

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

7:00 p.m.

MAY 3, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman John Rice; Members: Ellen Fineberg, John Golumb, Richard Katz; and Alternates, John Wyckoff and Sandra Dika

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice-Chairman David Adams and City Council Representative Edward Reynolds

ALSO PRESENT: Roger W. Clum, Building Inspector

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Benoit R. & Andrea M. St. Jean, owners** for property located at **54 Humphreys Court** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure and add a new free standing structure to replace it with additions to front of 23" and right side 6' as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 46 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Roe Cole, speaking on behalf of the applicants, stated that there was a problem with the original design, which was addressed in the last meeting. The redesign from the last meeting resulted in two different design options. The first would be to eliminate the window and make it a simple garage. The second shows a small arched door with a hip roof instead of a gable. Both of these options are acceptable to the homeowner and they would like to get a final decision from the Commission so they can start to build.

Chairman Rice asked which option the homeowner would prefer.

Mr. Cole stated that the owner prefers option two, but will accept any option that the Commission approves.

Chairman Rice stated that option two has a different door than is drawn.

Mr. Cole stated that he was correct; his first choice of garage door is the one with the arched top. If the arches aren't acceptable then his second choice would be the square glass door. His last option is the traditional raised rectangular panels with no glass. He wanted to provide the Commission with options.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the owner had eliminated all the windows on the side of the structure.

Mr. Cole stated that they tried to find a good way to satisfy the Commission. This will be their fourth meeting.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the garage doors would work with the 12' or the 9' space.

Mr. Cole clarified that the measurements are actually 8' x 8'. The first door would fit into the 8' x 8', while the second would need an 8' by 12' space.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the window pattern of the house. Was it two over two or four over four?

Mr. Cole responded that the original garage has six over six on the left, then one over one on the house. He would happy to eliminate that pattern and make it one over one. It would keep the theme going.

Ms. Fineberg stated that option two has a one over one drawing.

Mr. Cole stated that she was correct.

Mr. Katz asked why there was a 12' door in the gable end version.

Mr. Cole stated it was to balance the structure out and keep the roof line the same. He will have storage to the right near the entrance, so a 12' door is too narrow to have two cars side by side. This would make it more symmetrical in the front.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why he decided to include an 8' door.

Mr. Cole stated that both doors would be 8' high, in order to fit his large vehicle with a roof rack. His concern was that the garage be high enough to accommodate this.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Fineberg moved to consider option one with the second choice door and plans as submitted.

With no second, the motion failed.

Ms. Dika moved to accept option two with the first choice of door. This was seconded by Mr. Katz.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she was opposed to this because the design of the option two door is not the best design for this facility. The roof pitch would be better than the gable, but the window next to the door would be awkward to the façade of the structure. Square garage doors are more in keeping with the period of the house, rather than the arched windows. There are not any other arched windows in any photos of the house. She will be voting against the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he liked option two. The only problem is the height of the double hung window on the front of the structure. It is not in relation to any of the other openings. They should at least put it higher so it would match with the door on the side.

Mr. Katz asked how that could be done. He stated that Mr. Wyckoff should put forth an amendment.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he would amend option two to match the height of the window to match the side door.

Mr. Cole stated that that was the way it was supposed to be.

Mr. Golumb reviewed option one and stated that option two with the square doors would be more appropriate. The window is an awkward element with option two, due to the rounded garage. He will not support the motion. Square doors are more appropriate for this structure.

Chairman Rice will support the motion because it is a garage and does not see an aesthetic problem.

Chairman Rice called for a vote on the motion to approve the request with the stipulation that Option #1 with the first door on the exhibits presented at the meeting be used.

A motion to approve the request, with the stipulation, passed by a vote of 4 to 2.

~~~~~

2. Petition of **Nobles Island Condo Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (re-deck 4 existing decks with Trex or Timbertech) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120, Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Mr. John Merrigan stated that he is there to request permission to replace the 2' by 6' pressure treated decks with the Trex or Timbertech type material.

Mr. Katz asked if the material in his hand would be the material used to build the decks.

Mr. Merrigan stated that his intention was to replace the pressure treated decks with Trex material.

Mr. Katz asked if he would be replacing these in the same dimension as the previous.

Mr. Merrigan stated that he was, and that it would provide a more consistent view from the street. This type of material has many benefits: it doesn't need paint; it can be washed easily and will unify the look of the decks.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there was any issue with the Trex butting against the wood. Is there any problem connecting Trex wood with regular wood, and does this wood wear well?

Mr. Merrigan stated that he did not think there would be a problem. This would go right up under the vinyl. What will happen will be that the existing wood will be removed and the new Trex material will slide in the vacant spot? There will be no places where it is Trex to wood other than the rafters. He installed this material on a water environment in 1992 and it is still surviving.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the design of the decking would remain the same, or will it needed to be altered to accommodate the material.

Mr. Merrigan stated that the reason it was to keep the decks in the same consistency. Right now, it runs parallel to the building. The intent is to maintain the same dimensions.

Ms. Fineberg asked what would happen to the railings.

Mr. Merrigan stated that the current railings were metal and would be removed for the process and reinstalled. All of the rails have been previously repaired.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she realizes that the Commission does not review color, but asked what color the deck would be.

Mr. Merrigan stated that the present deck is mostly gray, but the color of the Trex would be a dark brown. Color may change due to weathering.

Ms. Dika observed that the deck had already been replaced with pressure treated wood. What was the life of that wood?

Mr. Merrigan stated that it was installed in the mid 1990s. It lasts about 10 to 12 years. The present decks are in dire need of an update because they are splintering and becoming destroyed.

Ms. Dika asked if the Trex had a life expectancy.

Mr. Merrigan stated that the Trex company claims 20 to 30 years.

With no one further rising the public hearing was closed.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Golumb made a motion to grant the petition as presented and advertised, which was seconded by Ms. Dika.

A motion to grant the petition passed by unanimous vote.

~~~~~  
3. Petition of **Norman B. Olsen & Tasha B. Kostantacos, owners** for property located at **70 New Castle Avenue** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure and new construction to an existing structure (replace barn structure in current footprint) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101, Lot 31 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Tasha Kostantacos, owner, stated she was requesting permission to demolish the barn that is connected to the house and rebuild a new structure on the same footprint. The packets include pictures of different perspectives of the home, the tax map in relation to where it sits in relation to Newcastle Avenue, and the survey map. She noted that she received variance from the Board of Adjustment regarding lot coverage and setbacks. The existing and proposed site plans are in the packet, which shows where the barn sits in relation to the house. The addition would be a bit larger, and more integrated into the home. The structure in question is located on the far right of the house. In the proposed front elevation, they would like to take the gable end to align with the height of the original house. This would stay in line with the class New England feel of the area. It would bring cohesiveness to the property. She would like to note that she adjusted the window due to comments made at a previous meeting that showed concern that it was too low. On the proposed right side, there will be two windows and a cellar entrance door. She would like to indicate an air conditioner unit in the back left. The owners are still discussing the ac situation; there may be a large unit or there may be two smaller units to save space. It is in the site plan near the house alcove, which is not visible from the street.

Chairman Rice opened up the floor for questions.

Mr. Golumb asked if the proposed front elevation of the new structure is taller than the existing structure.

Ms. Kostantacos stated that it would be one inch shorter.

Mr. Golumb stated that it looked taller in the drawing.

Ms. Kostantacos stated that it would be about two inches shorter.

Ms. Fineberg asked Ms. Kostantacos to explain the deck and the stairs near the proposed left elevation. She also would like to know where the deck and stairs attach to the building.

Ms. Kostantacos stated that she should look at the aerial drawings. The steps are angled off the back of it.

Chairman Rice asked if she had to obtain lot coverage relief.

Ms. Kostantacos stated that she did, and there was a stipulation added. The deck must remain clear and open to the sky, but was otherwise approved.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the barn windows looked like they would be very narrow double hung. They seem out of proportion with the existing structure.

Ms. Kostantacos stated that that was an adjustment that was made as a result of the work session. In trying to rearrange the window placement, the back windows and side were changed to fit the style of the house. They thought that was a good compromise, but is willing to adjust.

The designer of the project stated that originally the left window in the south gable end was in the water closet. They could not move it, so they had to change the layout of the bathroom, so the two smaller windows were changed. Now one window is in the water closet, and the other in the dressing room. These windows are not totally visible on that side. They can make them larger if needed, but that is not very functional.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was an inconsistency in the design. He can see how the side would not be visible at all times. He suggests that the deck include 45 degree angled steps toward the back, which are diagonal rather than a foot on each side.

Ms. Fineberg confirmed that the railing will go along from the side of the barn and the side of the residence. IT should start there, and go all the way down the stairs.

Ms. Kostantacos stated that it would, that is correct.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Fineberg moved to accept the application as presented, which Mr. Katz seconded.

A motion to grant the petition passed by a unanimous vote.

~~~~~  
4. Petition of **Fifty – Fifty Two Market St. Realty Trust, owner and John Merrigan, applicant** for property located at **52 Market Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to existing structure (replacement of slate on roof with 30 year architectural shingles, remove old hatch cover and re-deck, repoint mortar on chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117, Lot 32 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Mr. John Merrigan, representing Market Street Trust, stated that they had a failing slate roof on 52 Market Street. It has been falling off since they purchased the building, and is now past the point of repair. They would like to replace it with something that would be more architecturally pleasing and safe. He shows an example of the pewter colored shingles to the Commission.

Chairman Rice asks if the mortar used in repatching the chimney will match the color that is there now. Although it is aged, they will match it as close as they can.

Mr. Golumb stated that there are hatches on the rear of the building.

Mr. Merrigan stated that the hatch was always sealed on the underside of the building there is also a small crawlspace and water heater. There is access to the hatch from the adjacent building but it is sealed shut.

Mr. Golumb asked what 'redeck' meant.

Mr. Merrigan explained that it meant resealing patch covering. It is the process of putting wood down and the sealing it, and covering it with shingles.

Ms. Fineberg asked if they were planning to replace the skylights that are there.

Mr. Merrigan stated that the skylights were in excellent shape and could be worked around. They would be staying the exact same.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the decorative railing.

Mr. Merrigan stated that he thought it was used for catching falling snow or slates. It will stay to help catch the snow and ice coming off the roof.

Ms. Fineberg stated that they could stipulate that it remain as part of the structure.

Mr. Merrigan had no problem with that.

Mr. Rice stated that one could not see the roof without a helicopter, so it has little impact.

Mr. Merrigan stated that it could be seen from the rear and from the parking garage. It is in very bad shape. The photos enclosed in the packet were taken from the parking garage, and the front elevation was taken from inside another building.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Wyckoff moved to grant the petition as presented and advertised, which was seconded by Mr. Golumb.

Mr. Fineberg stated that she would like to comment that it is sad to see slate roofs in the neighborhood go, but she knows why. It is not something that the Commission can halt, at least in some buildings, but she would like to note that it is too bad. She asked if they needed to stipulate that the metal railing be retained. She then stipulated that the snow and ice guard must remain.

The makers of the motion agreed to the stipulation.

A motion to grant the petition with the stipulation passed by unanimous vote.

~~~~~

5. Petition of **Melissa Bicchieri, owner** for property located at **206 Northwest Street** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure, renovations to an existing structure and a new free standing structure (side and rear additions to existing house, changes to existing outbuilding and addition of detached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department.

Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 122 as Lot 6 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Wendy Welton, architect, passed out new copies to add to the packet.

Ms. Fineberg asked if this was the same applicant that the Commission had done work sessions with before.

Chairman Rice stated that it was.

Ms. Welton stated that she came before the Commission two times. The first work session raised the question of the volume of the building. At the second, they revised the plan. The revised plan included a second floor bridge with a larger garage. These connect, and they have an arch below. After the work session, it was concluded that this be 'calmed down' and eliminate the archway connector. They discussed if the roofline could be lowered, or alter the volume so that it could be lessened. They came to the conclusion that they could not reduce the volume. She included trim on the windows and made them more decorative. The original house had a trim board base, which would be omitted. They matched the trim, but otherwise made the articulation clearly subservient to the original house. She included the clapboard shutting between the windows in the garage, which was suggested at a previous meeting. They've added one attic window, and the garage with doors front and back. The doors will be flush with the structure, with no articulation. It will deliberately be painted a dark, plain color, to fit with the architectural style. They have rethought the right side elevation, on HDC three, which faces the garage. She is still deciding between the plain one or the windowed choice. The window on the upper left is necessary for bedroom egress. The side window is needed for the laundry room, as well as the living room window. There are two added windows on the revised plan. The patio door will have a single 2 wide/2 high muntin door. The roofing will be comprised of natural, real wood cedar shingles.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions or concerns about the front of the property.

Ms. Fineberg asked if they were looking at HDC 2.

Chairman Rice stated that 2 is the correct sheet. He had seen this previously in a work session. This was the only solution to extend this.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she was not crazy about the garage doors being arched. She was confused about the roofline on HDC 3. She does not get the break in the rear of the ridge. The 3D overview shows one part lower than the rest.

Mr. Katz explained that that was a cheat to maintain the ridgeline typically lower than the rest of the roof. Often done with dormers.

Ms. Welton stated that a shed dormer in the knuckle was placed there so that she could maintain a symmetrical line throughout. She kept a significant portion of roof to keep it aesthetically pleasing in two areas. The view from across the water made her try to configure the house to have good views.

Ms. Fineberg stated that there was a lot of glass on the first floor, and wondered if she would consider dropping two panes on either side of the door down to one pane each.

Ms. Welton stated that although it was a lot of glass, this was the one place in the house that needed it. The front needs the feel of the lighted face. The amount of glass reads well from a distance, because it is across the water from downtown Portsmouth. This reflects the wishes of the owners, and the view holds it because of the glass. She would prefer to keep the glass, but is willing to compromise for the sake of the Commission's approval.

Mr. Katz stated that the owners had shown restraint on the front and both gable ends. He does not have a problem with the owners wanted a water view. He does not think that it is a jarring use of glass. He has no problem with the view.

Mr. Wyckoff would agree with that even though the house is on a rear elevation. The garage is so high that it would help the traditional look if it had a double hung window on the front elevation. It might help to have it on the elevation as well. It would not be an expensive add and would help the look of the structure.

Ms. Welton stated that she included and removed that several times, but found that the 2' x 4' looked and fit the best. The owner will be building the structure first, so she offered to come back at any time if there is an issue with the windows. She has to return once more for a smaller structure on the property and could include the window issue at that time.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he would like to keep the windows and proposes an amendment to include that. The door that is proposed is not appropriate to the style of the house.

Ms. Welton explained that the door that is shown on the plan is a two panel wood door. They previously proposed a glass paned door.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the general look of the door dates back to the 1930's and 1940's, which is not appropriate to the rest of the house. Perhaps the Christian four panel 1040 door may be more appropriate.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz moved to grant the petition as presented with the aforementioned condition, and asked Mr. Wyckoff for his stipulation.

Mr. Wyckoff added a stipulation that the windows in the front and rear center of the garage be appropriately sized (30" x 40") double-hung windows to match the existing windows and the door on the right side elevation be changed to a Christian, four-panel door, (1040).

A motion to grant the petition with the stipulation passed by unanimous vote.



6. Petition of **March Twenty Two, LLC, owner** for property located at **58 State Street** wherein permission was requested to allow a new freestanding structure (4-story, mixed use) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey, of Somma, spoke on behalf of March 22 LLC. This application is for new construction on the 58 State Street lot. There are two separate buildings being proposed, both three stories. The shed dormers sit back from the wall about 6'. The back lot has a three-story structure currently under construction, and there are a number of decks relating to the building. Sheet two is the view from the bridge. Sheet three is the view from State Street. Sheet four is the proposed elevation seen from State Street. They are calling out for firewalls, shingles and wood framed dormers. She worked with the HDC to make the dormers as narrow as possible. They have aluminum clad windows, as well as granite lintels and granite sills. They have a wood signage band that runs across both, and canvas awning systems. Eagle aluminum clad storefront windows and a series of doors in the front elevation, two of which will access storage space will be installed in the store face. The middle door will lead to residential suites above with a private lobby.

Ms. Ramsey stated that, on the side view, they will build it as similarly as it exists with a brick filled window and granite sills. The back addition to the building will have closed shutter detail. Sheet 5 is the back of the building, best seen from Court Street. There are a number of decks, and the structure is a clapboard, plaid building. There is an entrance to parking below the building at the base. Sheet 6 is a perspective view from Court Street. Sheet 7 is a look at the building in sections. Sheet 8 deals with elevation detail, as well as dormer. She has the clad color with her to show the Commission. Sheets 9 and 10 have further details, mostly regarding the decks. There are some half rail and full rail decks. The closed shutter happens in the clapboard section, which would protrude 1.5" from the front face of the building. The sign band detail will be matched directly to the brick, as well as flower box details, which would be painted wood. The door would be a Simpson door with a long top front panel, which would be glazed on the retail space. At the residential area, it would be all solid, with no glass. She has a sample of the brick and granite with the color and mortar that was selected. The remains of the packet are specification sheets that detail the dimension and size. They have not yet selected a canvas color for the awnings, but it will most likely be taupe.

Chairman Rice stated that there have been several work sessions creating this plan.

Mr. Golumb stated that on sheet 4 there was some confusion about the shutter detail. He asks if the proposal is for a 1.5" sill with the shutters.

Ms. Ramsey stated that was correct, and it will look much like the detail shown. Elsewhere on the building, the windows will also have sills with shutters.

Ms. Fineberg asked why the parapet wall on the side elevation as well as on one side. Why is there an open railing between them? Why not carry the parapet wall throughout?

Ms. Ramsey stated that portion on the front of the parapet wall is pulled up toward the front. The other parapet wall is moved back. The interior view needs to view through the wall. The parapet wall is mainly used for privacy. The addition on the back is L shaped.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how they can build a dormer that's 3' 10" wide and have a 3' rough opening in the dormer.

Ms. Ramsey stated that they had gone from 5.5" framing to 3.5". After trimming and insulation, there will be lesser side walls.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if that was how they were to meet their energy code in that way.

Ms. Ramsey stated that was correct.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the front door was inappropriate for the style of the architecture. The two-panel door with glass is fine for the business, but not for the residential entrance that faces the street. A heavily molded Victorian style door would be more appropriate there. That is a very prominent spot. A recommendation would be more crown moldings or at least a solid wood door. This is on Sheet 4. A good way to correct this would be to put a more solid door, without glass facing the street. He suggests that it needs a different look. It could go either way. He would like to see a door with heavy applied moldings.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there was a drawing showing how far the parapet sticks out in comparison to the other decks.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that Sheet 7 showed the deck extending out as far as the furthest deck, which is one side of the building. It disappears behind the firewall. It is the furthest one out for that unit.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz moved to grant the petition as presented, with Mr. Wyckoff's amendment on door #2, which was seconded by Ms. Fineberg.

Chairman Rice called for a vote on the motion, with the stipulation that door #2, as shown on the plans be a four-panel wood entry door.

A motion to grant the petition, with the stipulation, passed by unanimous vote.

~~~~~

7. Petition of **Daniel Pinkham House, LLC, owner** and **Fred Attalla, applicant** for property located at **400 The Hill/Deer Street** wherein permission was requested to allow a new construction to an existing structure (installation of 2 air conditioners) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 26 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Mr. Fred Atalla stated they were requesting to be allowed to install two air conditioning units behind the building as indicated on the photos. The reason for the location was that the new heating system was located on the far end of the building, which would be far behind the air conditioning units in a grass alleyway. Also, the mature shrubs act as a good buffer for the units, and they felt that they would be hidden behind the units. The units are 2' x 2' x 2', and the dimensions are on Sheet 4.

Ms. Fineberg asked if these would be installed on concrete slabs.

Mr. Atalla stated that they would be.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there was any issue with noise. She asked if they were required to place a fence near the units to block sound.

Chairman Rice stated that it was not their purview.

Mr. Atalla stated that they did not plan on installing any fencing. The units are fairly quiet.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the cement slabs were fake or poured.

Mr. Atalla responded that they were pre-cast cement slabs.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why they were looking at it. These are Styrofoam encased in cement that the units sit on top of. The units are all high tech looking, none of which the HDC would ever approve of.

Mr. Katz asked the Commission to look at letter F under section C that gives any mechanical operations from 1' out from the building is something that the Commission reviews.

Mr. Al McElaney, abutter to the property, spoke in favor of the petition. He stated that he agreed with the area that it would be placed in, and has no objections to the request.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Ms. Fineberg moved that they approve the petition as presented and advertised, which was seconded by Ms. Dika.

A motion to grant the petition passed by unanimous vote.



8. Petition of **Joan D. Barondes, owner** for property located at **199 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127, Lot 6 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

John Fletcher, representing Joan Barondes, requested the replacement of an existing deck. They would replace exactly as is shown in the pictures, except for two changes. There would be an addition of a post on the side view to reduce the size of the rails. Also, it would be made of composite decking and painted wood.

Chairman Rice asked if the composite was the same stuff that was previously presented.

Mr. Fletcher stated that it was.

Mr. Katz asked if it was Trex.

Mr. Fletcher stated that the brand was called Rhino Deck.

Mr. Katz asked if there was a spec for that in the packet.

Mr. Fletcher stated that he didn't believe so. The owner selected this material from a shop in Portsmouth. He presented a pamphlet to the Commission.

Mr. Katz asked if everything was going to be replaced in time.

Mr. Fletcher stated that it would.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the vertical skirting on the bottom was going to be wood.

Mr. Fletcher replied that everything regarding the railing and trim would be painted wood.

Ms. Fineberg asked if this would look similar to the Trex.

Mr. Fletcher stated that it had a wood grain, so it was slip resistant.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Ms. Dika made a motion to grant the petition as presented and advertised, which was seconded by Mr. Katz.

A motion to grant the petition passed by unanimous vote.



9. Petition of **Mark H Wentworth Home for Chronic Invalids, owner** for property located at **346 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure and allow new construction to an existing structure (remove fire escape, add new ADA compliant entry, remodel exterior including new windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109, Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Rice recused himself and passed the gavel to Mr. Golumb to preside over the petition.

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

Mr. Christopher Tiernan, of JSA Architects, spoke on behalf of the Mark Wentworth Home. This was the third time he had been before the HDC, and he had made many changes to the plan after the productive work sessions. He handed out recent information they received after James Garvin, the state architectural historian visited the property. The original Wentworth mansion is on the national historical register, so they wanted to make sure they were proceeding correctly and paying attention to the needs of that structure. Mr. Garvin wrote a letter that shows his approval of the proposed project. He added an additional packet of information that details the trim and clarifies the fencing around the dumpster. The fencing would have to be 6' to enclose the dumpster. An additional sheet details the cut sheet of the entry doors. The entry doors are off of Wentworth and Melcher Streets. He asked the Board to look at the 3D model to get a better look of the renovations. The changes that are proposed would be the removal of open fire stairs, and the construction of internal fire stairs in the corner. They are happy about the design proposal.

He stated that the facility is comprised of three buildings: the 1700 mansion, the 1927 nursing home manor and the 1987 building. The old mansion would be painted and furnished with new windows. The 1927 home's external fire stair would be made into an internal fire stair, and they would remove the mechanical units outside the building. Most of the work will be done on the 187 portion of the building, which has a contemporary look. The scheme is to pull off the stucco covering and install clapboards. They also would like to change the shape of the windows to a more rectangular, historical type of window. They add more of a footprint in some areas, such as the lowest level to allow the nursing area to function by code. They would like to use black glass to bring more of a historical look into the home. There would be an extension of the roof line over some portions of the building. They're trying to help the buildings unify with the others. They've articulated the roof with dormers, and tried to bring more interest to the building. There will be an emergency generator that would be hidden in a roof alcove. There is no extension of the footprint on the Pleasant Street side, and the slate roofing will continue throughout.

Mr. Tiernan stated that the best drawing to show the changes from the existing to the proposed would be the elevation 1 drawing. The nature of the residence is senior living, and they wish to change it from institutional to more historic. The present entryway is storefront glass. They propose a large two story bay that would bring light into the front. The window proportion on the present building is square, whereas the proposed have a more tradition look. There are gable articulations and components to make add character. They will not be touching the 1700 building other than painting.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the articulating gable with trim would have a continuous front or if they would project outwards.

Mr. Tiernan stated that they would project out about 6" with an overhang to expand the 6" in the long face.

Ms. Fineberg asked how far forward the connection will be compared to the existing.

Mr. Tiernan stated that the connector piece, which is the main entry, would be 6 to 8' from the plane. The plane on the 1700 mansion sits forward, and the new configuration sits in back of the 1987 building 2' from the edge, but back.

Ms. Fineberg stated that it looks to be moving up 4' to 6'.

Mr. Tiernan stated that it brings better light and flow into the space. They want the light to jump out.

Ms. Fineberg stated that there was a significant piece of roofing on the right side of the building on the floor. Is there a functional use for that?

Mr. Tiernan stated that it was not. It is for aesthetic purposes.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how pulling the connector forward would affect the old clapboard window and trim that is there. Are they planning to cover more windows?

Mr. Tiernan stated that they recreated it and will do the same for the mansion, bringing the exterior of the mansion inward.

Ms. Fineberg asked if he had any drawings showing that.

Mr. Tiernan replied that he had none of the interior. Off Melcher Street, the top point of the existing roof is extended to continue over the building. A low level bumpout is illustrated on the bottom of the sheet. This happens below a low grade impact wall. The 1927 building has through wall units to be removed, which is an improvement. There will be an internal HVAC system.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the windows with dormers on the roof of the 1927 building.

Mr. Tiernan stated that that exists as part of the original elevator that is coming out with construction. The other chimney for the 1927 building had its own ventilation system for all the homes. The existing vent structure can be used. They are taking advantage of it and bring daylight to the office spaces that will be on that level.

Ms. Dika asked if the third section drawing was a garage door.

Mr. Tiernan stated yes, and that it was a receiving area in the original package.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the doors on the plan were the traditional, folding 4 panel doors.

Mr. Tiernan stated they were, and that a color version will show the joints, but they hide nicely with the color. The neighbors liked them.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the bottom floor balcony above the protruding addition would have a solid rail.

Mr. Tiernan responded that that was a flat roof, not a balcony.

Mr. Golumb asked if there was a panel in front of an arched window on elevation #2.

Mr. Tiernan stated that that is actually a stairwell, and it does not meet ADA requirements and is being removed. The window makes it not functional to convert into private rooms. The idea is to elongate the shape with the floor panel.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there were any changes to the 1927 building.

Mr. Tiernan stated that the window, the garage and the filling in of the mechanical units were the only ones. The flat roof would be extended and adding the decorative structure to the roof to conceal it. Nothing is happening to the 1700s mansion. They are reconfiguring the windows at the junction of both buildings. An additional door would be placed there, as well as a continuous roof. This portion of the building is stucco, not brick, which needs to be repaired.

Ms. Fineberg asks about the addition of the dormers to the new roof section.

Mr. Tiernan stated that the dormer helps with the headroom and allows light into the space. There are two side dormers now enclosing the roof.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they would affect the original Wentworth Home. Is there anywhere else affected?

Mr. Tiernan stated that it would affect the connecting side and the other piece of roof. Mr. Garvin felt it was sensitive to the design of the original mansion.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they planned to use real cement or stucco to patch off and cut.

Mr. Tiernan stated that they would be using the same stucco system, which is real as opposed to ethos.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why they didn't construct a balcony where the flat roof sits.

Mr. Tiernan stated that the roof was lower in that area and it would create more work. He stated he was nervous about creating balconies over flat roofs. He would like to talk about infilling and demolition. He brought window samples. They are using plank siding and posit trim which withstand maintenance and look good. The windows have simulated window sills. He shows the historic sill and the integrated trim. It is an aluminum clad window, the trim is full aluminum.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the windows were chosen due to cost consideration or because they fit due to the tightness factor.

Mr. Tiernan stated that they were chosen because they were recommended by the HDC and their favorable use in the past. The look is the main reason. The nice thing about the sill piece is the better flashing detail with less aesthetic concern, as opposed to wooden underneath.

Mr. Golumb asks Mr. Tiernan to speak on the demolition that will occur.

Mr. Tiernan showed the demo drawings. They generally want to pull out the windows but keep the head position and keep the cut out sill, to create the new rectangular area. The hatched area shows the areas of removal. Some of the areas are larger because they are creating smaller bay articulations on the side. They are pulling off more of the brick and adding more front articulation. They are trying to



create a residential look. They will put on new asphalt shingles and extend the roofline to the new structure. At the entry, the curtain wall is the most extensive area of deconstruction. The roof will be removed to insert another floor that marries with the existing floors. They have the connecting roof line to unify the buildings. There will be new steel beams and floor joints. This is mostly a skin refacing. The arched window would be cut out to expand the opening of the 1927 building. They would open some windows and drop the sills.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the new elevation of the entry would fit into the new entryway. Is their intention to leave the original dentil moldings, or replace it with meritex or mayzac? They could possibly save some of the crown molding.

Mr. Tiernan stated that Mr. Garvin wants to come out and see the property again and inspect it more carefully to determine what can be salvaged and saved.

Mr. Wyckoff wants to know how they are going to melt a metal frame roof onto the 1700 roof.

Mr. Tiernan stated that it would over build on top of it. They will not creating any additional structure underneath it.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would be taking the hip off the back of it and continuing the same plane.

Mr. Tiernan stated that that was correct.

Mr. Katz asked how the windows would be fastened if they were using aluminum trim.

Mr. Tiernan stated that it had non traditional jams. The jams have an attachment that can be screwed into the side of the frame to secure it.

Mr. Katz asked if it would be attached to the frame or to the exterior trim.

Mr. Tiernan stated it would be attached the frame.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they would not be replacing the windows in the 1927 building.

Mr. Tiernan stated that they would be replacing all the windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if those were the original 6 over 6 windows.

Mr. Tiernan stated that Mr. Garvin did not think so. They had been replaced at least a few times throughout the building's evolution.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the reason he asked was because he had worked on another case where the 6 over 6 windows were required to be kept. They had to be repaired and replaced. The other windows were allowed to be replaced. What is the difference between this building and that case? This is a more important structure. The compromise agreed upon was to install 6 over 6 Pella windows in the side and back, but repair and retain the front 6 over 6 original windows. Interior storm panels were put on later.

Mr. Golumb asked if the present windows were wood with wood sills.

Mr. Tiernan stated that they were.

Mr. Golumb did not realize that the petition indicated a replacement of *all* the windows. He also has a concern over putting aluminum windows in the 1700 building. He asked if Mr. Tiernan would consider putting all wood windows in there.

Mr. Tiernan stated that that would be fair.

Mr. Golumb stated that the length of the meeting and the amount of questions make this seem like more of a work session. He would open this if they felt it was worthwhile.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was any way to approve the project and later discuss the idea of keeping the windows on the original house.

Ms. Fineberg stated that that would be a mistake because that would mean giving partial approval. If they have an approved application then...

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they could just hold the window issue until another time and approve the rest of the petition.

Mr. Golumb stated that they have done that in the past. They could ask the applicant to withdraw that from the application. He asks if they should table this to a work session next week. He is just proposing the idea.

Mr. Bob Thaw, project coordinator, stated that he would like to address Mr. Wyckoff's question. Would the restoration meet the department of interior standards as to what is allowed? In this case, that is still unclear. He stated that it would be good to discuss the window situation in the original home anyway. He suggest withdrawing the application any discussion of the windows in the original building. Pending the outcome of the further investigation, they will reappear in front of the Commission for that specific issue.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there was any additional work planned on the original structure besides replacing the windows.

Mr. Tiernan stated that besides the roof connections previously shown, there would be nothing additional.

Ms. Fineberg asked if that was to be done in slate.

Mr. Tiernan stated that one portion was slate, the other was asphalt shingle.

### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Ed Hibbard, of 12 Whidden Street, stated that his family would be affected by this proposition. Their house is near the service entrance for the Wentworth. He would like to note that the Wentworth owners have been very helpful, respectful and terrific in addressing concerns and issues raised by neighbors. Many issues were addressed at the ZBA level hearings, which were dealt with by the

owners. He is also speaking on behalf of Philip Thayer, of 37 Whidden Street. He is pleased to see the change in the new siding and windows, as well as the fire escapes. They are concerned about the extension of the roof line toward South Mill Pond. Anyone walking down Pleasant Street would not be able to see past the extended roof. The mass of the roof line is already in excess, so any addition to it would be inappropriate. There is not a functional purpose for the extension, it is merely cosmetic. They are affected by this, and it is not a benefit. It would detract from the neighborhood. The slope in the land is toward the water, and roofline parallels it. Leaving the roof line as is makes sense. This is a massive structure, and he wonders how it ever got approved in the first place. He asks the Commission to consider his plea, and asked that they do not approve the roof line. He also notes that they would not find any other roof of this size or makeup in Portsmouth, and he would like to see it left as is.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Mr. Thaw stated that Mr. Hibbard was correct. This extended roof line is purely aesthetic, and the building planners chose to extend it to make it an even line. It has no function, and the applicant is willing to leave this to the discretion of the HDC.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application for purposes of discussion, which was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff.

Mr. Katz stated that he was taken by the mass of the structure. When Mr. Hibbard spoke on the roof extension, he realized that they cannot do much about a lost view. However, the fact that the topography fall away and the point of the roof line falls away speaks to him, and he considers it a legitimate, not functional, architectural criticism. He would like to revisit this. There is a necessity to extend the roofline for conformity and for additional mass. He is not convinced that it is crucial.

Ms. Dika agreed.

Ms. Fineberg does not understand.

Mr. Katz stated that he would not vote for the application with that roof extension.

Ms. Fineberg asked if he was proposing an amendment.

Mr. Katz stated that there would have to be an alternate plan. Perhaps it should be tabled until they have more information to look at.

Mr. Golumb stated that the applicant allowed the HDC to withdraw the roof stipulation.

Mr. Katz stated that another detail needs to be submitted.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that if the applicant removed the gabled roof line as well as the articulation pediment, they could keep the existing roof that is there now. The present roof goes up against the hip

detail on the end of the 1980 structure, so that detail would be kept as original. Essentially, they could have a converted factory look, and as the land slopes it would be a four story building in the back, which is too large. The abutter has a legitimate claim, and architecturally it makes more sense to leave the roof line as is.

Mr. Katz asked if the Commission was comfortable with Mr. Wyckoff's suggestion

The Commission agreed.

Ms. Fineberg asked what would happen to the pediment.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it would be gone.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she would like more time, but would like a roof plan that would show the new roofing structure.

Mr. Katz stated that there were two amendments to this proposal. The first is the windows in the original structure will be withdrawn, as well as the roof extension. They are not part of the application.

Mr. Thaw clarified that there were other changes to the roofline that are functional in the building, and would like to note that only the extension of the roof line will be withdrawn.

Mr. Golumb is comfortable with those two amendments.

Chairman Rice called for a vote to grant the petition with two stipulations: one, that the replacement of any existing windows in the original mansion be withdrawn from the applilcaiton; and, two that the roof extension on the Mill Pond side be eliminated from the application.

A motion to grant the petition, with the stipulations, was passed by a vote of 4 to 1.

~~~~~  
10. Petition of **Jacqueline R. Thompson Revocable Trust, Jacqueline R. Thompson, Trustee, owner** for property located at **139c South Street** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (addition of master suite above existing sunroom and entry canopy for front door and infill to closet and addition to first floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110, Lot 7-3 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Rob Harbinson, architect, spoke on behalf of the owners. He has been to work sessions regarding this case before, and directs the attention to Sheet 1. They are proposing a second floor master suite addition, and a first floor storage closet and entry canopy. The other buildings in the site plan are the other residences that are part of the south mill apartment complex. Sheet 7 gives an existing photo of the residence from the Mill Pond area at the north end of the building. The new canopy would lie over the main entry door. Sheet 8 gives the existing front elevation and the proposed main entry door. The existing deck and rail will be removed to accommodate the second floor addition to the master suite.

The new dormers will align with the center of the sliding doors below. The eaves and the window heads align with the dormers in the existing building, and the windows will be new. Also, a Juliet balcony will be installed on the right side of the building. Sheet 9 is the end elevation of the building, indicating a vent, deck rail, trim band, window, door and stair access to be removed. The sliders will be replaced to match the sliding doors below. To the right, the storage closet would lie beneath the second floor. Sheet 10 shows the rear elevation of the building, which shows a dash line for the removal of the stairs. The window will be filled in to make room for a shed. The two storage doors would be added. Sheets 11 and 12 show details for the entry canopy of the main door, as well as the Juliet balcony and custom doors on the rear elevation. They have attached the Anderson Window specs, which will be white aluminum clad windows, as well as the sliding patio doors. These match the existing. He has two letters of support from the Condo Association. Both letters submit their approval, and they are happy with the outcome.

Mr. Golumb asked if there was anything different in the drawings from the last work session.

Mr. Harbinson stated that one dormer to align the sliding doors below the front elevation was the only major revision. This is on page 8. They also slightly increased the width of that dormer per request of the HDC.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the brackets below the balcony were a certain style. He stated that it was hard to find a fit for brackets. He is not happy with the proportion of the brackets. He has never seen brackets horizontally extended twice past the height.

Mr. Harbinson stated that they tried to stay simple in choosing a bracket. There is a shallow depth of the canopy, and the balconies at the rear of Court Street are similar to that.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the brackets do not work for him.

Mr. Harbinson stated that he is more than willing to change the brackets in the front entryway, however they are limited on the Juliet balcony because the sliding doors below. That caused the type of brackets.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the roof looks to be floating without proper support.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there was any way to extend the bracket to the end of the roof.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that usually, the brackets have a 45 degree angle instead of the same height and projection. That is a minimal bracket. The higher it is, the more strength it can withstand.

Mr. Harbinson stated that the width of the bracket was 110.5 but is willing to increase it.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that that would work. That is acceptable.

Mr. Harbinson stated that was a reasonable comment. He would like to see an amendment.

Ms. Fineberg asked if Mr. Wyckoff also wanted to address the length of the bracket. It looks like it stops at the edge on the side elevation. Is that traditional?

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was. Crown moldings can sometimes take up 6", which would cause smaller brackets. If its 110 projection, then it would be more appropriate. He would like to see columns or posts.

Mr. Harbinson stated that he originally proposed that, but was denied when the tenants complained of losing views of the Pond. That is the reason for the bracket.

With no one further rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Fineberg moved to accept the proposal with the amendment of the bracket. The height of the bracket is the same as the projection, and in a similar style. Mr. Katz seconded.

Chairman Rice called for a vote to grant the petition with the stipulation that the height of the brackets under the balcony be the same as the projection of the brackets.

A motion to grant the petition with the stipulation was passed by unanimous vote.

~~~~~

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:17 p.m., the motion was made, seconded and approved unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Auger, Acting HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on September 6, 2006.