

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

7:00 p.m.

May 10, 2006

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: City Council Representative Edward Reynolds

ALSO PRESENT: Roger W. Clum, Building Inspector

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

11. Petition of **6-16 Congress, LLC, owner** for property located at **6-16 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previous approved design, a new construction to an existing structure and a new free standing structure (add rear exit steps and add security fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117, Lot 37,38 & 39 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Steven McHenry, of McHenry Architecture, stated that the proposal was simple. He explained that it is the result of ongoing discussion between the owners and the abutters wherein stipulations from the work review resulted in the addition of a security fence at the rear of the building. There are four drawings that detail the type and location of the fence. He explained each sheet and the details from each page.

Ms. Fineberg asked how the property is connected to the abutting house.

Mr. McHenry referred her to page two and explained that the elevation of the two were the same.

Ms. Finberg stated that the picture makes it look like the steps were outside the fence.

Mr. McHenry stated that in the plan, the stairs were to the north of the fence. It is virtually along the property line.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Finberg made a motion to grant the petition as presented and advertised, which Ms. Dika seconded.

A motion to grant the petition passed by unanimous vote.



12. Petition of **Chad and Laura Morin, LLC, owner** and **Daniel Sheehan, applicant** for property located at **36 Market Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (change existing 2nd and 3rd floor windows and add 4 new windows on each floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 29 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Daniel Sheehan, applicant, requested that he would like to change the single pane bay windows to therma pane double hung windows on each floor.

Chairman Rice asked if there would be true divided light or simulated divided light.

Mr. Sheehan stated that it would be true divided light.

Chairman Rice if it would be two over two.

Mr. Sheehan responded that it would be double.

Ms. Dika asked if he was planning on using Pella windows.

Mr. Sheehan stated that he would be using Pella double hung, architectural series windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would be simulated.

Mr. Sheehan stated that they did not snap out.

Mr. Adams stated that this was not just for windows.

Mr. Sheehan stated that the request was just for window replacement. He would also be added four new windows on each floor, for a total of 8 windows. The windows that will be replaced will be similar to the existing windows, except that they would be double paned. On the end, there will be four on each floor. The windows will match with each floor window heights.

Ms. Fineberg asked if they could sit in a work session because she was confused.

Chairman Rice explained that that was not necessary.

Mr. Sheehan explained that the packets included plans and information on the windows. The new windows will be similar to the ones that are there right now. The existing windows that are in there now will be replaced. On the end, where there are no windows, there will be four on each floor.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the placement of the windows.

Mr. Sheehan stated that the first floor had already been approved. This is 36 Market Street. The repairs will be on the second and third floor only.

Chairman Rice stated that there were 6 over 6 windows coming in. The front area has 2 over 2 windows. All the lower level changes were approved.

Mr. Adams asked if the new windows will be cut from the stucco walls to fit, and if there were any lintels or sills in that location

Mr. Sheehan stated that that new windows would be cut from the wall, and there were no lintels or sills there now. It is a brick wall.

Mr. Adams asked how he was going to handle that.

Mr. Sheehan stated that it would look the same as the windows in the front and back.

Mr. Adams asked if he was going to put in new headers, and precast sills, then repair and stucco the outside.

Mr. Sheehan stated that it was his intention to do just that, and he hopes to make it look the same as it was before, except for the windows.

Mr. Adams asked if he would be using precast sills that are similar to the ones already in place.

Mr. Sheehan stated that he would be matching them to the ones in the back.

Mr. Adams asked if he was refitting new windows to the current windows on the first and second floors.

Mr. Sheehan responded that that was correct.

Mr. Adams asked if the pane size was going to be lowered to account for the large sills and framing that it would require.

Mr. Sheehan stated that they would be only 4 to 5" smaller. The window that is going to replace them is bigger by about 6". It is about 6" higher and 6" wider in total. He believes that it is 4" all the way around.

Mr. Adams asked if he would have smaller casing to the windows, and asked the windows would have even casing all the way around.

Mr. Sheehan stated that he would.

Mr. Adams asked if the new windows would be the same height and area as the existing.

Mr. Sheehan stated that there might be a mistake in the packet. The windows will all look exactly the same all the way around. These windows will be set into a masonry exterior wall, which would require headers cut into the masonry and precast sills set into the wall. They will make sills the same size as the present windows. The windows will look the same all the way around per floor.

Mr. Adams does not have any dimensions, so he is trying to come up with a way to make sure that each window is the correct size and placement.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the problem was that they did not have any dimensions or clear indications of the size of the new windows. He wondered if this was the same size as the opening, what kind of lintel is going to be used; there are too many questions. He asked if there was brick baster on the walls, and if it was a brick building.

Mr. Sheehan responded that it was an early 19th century brick masonry building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they went over the bricks with new bricks.

Chairman Rice responded yes.

Mr. Sheehan stated that the front is much the same as it always has been, but the back had been extended.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the back wall facing the parking lot was original brick. The front had been torn up a little bit. The windows will not disturb the openings.

Mr. Adams asked about a building farther down on Market Street.

Mr. Sheehan stated that he is only dealing with one building. The only building on the application is 36 Market Street. This is outlined on Sheet 4. This is the only building he is purchasing. He only requests the replacement of the existing windows to thermapane, and to allow for eight new windows to be cut into the side brick walls.

Ms. Fineberg stated that the information sheets should be annotated or signed, because anyone could look at them and think that the plans were confusing.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission if they felt comfortable taking a vote, or if they would like to wait for more information regarding the specifications of the window.

Mr. Adams stated that as long as Mr. Sheehan adheres to the information presented in the packet, and uses the same masonry size openings, then that should be fine. He will not be changing the size of the existing windows. He asked if they could make a sash rule because of the mulligans.

Mr. Sheehan stated that they had already been approved.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Chairman Rice stated that they usually required more information from the applicant in order to run things smoothly. Otherwise, the meetings can become delayed.

Mr. Adams made a motion to grant the petition as presented, which Mr. Wyckoff seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they should make an amendment stating that the new sills must be matching to the existing ones.

Mr. Adams seconded the amendment.

Chairman Rice called for a vote on the motion to grant the petition with the stipulation that the new openings match the existing ones.

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

~~~~~

13. Petition of **Dilorenzo Real Estate, LLC, owner** for property located at **33 Bow Street** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure, new construction to an existing structure (replace existing solarium at the roof with a new structure, exterior decks and add metal balcony at 3<sup>rd</sup> level) and to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (Renovate existing wood frame addition at north elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106, as Lot 48 and lies within the Central Business A, Downtown Overlay, and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Mr. Golumb stated that he wanted to make it known before the hearing opened that Mr. Dilorenzo was his landlord. He mentioned it to the Commission for them to make a decision on whether or not he should be recused.

Chairman Rice noted that he does pay rent to his landlord.

Ms. Fineberg stated that it might be better if Mr. Golumb recused himself.

Mr. Golumb stepped down.

Mr. Steven McHenry stated that he had been through two work sessions for this project. They have a good consensus on the overall treatment and the intent of the design. There are few items that bear discussion, but they would like to present what they have at this point to get it out of the way. The information package shows photos of the existing conditions. The intent of the design is the same as presented in the work session. Sheet 4 shows the demolitions and reconstruction. They will be removing the greenhouse structure/solarium from the roof, removing the existing deck, stair and flag pole from the existing roof, and removed all the windows in the rear elevation, except for the bay window at ground level which will be reused but moved to the center of the building. They also intent to removed the existing balcony and spiral stair and a portion of the sloped roof. Sheet 6 shows the rear elevation and the side elevation on the street. The finishes and materials are included in the information packet. There is a window on the Bow Street side that has wooden shutters. Their intention is to replace the wooden shutters but keep the window. There is an even overhang that projects out, that they will be reusing on an upper roof hip. A new water table molding will be included as well. There are examples of the molding in the packet. They are using windows approved by the HDC. The owner is happy to change to Pella, but the architect stated that the older windows with a muntan bar is more authentic and more in fitting with the style of the building. If the owner is insistent on using the Pella windows, would they have to come back?

Chairman Rice stated that he would have to come back and present information on the windows.

Mr. McHenry stated that Sheet 11 shows the door detail, while page 12 gives perspective views from different vantage points.

Mr. Adams asked if he intended to use any coatings on the glass. He has seen the purple, metallic coat that happens to some windows that are covered, and wonders if the low E has the same effect.

Mr. McHenry stated that the coating used should not affect the color or the tint of the glass. Other coatings may do that, but not the Low E. It depends on the light coming through the window. They are proposing to use the thin brick structure on the rooftop and the foundation. They are anticipating using a thin brick application to unify the building. The brick would then be painted, because matching patina from the old to the new bricks is difficult. Instead of doing stucco or plaster finish, they decided to place thin brick with mortar and paint it.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the shutters were going to be hung correctly.

Mr. McHenry stated that he already explained that. The shutters will be held in place by regular pentil hinges, as well as the standard holdbacks rather than flat screened. These will be hung correctly and will serve as closable, functioning shutters.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were planning on changing or replacing the windows currently on the structure.

Mr. McHenry stated that they were not proposing to do that in this petition, however they may in the future because the owner would like to eventually replace them. Again, that is not part of this application.

Mr. Adams asked for specifics on the casing, frames and window detail.

Mr. McHenry stated that they did not have specifications for the casing, frames or window detail.

Mr. Adams asked if he would like to try to talk his way through.

Mr. McHenry stated that the design intent is to have the windows and their casings match out what is shown in the brick now. There is a photo of the window on Sheet 8. This shows a flat casing on the outside of the brick as well as a wood sill. That is what they propose for the windows.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the casing was a little narrow for that type of window.

Mr. McHenry stated that it would be about 4.5" and would hook onto the frame.

Mr. Adams stated that it would be 5.25 x 5 on a 2" nominal sill.

Mr. McHenry stated that he would like the thickness of a brick course, which would be 2.25".

Ms. Dika asked if the brick veneer would hold up on the top story. She noted that he was concerned about it earlier.

Mr. McHenry stated that since there was all new construction on the top, they could detail the veneer to fit. The only worry was to put the brick veneer on top of an all wood frame. This has been used many times, and will work fine if it is properly installed. He had a sample to pass around. He does not have a color picked out yet. He knows that there will be a contrast between the top and bottom floors, but does not know to what colors will be used.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he noticed that there were no casings around the windows and doors. There is also no embellishment on the door headings. He wondered if they might not add some detail, such as on the French doors. He stated that it should have some crown molding or a design.

Mr. McHenry stated that he sees why Mr. Wyckoff would like to see more detail. He realizes that it may look boring, and they may come back and revisit that. When they return to address the window situation, they could present a detailing plan that shows embellishment on the door and around the windows and building.

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

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Adams moved to grant the petition as presented, which was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff.

Ms. Fineberg noted that they were losing another solarium. There is now only one left.

Mr. Adams usually does not approve things that are so whimsical, but he does appreciate the architectural effect of the building. He hopes the building would be interesting. He added an amendment that states that samples and a site review must occur in order for the thin brick to be added to the fourth floor. There has to be approval of the color and type so that they get a good match from the old to the new.

The makers of the motion approved the stipulation.

Chairman Rice asked for a vote on the motion to approve the petition with the stipulation that a full Commission review of the thin brick mock up be done.

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

---

## II. WORK SESSIONS

A. 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 was 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. *This work session was tabled at the April 5, 2006 meeting.*

Mr. Tony Fallon, architect, stated that he was there to request permission to construct an addition to an existing structure located at 10 Commercial Alley. There is a fire stair that comes down from the back of the building, which will become enclosed after the addition. This is a coffee shop, with a proposed coffee shop addition. The shape of the building is unusual; there are angles all over the place. They wanted to create a feature, such as a bay window or a walkout area. The new building will be set back to maintain parking. The owners have purchased a tiny building that is other than viable and would like to improve the situation and will do so if the numbers get closer to working. The concept is to expand the coffee shop, add a retail tenant, office and apartment with loft. They would also like to add definition to the Pedestrian Street and Commercial Alley without getting things too high by use of a standard for the area. They would like the small parking lot to remain, and would also like to create a feature in the form of a bay window or walkout. If the Commission was wondering why they did not include any windows on that wall, it is due to the fact that they did not want future expansion of surrounding properties to infringe on the business. In case surrounding properties build higher than 60', they would like to keep that wall free of windows and keep the height to three stories.

Mr. Fallon stated that the owner constructed a fence around the first floor to keep snow and people from damaging the windows. They would like a sloped rake roof, because flat roofs are more modern and out of line for the intent of the building. Older buildings usually had at least a 5 pitch at least. This will also allow for the loft in the apartment, and the loft is vital to the projects viability. There are many instances of sloped rakes in Portsmouth because it was once a common historical architectural element. The shed roof allows for most historically correct cover of site dictated in the rhombus floor plan. The provision of the bay window with balcony very much lessens the vacancy rate and so



contributes to the viability. There are several instances of bay windows in Portsmouth, for example Rockingham Hotel. This structure has a bay with a porch on top. The owner would prefer a box bay, but they are showing the angled bay as well. This would be constructed on the third floor. At the previous meeting, they progressed towards understanding the logic on the roof, and understood that the roof is not visible from street level. The Commission previously asked them to look again at the Penhallow elevation. They previously proposed a large scale box design, but abandoned it by request of the Commission.

Mr. Adams stated that he lists a 5 and 12 pitch, but the roof pitch seems much steeper.

Mr. Fallon stated that it is only 5, just as listed.

Ms. Fineberg asked where the window he planned on bricking in was.

Mr. Fallon stated that it was in the bottom right corner from the side view.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the slant design is much better and more pleasing than the slant design.

Mr. Fallon stated that the existing roof is 6.8 and 12. The view from the alley looks over to the façade of another building.

Mr. Golumb asked how much of the driveway would be left after renovation.

Mr. Fallon stated about 40'.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the box shed sticking out from the building.

Mr. Fallon stated that that would be destroyed and the windows removed as to join with another building. Basically, that was a glorified cover for the fire escape. It is more of a cover.

Mr. Adams stated that 40' is more than a cover. He asked if they would be building in front of the existing building. He asked if they were planning on building the new building near it or on top of it.

Mr. Fallon stated that they will be ripping down a wall and constructing a new one that lines up with the existing intersecting wall. They will build another wall outside the old one.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission if they understood the presentation and were clear on the project. He asked the Commission if they preferred the three sided bay to the box bay.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the bevel should be underneath.

Mr. Golumb stated that he was concerned about losing all the windows on the bottom floor. It may look strange from the ground, especially because it will have no way for people to see in. It is not a retail front, and is not pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Adams stated that it was not the articulation of the wall, but the glass that is not there. Currently, the fence blocks it.

Mr. Golumb stated that the fence makes it even more pedestrian friendly. He stated that the yare coming out further, not going back.

Mr. Silverstein stated that he did not think they would benefit from any type of retail setback of 40'.

Mr. Golumb stated that he was juts one vote, but he has a problem with the brick wall and lack of windows.

Mr. Adams asked if the space would continue to be a parking lot.

Mr. Fallon stated that it would be, but it would be reduced. The previous parking lot had about 6 spots, after construction this would have about 3 or 4 spots.

Mr. Silverstein stated that it was not much of a parking lot.

Mr. Adam asked if it would be customer parking or tenant parking.

Mr. Silverstein responded that it is tenant parking. It always has been. There will be cars there all the time.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the new building came closer to Penhallow than Gray's garage.

Mr. Fallon stated that it did come slightly closer. They will be 14' closer to the street.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he sees why Mr. Golumb had a problem with the unfriendliness of the street. He didn't understand why the proposed window had to be bricked off. What harm would it do to leave it as it is? It would improve the streetscape, especially with the angled bay that acts as a support beneath it. His problem is that this plan ignores the street. They are presenting it as the back of the building, whereas they look at it as the front.

Mr. Adams stated that concerns could be addressed by shrubbery or landscaping. Architecture could be improved by plantings, but would that provide a cushion and buffer the hard surface to the building? He was concerned that it was not aesthetically pleasing, and would like to make it better to look at.

Chairman Rice stated that it looks a little gray and industrial, so a window or landscaping would be ideal to make this a better looking place. It needs some interest.

Ms. Fineberg stated that the first floor door could be a focal point for the building.

Mr. Adams stated that that was a problem because that was the door for the tenants, and wouldn't want to attract people to this area. He asked if it was gated, and if the gate had been approved.

Mr. Fallon stated that it was indeed gated, and that it had been there for a number of years.

Chairman Rice stated that the Commission proposed that gate.

Mr. Fineberg proposed putting a roof structure somewhere to dress it up. That was her contribution.

Mr. Silverstein stated that he wanted the roof bricked in because he didn't want cars or people disrupting the retail store. The window is at the very back of the store and looks out to the parking lot. He does not want the disruption, and would prefer to brick the window. Cars will be pulling and backing up.

Mr. Katz suggested a brick planter.

Mr. Adams stated that this would bring some detail in.

Chairman Rice stated a brick planter with some banding could break up the wall nicely.

Mr. Adams agreed.

Mr. Fallon stated that he would like to use the gate that is going to be removed as an appliqué for the bottom of the new fire escape. He wants to keep it with the building.

Mr. Adams stated that it was a good idea, and would hate to see it lost. He stated that the Commission is on board with the changes. He would just like specifics on the windows, doors, masonry, overhangs, roof edge details, sills, headers, setbacks and the front façade work. Also heating and cooling units should be addressed.

Mr. Fallon asked if they should come before a public session or another work session.

Chairman Rice stated that they tried to discourage those. They should try for a public session.

~~~~~

B. Work Session requested by **Michael and Amy Quigley, owner** and **Bob Maranhas, applicant** for property located at **40 Mt. Vernon Street** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (16' x 26' two story addition to rear of house with 6'x18' one story side porch). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111, Lot 28 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts. *This work session was tabled at the April 19, 2006 meeting.*

Chairman Rice stated that they took a site walk earlier in the day. They basically had the work session during the site walk, but would like to go over what they covered.

Mr. Maranhas stated that there was a request for a two story addition on the back of an existing structure. The porch runs into the driveway, and the clapboard is going to be wood. The trim will also be wood. The new addition will replicate the house, and the owners are planning on restoring the house to its previous condition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would be removing part of it as to replicate it.

Mr. Maranhas stated that they would be removing the back corner. When he opens the side of the house, he will be able to fit it well and also match the existing trim and wood fixtures.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the detail underneath the porch is crucial. He thinks the smaller cord trim is inappropriate and should be wider to accommodate the porch.

Mr. Maranhas stated that the windows in the house were sufficient and that they would be staying with those. The back door will be a French door, but is willing to leave it open without any grills.

Mr. Adams stated that the issue was the 2 over 2 sash. It would be impossible to match with the French door. He asked about the bulkhead. Were they planning on using it or getting rid of it?

Mr. Maranhas stated that the bulkhead would be used. The deck that is there is by the bulkhead. He is also going to try to reuse the deck.

Mr. Adams asked if he was going to match the sash size of the building, and the window and door trims as well.

Mr. Maranhas stated that he will match the sash size and use the trim as a mold for the new.

Mr. Adams asked if he intended to maintain the corner boards that are currently on the house.

Mr. Maranhas stated that he had to.

Mr. Adams asked how he would match up the floors.

Mr. Maranhas stated that he would have to use a different sized floor joyce. The porch will cover it on the front side.

Mr. Wyckoff recommended using 2 x 4 on the floor joyce. They could match up the existing elevations.

Mr. Adams asked about the porch posts.

Mr. Maranhas stated that they would be wooden turnposts, which would be low enough to not need a fence.

~~~~~

C. Work Session requested by **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **7 Islington Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure and a new free standing structure (renovate existing building and add new building on adjacent site). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126, Lot 51 and lies within the Central

Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts. *This work session was tabled at the April 19, 2006 meeting.*

Mr. McHenry stated he tried to show the zoning possibilities on the site that were compliant. The first two pages are photos of structure. Page 4 shows the map discrepancy that the Planning Department found. The Historic District actually extends two lots farther than this lot. They come to the Commission to ask that this be approved.

Mr. Adams asked if the maroon building was part of their parcel.

Mr. McHenry stated that they were, along with three others. Also, there are abutting zones in the area that allow different visions of what can be used.

Mr. Adams noticed a gradient. He asked what the increment in the steps were.

Mr. McHenry stated these figures were not accurate to the site plan. He gave some figures by motioning with the plans. They wish to recycle the building, because it will have such a large impact on the adjoining lot. Their biggest concern was the effect to the street. The second building is going to be demolished and rebuilt. He would like to meet with the Planning Board to address traffic concerns, and figure out the flow on the site. He would like to get cars to use Tenor Street, but there is a resistance to using it for two way traffic since it is near a residential area.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the computer building.

Mr. McHenry stated that that was part of the property.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what happened to another building.

Mr. McHenry stated that they took the second L off of it, and put a hip roof on it. Page 13 shows option G, a pass through driveway.

Chairman Rice stated that that was more palatable than a driveway door or garage structure.

Mr. McHenry stated that they have drawings of the buildings on the street, the retail shops and the apartments. Page 16 shows the parking lot.

Chairman Rice asked what the Commissions reactions to the plans were.

Mr. Adams stated that they would like to keep the building intact, but renovated.

Chairman Rice suggested going through page by page.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the car port, or garage, had to be as tall as it is shown.

Mr. McHenry stated that it was 10' at the top of the arch, and the curve made it 8' on either side. They could get in trouble for making them too short. They have had some issues with inner city buildings

that have garages with a height of 7'. The top of the Buckminster ridge line is about 44'. The building next to it is about 37'. It is feasible that their ridge line extend no further than 8' high.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that these buildings were a radical shift from the other buildings on the street. He stated that the owners should try to fit these buildings in more with the context.

Chairman Rice stated that a building like this creates an interest where there was none before. It is basically a depressed area, which is addressed by this renovation. Although this perks it up, it may not be exactly where the City wants to go.

Ms. Fineberg stated that her preference would be to hold on to the existing building. At least until she knows exactly what the compromises are.

Mr. Adams stated that at this point, the architecture of the street is not enhanced by the second addition to the Buckminster house. He thinks that negation for this loss is the creation of two buildings in the remainder of the site on the Bridge Street side. These two buildings will be much more in scale with the remainder of the other lots. He appreciates the negation of the second addition by the creation of two buildings.

Ms. Dika stated that she liked the individualization of the units, option E, and would be willing to give up the addition to the Buckminster building.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he had no love for the entryway on the second addition, it is kind of a Victorian thing that they put on the back of the Westminster House, and someone tried to dress it up.

Mr. Golumb agreed with everything that had been said.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it looked like a fire station.

Chairman Rice stated that he would rather have a flexible drawing that showed the landscaping and dimensions. He asked what material would be used in constructing the garage.

Mr. McHenry stated that wood siding, but meant to be a Victorian Era building. This is a gateway to some larger Victorian structures that carry down Islington Street that are massive in scale and in stone.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there was a mistake on page 15. She asked if there was anything behind the house.

Mr. McHenry stated that those were drawings of different ideas and concepts. He stated that there was a wing behind the house.

Chairman Rice stated that the more intense development works better than keeping that wing in the Westminster building.

Ms. Fineberg asked Mr. McHenry to bring along a perspective view from the Tanner Street side at the next meeting.

Mr. McHenry stated that he would. He stated that previous versions of the plan included underground parking, but it is extremely difficult to put parking there. They are mostly stuck having cars go through Tanner in a one way situation.

Mr. Adams asked if the houses on Tanner Street would be maintained.

Mr. McHenry stated that if they had the surface parking and the pass through as it is, the houses would not be affected because they would only be parking or accommodating a few cars.

Mr. Wyckoff asked where the house on Tanner Street would be.

Mr. McHenry stated that it was on the right. Page 2 shows the house. There are four houses in a row down Tanner Street.

Chairman Rice stated that they had worked on many of them. The other side is out of HDC jurisdiction.

Ms. Fineberg asked if there was consensus among HDC members that they preferred the scheme with the three buildings with the new version of the new wing on Buckminster and two separate buildings after that.

Chairman Rice stated that they liked option E, but they could live with option G. The more intense building looked better than leaving the back of the Buckminster building open.

Mr. Adams is concerned with the magnitude of a street façade of the new proposed units. One of the things that they tend to fight is the bigness of the buildings. Although this is a historic trend, it is no longer necessary to keep constructing these large buildings. This leads them to have many oversized buildings.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that Mr. Adams was rejecting things that haven't even been presented. He thinks it's appropriate. He asked about the setback entryways.

Mr. McHenry stated that those were on the storefronts. They cannot swing out over City property.

~~~~~

D. Work Session requested by **Chris and Alison Pyott, owners**, for property located at **774 Middle Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (build shed dormer on front of house, add 3 skylights to back roof and add windows to back of house). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 153, Lot 9 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

Ms. Pyott stated that they had been to the HDC in November, and were adjusting their plans to fit their requests. She proposed adding a shed dormer.

Mr. Pyott presented four angels to give the Commission a better idea of what they were proposing. They propose a shed dormer to give them more space upstairs. They would install an upstairs bathroom and more headroom on the second floor. They presently have a slate roof, and look for recommendations on materials from the HDC. They would like to preserve the slate.

Chairman Rice asked how old the structure was.

Mr. Pyott stated it was from 1886.

Ms. Pyott stated that the pink house was the old carriage house and was from 1800-something. All the windows are casement. The main roof is the only original piece of the house except for the front house and barn door. Everything else was redone when they renovated.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they would be doing anything to the rear of the house.

Ms. Pyott stated they wouldn't, they would just be adding skylights and the dormer.

Mr. Pyott referred the HDC to the information packet.

Ms. Pyott stated that they would be raising the ceiling 18".

Mr. Pyott stated that they presently had floor to ceiling panels, so they would turn them into classic windows.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that if they had safety glass, they did not have to change it.

Ms. Pyott stated that they wanted to replace them because they were made onsite by the manufacturer and were not acceptable. They had poor seals that let heat out, and they wanted a more solid structure. They would be adding casings to them as well. The regular solarium setup with the skylights will remain the same. They would like to add another skylight in their bedroom. They would be egress lights.

Chairman Rice stated that they would be going from one skylight to five.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what kind of skylight they were.

Ms. Pyott stated that they were the largest skylight they can buy and install. They will be side by side.

Mr. Adams stated that this was the poster child for a modified view.

Chairman Rice asked why they wouldn't want a shed dormer instead of the skylights.

Ms. Pyott stated that they loved the skylights. They prefer a shed dormer in the back of the house because she loves the look of the front so much, but they need the stairs and bathroom to be raised.

Mr. Pyott stated that they needed to do that to squeeze the staircase in.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested that they talk to their designer about making a door that is 9' wide to hang there. They would not have to use it, but it would improve the look of the front.

Ms. Pyott stated that she modeled the dormer after the house across the street.

Mr. Adams stated that the dormer and the windows would be extremely high.

Ms. Pyott stated that they need that for privacy directly in front of them. They will be removed the two tiny windows in the eve's edge of the building will be removed. The roof edge will be maintained.

Mr. Katz stated that this place was very hard to see unless someone was trespassing. It has little to no visibility.

Chairman Rice stated that this was a petition that they could support.

Mr. Adams stated that the roof pitch looked less than 5".

Ms. Pyott stated that it was a concern because anything other than a slate roof may not fit right.

Mr. Adams stated that the slate is bedded into hot asphalt, so it would be worth it to replace it with a better material. He stated that they could use asphalt product on the dormer cover. There are new products that can be used with low pitches that work well in heat.

~~~~~

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:17 p.m., the motion was made, seconded and approved unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Auger, Acting Secretary

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