and to allow new construction to an existing structure (add one-story structure on roof, exterior deck and hand rail, and

skylights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 57A-0001 and lies within the Central Business A, Downtown Overlay, and Historic A Districts.

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

Steve McHenry, architect, with Kevin McDevitt, owner, spoke in favor of the petition. He stated that the presentation is in an 11x17 format and not easy to see however he had additional copies if anyone needed them to follow along.

He stated that this had been through a couple of work sessions and received valuable input from the Commission and the public. The presentation is essentially the same with some refinements based on the feedback. He noted that the first several sheets were the existing conditions photographs. Pages 3 and 4 were existing conditions of elevations of the waterside, the Bow Street side and north elevation. Page 5 was the existing group plan showing the mechanical equipment, catwalk across the building, the chimney. Page 6 showed the overall elevations with the building structure on the rooftop. He stated they only slightly changed the metal pattern of the siding on the building and it was now a recessed channel that was 1' wide rather than what they showed before which seemed to be out of scale. There were two small skylights on top of the building structure which were removed from the original proposal. On the left side is the railing detail and proposed new parapet detail that was not as long as previously presented. Page 7 shows the east and west elevations. He noted that the east elevation is straight from the water side and they eliminated the railing from that view so you can see the elevation. The west elevation was somewhat distorted to give a sense of that elevation's set back some distance on the roof. He noted on Page 8 of the plans that the detail of the eave has been pulled in a bit because it was a little over scale. On Page 9 of the plans it showed the east elevation with a small deck extending out and he stated that the guard rail was identical to the other deck. Page 10 showed the floor plan and the interior layout with the configuration of deck and the overall exterior dimensions of the building and the deck. He also noted where the locations of two small square skylights and the rooftop view of the larger skylight and the deck below. Page 11 described the proposed changes to the existing parapet wall and the wall section on the right hand side of the page described in the dimensions of the exterior wall. Page 12 explained the sizes and descriptions of the types of doors. Page 13 described the larger skylight (all the skylights were really a light monitor built up on the metal clad roof). He stated that the reason for the scale was the ceiling below this which was quite low and this would help bring light in. Page 14 described the small skylights as well as the Pella windows. Pages 15, 16 and 17 were the now familiar perspective views which help put the whole thing in context. Page 15 showed the view from above and the waterside. Page 16 showed the same view from above with a slight change in the 2 windows which were showed as smaller horizontal windows before but they realized they would be more useful as egress windows, so they made them larger. Page 17 showed the extent to which the building protrudes out from the building that it sits on. He stated that there was also information in the plans on the metal cladding on page 13.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the chimney that exists on the roof of the building was going to be extended.

Mr. McHenry stated it was but would need to be extended approximately 4' above the roof.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if it would be all new brick so that it would not have to match the existing brick on the chimney.

Mr. McHenry stated it would not.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if he was going to use similar brick to what was used for the chimney now.

Mr. McHenry stated that it would be similar, but did not specify it in this package, but would be happy to use Old Port bricks.

Mr. Wycoff asked if the parapet on the new addition shown on page 17 was scaled back.

Mr. McHenry stated it was not. It was exaggerated. He stated that they actually pulled it back a good 6" from what was shown.



Mr. Wycoff asked what the larger skylight was and was it part of the prior Work Session.

Mr. McHenry stated he had a copy of the prior submission here and it was shown in the perspective views which he showed to Mr. Wycoff.

Mr. Wycoff stated it was not really visible at all.

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

### **SPEAKING AGAINST THE APPLICATION**

Ms. Joan Jones, owner of Bow Street Inn which abuts this property spoke against this application. She passed out handouts. She asked Mr. McHenry what the height of structure was.

Mr. McHenry said that the pavilion structure height was shown on the section detail.

Ms. Jones was concerned about what she found in the Zoning Ordinance, Section 10-103 regarding the overall height allowed for the structure of this building. The property at 117 Bow Street is located in the Central Business District A and the maximum height of a structure is 50'. She read the Zoning Ordinance section which defined how to measure the height of a structure. She asked if the measurements for the building heights were submitted back in February. She thought there was nothing which indicated they were done by a surveyor or licensed engineer. On the east elevation, the measurements were taken 6' out from the building as shown in the illustration from the ordinance. She asked if the measurements were taken down to the water or at the decking that runs along the side of the building. The ordinance indicates it should go to the water 6' out. The sketches provided shows the height of the decking that runs along the building. Depending on the tide, the water is from 10' to 20' below the deck. She asked why the inclusion of the small portion of the building was included in the calculation for the east elevation, but not on the north elevation, and on the sketch of the east elevation the measurements include the 20'4" setback portion of the building but the height of the setback portion of the proposed structure is not included. She felt there was an inconsistent and arbitrary approach to these calculations and they do not comply with the Zoning Ordinance and therefore the calculations as presented cannot be used to determine if the proposed structure is within the height of 10'.

Mr. McHenry indicated that it was 9' 3" to the roof.

Ms. Jones stated that with the height of almost 10', she wondered if it falls within the 50' that is stated in the ordinance.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Vice-Chairman Adams moved to approve this application as presented for the purpose of discussion and the motion was seconded by Ms. Fineberg.

Chairman Rice stated that the Commission had dealt with height ordinances in past. He stated that the way they look at architecture and applications is through design review and what the character of building is with regard to neighborhood.

Mr. Fineberg asked if this zoning issue would be more appropriate at the Zoning Board of Adjustment or TAC.

Chairman Rice stated he was thinking the same thing.

Ms. Tillman stated she had plans submitted by Mr. McHenry which showed they meet the height requirement of 50'.

She stated that if they would like an independent review by the building inspector you could have that done, but she was satisfied that it meets the height requirements in the ordinance.

Mr. Wycoff felt the structure was compatible to the nature of the building.

Mr. Katz stated that the more he sees it, the more he likes it. He also felt it would be compatible with the building and the neighborhood.

Vice-Chairman Adams indicated he did not believe it was a compatible design for the building, but he didn't find it was inconsistent with the re-use of a warehouse building along the waterfront. He thought before he heard it obstructed a view from a neighbor that it was a good construction project and would have little impact to the historic area. He was disturbed with the view issue but had been told that the Commission have no way of protecting anyone's view so he will support this application because he has no quarrel with the architecture.

Chairman Rice felt the same way and did not want to ignore the comments of the abutter, however, the City was aware of the height issue, and the City stated that it meets the height requirements; so he will support this application.

Ms. Dika asked if Ms. Jones was not satisfied with the Commission's decision what was her recourse.

Chairman Rice indicated she could appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Tillman explained that a request for rehearing would come back to the Historic District Commission and then a request for the Board of Adjustment after that if not reheard.

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

---

#### IV. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner**, for property located at **80 Hanover Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (fenced-in deck with awning, retaining wall and planting bed) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate entry door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 2-1 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts. *This item has been changed from a petition for a public hearing to a work session at the applicant's request.*

- Rob Harbison of Destefano Architects stated he was there with Jim Perrin who represents Jamer Realty, the owner of the property. He handed out additional materials and pictures. He went over the old packet and stated that the first sheet of the packet showed the site plan with the location of Legends Billiards on the corner of Hanover and Fleet Street. The second page showed photographs of the existing conditions. The third sheet showed a plan of the proposed changes. He indicated that the existing landscaping to the left will remain and the concrete walkway will shift slightly over to approach the new entries. He pointed out an additional entry door to allow entry to Legends Billiards and a separate passage way through for servers of Legends Billiards to the new patio they are proposing. He stated there will be a new fence surrounding the patio and a planting bed.
- Ms. Fineberg stated she was having trouble reading the plan.
- Mr. Harbison stated that Hanover Street is towards the top and Legends is towards bottom.
- Ms. Fineberg discussed the different viewpoints and tried to identify features on the plan.
- Mr. Harbison clarified the features then stated that the existing entry door to Legends will remain and in creating the patio they were proposing a new entry door to Legends. The fourth sheet which shows the front view of the elevation shows the existing elevation on the left with the existing entry doors to remain and on the right was the proposed elevation showing the new entry door. He stated they were proposing the same window system as currently exists and the same storefront system.

- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the doors on the extreme left and right were going to remain and was he just going to put a new panel, cutting out the brick base and removing it completely.
- Mr. Harbison answered that he was cutting it out for a door.
- Chairman Rice asked if it was a typical fence.
- Mr. Harbison said it would be a typical fence painted cedar. The vertical boards and the lattice will both have gaps to allow view and light through. The fence will sit in metal sleeves and concrete piers. The proposal for the fence will be seasonal and will slide out and be capped for the winter and just the patio and the planter will remain. The next sheet shows the fence and the planting bed. He stated that as you approach the building the height of the planting bed is decreased. The patio is aligned with the front elevation and the awning is proposed over an outdoor bar. Both the awning and the bar are temporary and will be seasonal as well. The next packet shows the stone material for the retaining wall and planting bed. Appalachian stonewall sandstone red is the material of the block.
- Chairman Rice asked how high the retaining wall would be.
- Mr. Harbison explained that the furthest corner from the entry is 1'5" and as you get closer to the entry and the building that height decreases.
- Mr. Harbison stated that the next sheet shows the regular pattern of the wall and the coping will be 12" wide. The third sheet was a diagram showing the construction of the awning which has a 1 x 1 aluminum frame that will be screwed into the existing roof, the bottom of the frame will align with the socket of the existing building and all will be removed seasonally. The next sheet shows the general seating layout and the size of the bar proposed. The last photo shows the interior bar of Legends. The new bar is going to be the same design with the exception of fluted panels.
- Mr. Katz asked what would be left outside when the cold weather comes.
- Mr. Harbison indicated that the stone wall, the planting bed, and the concrete patio will be left outside.
- Chairman Rice asked about the aluminum support structure
- Mr. Harbison stated it would be removed.
- Mr. Perrin showed a sample of the awning fabric.
- Mr. Wycoff asked if this was a condominium building.
- Mr. Perrin stated he owned the entire building.
- Mr. Wycoff felt that this project looked out of proportion.
- Mr. Perrin stated that the issue was an ordinance to have a certain amount of free space and the parking lot is not included in that so that is why it is laid out this way.
- Mr. Harbison explained that they tried to leave gaps in the boards and lattice so there was a view through however, the owner was concerned about the passage of alcohol.
- Mr. Wycoff indicated that his concern was about the right hand side where the landscaping was not great.
- Mr. Perrin stated that when they bought the property they redid the whole land which was basically dirt. He spent a large amount of time re-landscaping and maintaining it but when Bananas got busy there was a lot of traffic so within two years it was dead. He would like to continue the retaining wall in front of the deck of Legends across the front of Shalimar and put in some more shrubs and make it more elevated.
- Mr. Wycoff said that makes sense.
- Mr. Perrin stated that he wanted to keep people from going through by putting the shrubs closer together.
- Chairman Rice stated that it sounds good but they need to deal with what's in front of them now.
- Mr. Wycoff said that he would like to see the wall going across rather than having half of the property being landscaped and the other half being left alone.
- Chairman Rice asked if anyone else agreed with that.
- Vice-Chairman Adams agreed that it was an excellent thought and felt it would cut down on the traffic.
- Ms. Fineberg liked the idea of the seasonal items being put away however, she felt the fence was too high.
- Mr. Perrin said it was a 6' fence and asked Ms. Fineberg if a 4' fence would work.
- Mr. Wycoff asked if he had that type of flexibility.

- Mr. Perrin explained that they do because the 6' fence was his idea. He was concerned about security, however, a security company assured him that they could put a security system out on the deck that was full proof. He now does not mind lowering the fence down to 4' but did not want people to be able to crawl through.
- Ms. Fineberg stated that she was in favor of that. She felt that having it so closed would encourage people to come up and see what was over the top. She felt it should be more open with latticework so it would not look so suburban. She would encourage lowering it and also using fencing that would give it a more open feeling than what he had. She stated that she would have a hard time approving this the way it was.
- Chairman Rice asked if there were any more comments.
- Mr. Katz asked if they were going to continue the retaining wall down the side of the building which would cut down the cross traffic.
- Mr. Harbison stated they would continue the retaining wall down the side of the building.
- Mr. Katz felt this would enhance the appearance of the building.
- Ms. Fineberg liked the idea of the outdoor activity however, felt by having the public being able to see the activity would actually encourage participation.
- Ms. Dika felt this project would enhance the area however the parking was unattractive and asked if there was any way to deal with that, maybe have striped parking markings.
- Mr. Perrin stated that when they do the project they will be re-paving and adding lines for parking.
- Mr. Wycoff indicated that it was an important location and everything he put into it would come back to him.

B) Work Session requested by **Dilorenzo Real Estate, LLC, owners** for property located at **33 Bow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace existing solarium at the roof with a new structure) and to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (Renovate existing wood frame addition at north elevation) Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106, as Lot 48 and lies within the Central Business A, Downtown Overlay, and Historic A Districts. *This work session was tabled to the March meeting at the February 1, 2006 meeting.*

- Steve McHenry, Architect, spoke on behalf of this application. He stated that this building was the former Zilgen property. He passed out plans and photographs. He indicated that they wanted to do something with the roof structure. The intent of the owner was to remove and replace it with something more in keeping with what is already on the building. He indicated that on the left hand corner there was an addition on the water side which is a clapboarded bumpout. Page three showed where it was connected. He stated there was a lot of wood structure on the rear to the water side and it is awkward. Page four shows the existing conditions with drawn elevations and it looks tall. Page five showed the rear elevation on the water side and the left hand and right hand side that faces Ceres Street. He stated that on the clapboard side note the placement of the windows because the owner wanted to change them and give some symmetry to that elevation. He wanted to remove the spiral stair and remove the glass windows. He explained that they were trying to extend it as a brick structure to create a definitive break at the old eave line and create a low pitched hip roof which is similar in pitch to the fire wall between it and the building next to it.
- Mr. Wycoff asked if the chimney is going to stay.
- Mr. McHenry stated it was going to stay and it is shown on page five. He indicated that this building is a significant end condition on this block and needs something to give it a clear definition but not overwhelming. They do not want to overwhelm that end so they did the hip roof, a low pitch and a horizontal banding of the eave along with a wide band below the window treatment achieves that. Page six shows the brick massing portion of that scope of work. Page 7 shows that the clapboard portion has changed. He noted that on page 3 there were little pitches on the shed roof and a step-in from between the second and third floor which leaves the defining edge of the structure in tact. At the second level where a balcony sticks out they picked up a line of banding and brought it around so at a straight on view you have a tiered effect which diminishes as it goes up. He noted that the proposed balcony on page 7 sticks out further than what was there now which is a recessed deck. They would extend the deck out 3' and put doors there. Also on page 7 there is a dramatic difference in the window patterns and alignment. The lowest level has a bay window which they are keeping however moving over to the center of the proposal.

- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if they were keeping the roof.
- Mr. McHenry indicated they were. He felt that when looking down Ceres Street there was a wild collection of window types so he thought he could be a little playful with it. The last page had a wider curved balcony on the third level and on the fourth level they dropped the windows down to the floor and create windows that swing in and create a balconette practically flush to the building so that you can open the doors in but not step out. He indicated that because it is an old masonry bearing structure, the weight of the brick on the top floors would not make it possible to do this as a real brick structure. They are looking for a solution to match out the brick with a “thin brick system” which you may have approved before. He showed a thin brick which is ½” thick and is real brick. He stated that they were trying to get a brick to match what was there now which was not an easy task. They would like to get a feedback on whether they would approve replacing clapboard in back with this brick material.
- Ms. Dika indicated she did not like the hip roof. She was wondering if the structure on top that was done down the street might be better and then you wouldn’t have to use brick. She felt that some of the other treatments they were using seemed to go with the rest of the block.
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated that the window headers show its warehouse history.
- Mr. McHenry referred to the first photo on the top page which shows what already exists there which are a variety of roof shapes.
- Chairman Rice noted that they were all gable roofs.
- Mr. McHenry said he was willing to show a gable version but they seemed too top heavy.
- Mr. Wycoff asked who did the old cast iron storefront on Izzy’s.
- Mr. McHenry stated that it was an old detail and did not know.
- Mr. Wycoff felt that the building is a formal looking building that anchors the corner and looks like something you would see on Beacon Hill in Boston.
- Mr. McHenry stated the hip roof allows a flat portion that abuts the old chimney and they plan to recess the area so that mechanical equipment can be hidden up there.
- Mr. Katz stated that this was a focal point so there is an element of formality about this property that could take this treatment.
- Mr. McHenry stated that the Board just approved a larger series of structures at the other end of the block so he felt it was not out of place.
- Mr. Katz asked if Mr. McHenry thought it was going to work. He felt you could not match it.
- Mr. McHenry said it would work but did not know if he could match it. He would need to do more research and see some actual samples. If they were able to match it they would mask the history of the building by changing its shape.
- Vice-Chairman Adams felt he would not be able to match it.
- Mr. McHenry said getting close would almost be worse than creating a contrast.
- Mr. Katz asked how he would create a contrast.
- Mr. McHenry said he would use a different color brick.
- Ms. Fineberg said come back to the Board with thoughts. She asked if it was possible for him to use clapboard up there.
- Mr. McHenry said that could be possible. They have not gotten any of their structural data back to know what that would take.
- Ms. Fineberg stated that she preferred option A with the break in the middle on the third floor with just smaller windows and no balcony. It gives the building a feeling of lightness where the other option is more elaborate.
- Chairman Rice felt option B was too elaborate for Bow Street and Ceres Street.
- Mr. McHenry stated that the problem was if you take away the recessed area you do not have enough room for a real deck out there so you have to make it bigger.
- Ms. Fineberg said the fourth floor was what she was referring to. She felt they needed something on the third floor.
- Mr. McHenry said he was a little resistant of this option until he saw the 3 dimensional view.
- Chairman Rice asked how everyone else felt about Option A and Option B.
- Ms. Dika preferred Option A.
- Vice-Chairman Adams liked the darker color brick in Option B.
- Ms. Fineberg asked if the railing on the third floor in Option B would have to be that wide.
- Vice-Chairman Adams indicated the wider balcony provides an opportunity for a couple of console brackets so it looks like the balcony is being held up by something which is what drew him to Option B.

- Ms. Fineberg said it bothered her the way it cuts into the windows. She felt it might be better if it was between the windows.
- Chairman Rice suggested keeping the Option B balcony on the third floor but get rid of the balconette on the fourth floor.
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated he would like to see some sort of support for the balcony.
- Mr. McHenry agreed with Vice-Chairman Adams.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if there would be any changes to the firewall.
- Mr. McHenry said there would not be any changes.
- Vice-Chairman Adams was hoping that they would keep the bay window on the cellar wall of the building and that they would use brick on the extension of the building. He asked if they would “Z brick” the whole house or just the addition.
- Mr. McHenry indicated he did not know. He described how much work it would take to create real veneer brick on the back of the building.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if he was going to have a vent or miss the egress that the spiral stair creates now.
- Mr. McHenry stated they would not
- Ms. Fineberg asked if they could influence the owners of the building next door to do the same thing.
- Mr. McHenry stated it was the same owner.
- Vice-Chairman Adams indicated that they would all have issues with the siding.
- Mr. Katz asked Vice-Chairman Adams what those issues would be.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said the clapboard and there will not be a match with the “Z brick”.
- Mr. McHenry indicated the brick may work because it can be sliced thin and does not have to be this kind of metal grid to match courses.

C) Work Session requested by **Marcy Street Investments, owner and Win Rhoades, applicant** for property located at **359 Marcy Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (enlarge existing front windows). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 26 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

- David Witham and Win Rhodes speaking on behalf of the application.
- Mr. Witham showed the building and indicated the owner was looking to move his business into the first floor, which is now residential with 2 apartments. It is in waterfront business zone and has permission to move a business into it. He indicated that it was a pure building that has survived a lot however has had some additions to the doorway to dress it up a bit. They would like to get more glazing on the two windows he pointed out. The plans showed the progression to get more glazing to have more light but still try to maintain that residential feel. He explained that he did some research to get the scheme he had now. He noted the fish market which has a commercial feel to it and was hoping to get some synergy of the work they would like of do on their building. He passed out a packet with Scheme A to F which shows progression of their thoughts to give it a commercial feel. He stated that Scheme A was to double up the double hung windows to get more light. Scheme B was trying to put in a more commercial type glazing but wasn't working. The progressive schemes showed a little more banding effect with trim detail and signage. Scheme F was where they would like to end up. The window proportions worked well on the upper level. They had added shutters to the upper level which made it balance the weight below it. He felt that the signage going across gave it the feel of an older commercial building. The last page showed photos of buildings that were residential at one point and had residential feel on the upper level with larger glazing down below which started to become the model or their project.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the windows were boxed out.
- Mr. Witham indicated they were out about 2” from the build up of the molding
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated that there was really no socket to the sill.
- Mr. Witham said there were none.
- Mr. Rhodes said that the existing detail on the roof overhang to the front door has a crown molding around it which Mr. Witham used to meet the existing detail.
- Mr. Witham said that the crown molding over the windows was set back 14” to 18” from the crown molding over the door and stated it was hard to butt up to that and wanted to keep the integrity of the brackets so he

copied the crown molding so that the overhang of that over the door was 5" and made the same 5" overhang over the windows.

- Mr. Wycoff in stated that the brackets over the door were added 100 years ago. It seems that if the roof over the door should go then a continuous roof, maybe 12" or so should go right across the windows. He did not like keeping the clapboards under windows. He felt it would look too much like a residential house.
- Mr. Witham pointed out buildings on the last page which had clapboards underneath the windows. He said that in his research a lot of the commercial applications had glazing that would go down to the floor and they would be in a series of several buildings with this pattern. They only had the two buildings and felt this would be too much glazing for that area.
- Vice-Chairman Adams felt that the casual nature of the windows was not a problem. He thought that the brackets should not be removed as they represent part of a turn of the century upgrade.
- Mr. Witham referenced the other buildings in the research photos where there was no brackets or overhang but they had double doors which defines the entry. He felt he would loose that with the one 3' door without the overhang and the brackets.
- Ms. Dika felt that it was a very attractive solution.
- Mr. Katz felt that the sign transforms it.
- Mr. Rhodes said the old sign doesn't fit the period of building. The sign design is in keeping with the period of the building and reduces verticality of building.
- Ms. Fineberg wondered about the side trim of the windows which she felt was a bit wide.
- Mr. Witham indicated he basically replicated the width of the trim on the doors which was 9".
- Vice-Chairman Adams suggested doing a quick study to bring in.
- Mr. Witham said that the windows on the second floor were 1' x 5' with a little Scotia band around it so he was thinking to do the same window treatment with these windows and side that with a 9" band.
- Ms. Fineberg felt that they look heavier than they need to be but liked the wider trim on the door.
- Mr. Witham stated that he did a study where the trim was all the same so he could certainly look at that again.
- Mr. Wycoff agreed that the casing on the windows was too wide.
- Mr. Witham asked if he could do vote on it next time.
- Ms. Fineberg said they could do a work session then a hearing.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said it makes more sense to have the windows installed at a different time.
- Mr. Rhodes stated that he also wanted to clean up the front of the building a bit.
- Mr. Witham felt that if the fish market was not there it would not work or a continuation of houses it would not work but these two houses have their own thing going on and this might bring them together.
- Chairman Rice said see you next month. He reminded the Board that they were trying to get away from the work session/public hearings because they can be too long and sometimes go into another work session.

---

D) Work Session requested by **Perry Silverstein Revocable Trust 2001, owner** for property located at **10 Commercial Alley** and **Perry Silverstein and Kristin Magnus, owners** for property located at **Penhallow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (addition extending into adjacent vacant lot). Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 9 and 10 and lie within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay, and Historic A Districts.

- Perry Silverstein spoke on behalf of the application. He passed out packets and showed photos on his laptop. He pointed out the lot he owned on the laptop which was to the right of the fence and he described the surrounding buildings. He said he always wanted to clean up the back lot. He pointed out the fence which he put in. He pointed out the fence that runs along his parking area. There was a building that was in the parking lot and he noted where the coffee shop was. He noted the second page was the map and then there were photos of the lot. He explained that his architect was not with him because he thought they would not be heard until next Wednesday. He just wanted to get the commission thinking about his project. He referenced the last page which had a proposed sketch of one elevation. He proposed cleaning up the lot and get rid of the shed style hip roof along with the egress. He also wanted to change the door to a wrought iron gate which is complete. He showed a picture of the gate proposed.
- Chairman Rice asked which house would go in to the open space.
- Mr. Sylverstein stated there would still be some open space.
- Mr. Wycoff could not see it there because it was 18" wide.
- Mr. Sylverstein said it got wider to 44" wide. It was pie shaped.

- Mr. Wycoff asked where the right hand portion was.
- Mr. Sylverstein noted it on the laptop and showed which section he was going to put the building in.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the service of the steps would go through the building.
- Mr. Sylverstein stated that it would. He said his architect had done his homework and thinks it can work.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if Mr. Sylverstein was thinking of creating a small courtyard against the side of the building he owns.
- Mr. Sylverstein indicated it was the courtyard that exists currently in front of the coffee shop.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the wall behind that is a new portion.
- Mr. Sylverstein said that the courtyard remains the same.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said Mr. Sylverstein was talking about having an entrance door into some sort of public space.
- Mr. Sylverstein said yes there would be an entrance door to a public space.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said there would be some sort of Commercial Alley presence with some sort of mercantile use in this space.
- Mr. Sylverstein explained what had started this project was the coffee shop was too small. He wants to increase the size of the coffee shop. The window he pointed to on the plans would be the opening to the expansion. He pointed out various parts to the project, the coffee shop, where seating would be, windows, front door etc. and where the egress was.
- Chairman Rice said this view was on the Market Street end of Commercial Alley. He said all the Board can comment on the concept of the operation because they just had some sketches.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked what the Penhallow Street side of this starts to look like and whether or not it will still be utilized for off street parking. He said in looking at what they have here, he could not have a negative reaction.
- Chairman Rice said that a building of this size requires a lot of detail and that is what they are going to require, so they will require blue prints.
- Mr. Sylverstein stated that he would not be doing the plans. His architect did the sketches and he will start the him on the blueprints.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said there was some window height issues.
- Mr. Sylverstein said he would move forward with the project.

E) Work Session requested by **March Twenty Two, LLC, owner** and **SOMMA, applicant**, for property located at 58 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (4-story, mixed use). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Jen Ramsey, representing Olde Port Development, from SOMMA Studios passes out packets which were basically a repeat from last month. She stated that the first couple of sheets locate the building in town and the perspective of the 2 building conversion which was talked about last month. The site plan has been further developed noting the dimensions of things and shows the two buildings in relationship to each other. The important thing shown is the building that with a 45” dimension was the Book Guild, and the 50” one is the new structure. They look were different characteristics in the two buildings, however the do look alike.
- Vice-Chairman asked about the Book Guild.
- Ms. Ramsey said the Book Guild was the one they were taking down and they would be putting a new building in its spot. The issue last month was the dormers. She said the bulk of this package was going to talk about that. She noted Sheet 5 which was a large panoramic view from the site and it showed other buildings on the street that have dormers. The other image was an insert of the Warner House with dormers. The lower left of the sheet was the pedestrian approach. The current dormers at end of State Street sit right at edge and theirs will set back 6”. You wouldn’t be able to pick them out from the streetscape; so she wanted to show different angles. Sheets 5a and 5b shows the gabled end dormers which in most cases are on shorter buildings but it was important to note the Rusty Hammer is a 4 story building with dormers and was the best example to use on that street. The catch twenty two with this site is they were filling in a vacant lot that once had a building. Sheet 5b illustrates the side walls of the two existing buildings had windows in them so by filling in the block they were eliminating the side wall ability for windows, which eliminates the ability to have natural light and ventilation which is required by international building code and standards. The dormers were the next best way to get light in to that living space and for egress. She felt it was a more appropriate means than skylights. The next couple



of sheets show the process they went through. They had a store front design they liked and window patterns that seemed appropriate and started looking at the roof line. The ease for them a large dormer was preferable but the Commission did not like it because it made it look heavy which was investigation a. Then they went with investigation b. with the smaller dormers on the larger lot and a double wide dormer on the new building but still did not fit but worked spatially. Investigation c was the one they developed further which has five single dormers across the front where two seemed appropriate for the narrow building and three seemed appropriate for the wider building. This was giving some living space within and the look of an historical style which was preferred with a simple single dormer and narrow corner board. This design was modest and they were hoping the Commission would like it. Investigation D looked at what they could get down to spatially and window wise. She felt this was not the best option because the two dormers looked fine on the narrow building but not on the wider one. Sheet C is the one they return to and have gone with. A further sheet in the packet shows the back elevation they have started to develop. She noted that decks and dormers were more prevalent on Court Street which was a secondary street to State Street. She also stated that they simplified the sign band and made it more traditional.

- Chairman Rice said to start with the concept of the dormers.
- Ms. Fineberg that the dormers look bigger than the windows below them and wondered if it was a trick of perspective
- Ms. Ramsey said that it was because you were seeing the whole face of the dormer wall and it makes it look larger. It was the same size window.
- Chairman Rice agreed with conclusion on investigation c if he was going to approve the dormers. He felt it had a lighter touch.
- Vice Chairman Rice asked if they would consider constructing a more exotic side wall so that it would bring the side casing of the windows into a smaller scale.
- Ms. Ramsey asked him to elaborate.
- Vice Chairman Rice said something with thinner framing and has a more high-tech insulation to allow you to shrink the size of them down.
- Ms. Ramsey said she could.
- Vice Chairman Rice felt that one of the failings with dormers was they had bulk and it adds bulk to the roof.
- Ms. Ramsey said they would possibly need a light at the end.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said if it was just light they would need glazing.
- Ms. Ramsey agreed because the windows get bulky once they started adding eaves.
- Chairman Rice asked for feedback on the investigations.
- Vice-Chairman Adams liked demonstration C the best.
- Mr. Katz agreed with Vice-Chairman Adams because he was looking for a minimal impact on the dormers and having the shed rather than the A dormer added to that. He also felt that Vice-Chairman Adams' suggestion about diminishing the side wall will work well.
- Ms. Fineberg asked about the storefront level and was trying to figure out if the masking of the windows made sense.
- Vice-Chairman Adams suggested trying to imagine it without the transoms because that was not going to happen. He asked what happened to the structural brick masonry between the window and the door.
- Ms. Fineberg would rather see a bigger window than the two windows together. It looks more commercial and that is what will be on the first floor.
- Vice-Chairman Adams appreciates the doors aligned with the windows above.
- Ms. Dika was uncomfortable with the dormers. She felt it looked busy.
- Vice-Chairman Adams suggested a couple of good perspective drawings would help to show what it would look like.
- Chairman Rice liked this perspective better than last month. He referenced the back of the building facing Court Street.
- Ms. Ramsey said this was facing Court Street but was set back from Court Street. She said you would not see the first 21' of the building which would cover the second single dormer. You would see more prominently the new infill building with the deck, window bay and copper roof.
- Chairman Rice felt Ms. Ramsey was mixing some contemporary or institutionally elements.
- Ms. Ramsey explained that they were re-building the Book Guild in kind but the clapboard piece with the wooden decks would look like a more recent addition. They could build the building from State Street to the depth they wanted but would have a low pitched roof which would not be good for rain or snow and it started looking massive. The proposal they were using looked more appropriate.

- Chairman Rice was concerned was that they were abutting Strawberry Bank which had a more traditional antique setting so there was a contrast in style. He suggested paying attention to that character.
  - Mr. Katz asked what bothered Chairman Rice.
  - Chairman Rice said it was the copper roof, the big wood frame dormers and a mismatch of railing. The balconies look thick.
  - Ms. Ramsey stated that the balconies had window boxes which they were making it look similar to the rest of the neighborhood with a rounded deck and rounded flower boxes.
  - Mr. Katz asked the bulk of this would be seen on the left side.
  - Ms. Ramsey said that the bulk is the section that is covered by the Court Street house, which is very historic and antique looking. She stated she would bring plans next time that would show this.
  - Ms. Fineberg asked about the doors that go out from the deck. She felt it was jarring to go from having 2 doors on the second and third floors to having one door on the roof area. She suggested continuing the design from the second floor to the roof.
  - Ms. Ramsey said that would lead to a wider dormer which would lead to problems with other Board members.
  - Ms. Fineberg suggested a trade off might be that the building next to it could have a dormer that was 2 bays wide instead of 3 so that there was a balance visually. She was concerned about the many different window sizes and types and the many different door openings. She felt it was a bit busy.
  - Ms. Ramsey said they were trying to make it look like two separate buildings instead of one which was what was in the front.
  - Ms. Dika was concerned about it looking busy also. She asked if they had to have the double doors on the decks.
  - Ms. Ramsey said they could do a door and a window which would lessen the impact or the doors could be a little more separate.
  - Mr. Katz asked if anyone could actually see this.
  - Ms. Ramsey said that if you were walking on Court Street this was a private back yard that would be gated.
  - Mr. Katz said this would be almost impossible to see.
  - Mr. Wycoff said the building on the right hand side would have an opening in it. He felt this building with the rounded copper roof and rounded railing above the French doors was totally out of context with Portsmouth. He suggested that they have two single windows with a separation in the dormer lined up with the corresponding windows on the second and third floor or a smaller dormer with only two windows in the center. He felt that the heavy mass of three windows on the fourth floor with the copper roof was too much. It looked top heavy.
  - Ms. Ramsey thought that the copper roof was Victorian and not out of character.
  - Mr. Wycoff thought it was more second Empire.
  - Ms. Ramsey referenced the curved deck on the new building along with the arched garage doors and the planting boxes giving it a softened interior courtyard they were trying to create.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams thought that a couple of perspective views of the front, the dormers and the rear of the building would help them analyze this. He asked if there would be issues with egress from the third and fourth floor of this building.
  - Ms. Ramsey indicated there would not because the doors take care of it and Portsmouth allows the flip out dormers.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams asked if there would be issues with mechanicals.
  - Ms. Ramsey said there would not because they have basement space.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams asked if there would be a chimney.
  - Ms. Ramsey said not presently.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams suggested having one because they are popular in Portsmouth.
  - Ms. Fineberg disagreed that the front of the two buildings were totally different.
  - Ms. Ramsey said they are similar.
  - Mr. Wycoff thought they looked exactly the same with the windows aligned and both being the same height. He suggested making the smaller building slightly taller.
  - Ms. Ramsey indicated that it was taller. Ms. Ramsey indicated there were many type of options. She indicated she would like a public hearing.
  - Vice President Adams indicated you could come a lot closer next month with more detailed drawings.
-

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairman Rice mentioned that the Commission was offered the opportunity to go to the 13<sup>th</sup> Spring Planning Conference with an item on the agenda regarding Historic Preservation Planning on April 1, 2006 from 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at the Radison Hotel in Manchester. The City will pay for a portion of the registration. If you are interested see Linda.

---

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:17 PM, a motion was made and seconded that the meeting be adjourned to the following month's meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Corless  
HDC Secretary

/lc