

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

7:00 p.m.

**AUGUST 9, 2006
RECONVENED FROM AUGUST 2, 2006**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: City Council Representative Ned Reynolds and Planning Board Rep. Jerry Hetjmanek

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

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

I. OLD BUSINESS

Approval of minutes, April, 19, 2006

Approval of minutes, May 3, 2006

Approval of minutes, May 10, 2006

A motion was made by Mr. Adams to table the approval of minutes to the September 6, 2006 meeting to allow the Commission additional time to review them. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

8) Petition of **Old City Hall L P, owner**, for property located at **126 Daniel Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace roof, gutters, repoint masonry chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 1 and lies within Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *This item was tabled at the August 2, 2006 meeting to the August 9, 2006 meeting.*

Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the petition from the table. It was seconded by Ms. Fineberg. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano was present to represent the property owner and speak to the petition. She presented more information to the Commission which she hoped would help with their deliberations for the roof replacements. She stated that she would like to make an amendment to the application from the August 2, 2006 meeting. She said that she was able to find a ridge vent that could be wrapped with copper so they will have the copper ridge in the application. She added that the copper cap that is there currently will be removed and a ridge vent wrapped in copper would be added on. Ms. DeStefano mentioned the cost factor. She pointed out that the work the owner has had done to eave in the past year was approximately \$20,000. She said that it does not include the cost of the 90 brackets that will have to be custom made and installed. She told the Commission that the cost for the current application that was before them is \$125,000 to replace the roof, repair copper ridge vent venting. She continued that if they were to use the synthetic slate, the cost goes up to \$180,000 for the same amount of work but with different materials. The cost is \$240,000 if the roof is replaced with slate. Ms. DeStefano said that she hoped the Commission would take into consideration the extensive cost to the owner. As a cost comparison, she mentioned that if they were to go with the fake slate, the cost is two and half times what the income of rent is for the building. She continued to say that the owner wishes to maintain the integrity of the building but is looking for a more economical material to extend the life of the building.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that on Congress Street they put a different type of material on. He said it was a very heavy asphalt with 9" exposed. He asked Ms. DeStefano if she had considered that type of material. She replied that they have upgraded the quality of the asphalt and that was in keeping with the exposure, the color, and the depth.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, he asked if anyone in the public wished to speak to, for, or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Fineberg made a motion that for the purpose of discussion, they consider the application as presented. It was seconded by Ms. Dika.

Ms. Fineberg commented that she feeling very torn with this application. She said the building is such that it warrants a treatment that mimics its historic self but she also understands the economic considerations as well.

Mr. Wyckoff said that they have seen this happen before. He said that they should have to assume that the applicant will find the most compatible shingle they can find. He added that it is sad to see it go. He stated that he would support the motion.

Mr. Golumb stated that he understood the cost consideration. He said that it is an old and prominent building in town whose roof can be seen from almost 360 degrees. He added that when this project came before them in 1998, they denied it because they thought it would be a tragic loss. He said that you have to be stewards of your buildings. He went on to say that he understands the cost factor. He said that when he did the site walk

around the building, the rear section did not look compromised to him. He thought that the sections on the front of the building looked like they were disintegrating. He wondered what the cost of taking the disintegrating tiles off and putting new slate on. He said that they did that at North Church. He added that they really need to address the issue of slate roofs on prominent buildings around town at this meeting. He felt to take it up to the next level was not unreasonable.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the next level was imitation slate. Mr. Wyckoff asked Ms. DeStefano what the imitation slate was made of. She answered that it was a composite material and they are separate shingles that get installed. Mr. Golumb asked the brand name. Ms. DeStefano replied Lamerite. She said this is one of the better known manufacturers of that type of slate. Mr. Golumb said he thought this would be a good compromise.

Ms. Dika asked what the cost differential between the asphalt and the composite material. Ms. DeStefano said \$60,000.

Ms. Dika said that when the cost differential is so great that it may compromise the maintenance of the rest of the building, she finds it difficult to impose that on a private owner. Although she does not like to lose slate, she would be supporting the application.

Mr. Adams said that he did a fair amount of slate roofing repair. He said that slate is fire proof, durable, and a historical material. Clearly, it is the historical roofing material for the building. He stated that over time, slate roofs get shinier and shinier and the composition materials are probably going to get duller and duller. He said that this probably all comes down to expense. He suggested that they think about this expense as the amount of wear it will sustain. He said that traditional slate roofs are very long-lived. Asphalt roofs may last 30-35 years. The synthetic slate material has a warranty of around 30 years. He said as for the warranty on the slates, it is not very clear but generally it lasts 80 – 100 years.

Chairman Rice asked if a slate roof can be patched or does the entire roof have to come off for repairs. Mr. Adams answered that his rule of thumb was if it was less than 5 percent of the slate that needed repaired, then those areas would be repaired piece by piece. If it was more than 5 percent, then it was better for the longevity of the roof to tear it all off and put on all new flashings, repair the sub straight and replace the slate, using old and new slate.

Ms. DeStefano pointed out that the contractor has been up on the roof three times using a lift to patch the holes that are there. She said the slate tiles are very brittle and so she is not sure how much of the existing slate could be reused.

The contractor spoke to the condition of the slate tiles. He said that the lower section in the back is in better shape than the bigger section of the building. He added that he can not currently get on the roof because the tiles crumble when touched. They have patched tiles with copper. He said that he believes that this is the original roof on the building. He pointed out that a major expense is the staging just to get at the building.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any additional questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone in the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Adams asked if the expense of the staging was the same for putting on a slate roof and an asphalt roof. The contractor said they have to have the staging no matter what kind of roof they put on. Mr. Adams asked if he had participated in the cost estimate for a new slate roof. He replied yes. Mr. Adams asked if he intended to replace all of the slate. The contractor said yes, because the condition of the slate is very thin and tender.

Mr. Katz asked about the synthetic slate. The contractor said that it is a rubberized plastic. He has known of it for 10 years. He believes that its track record is good. It has a 50 year warranty on it. He added that it is a substantial product. It is plastic and it looks better in its finished assembly. Mr. Katz asked about its dulling or matting over a number of years. The contractor said that it has not been around long enough to know. Mr. Katz said the newness of the product causes him some concern.

Mr. Golumb asked that if they did not replace the slate on the back the lower back level of the building, would it allow them to replace the slate on the main building and mitigate some of the cost of the staging. The contractor said the back building is one third of the project. He said it would certainly reduce the cost of the project. Mr. Golumb said he is thinking about the cost of the staging. The contractor said it would still need to be staged in that area.

Ms. DeStefano said that that they still have problems with the chimneys that are in the back so they will still need to have access to that area and so some staging would be required.

Mr. Katz said he would like to get a comparison on the cost of the roof and the value of the building.

Ms. DeStefano stated that one of the owners was present and said that the value of the building is somewhere around \$1,000,000.00 – \$1,200,000.00.

Mr. Katz said that he was just trying to get an idea of the impact. He asked if the Commission has ever required that someone replace a slate roof with slate.

Chairman Rice said that he could not recall a time and certainly not on this scale.

Ms. Fineberg said that she felt the building value should be considered in the context of the project.

Chairman Rice said that he agreed with Mr. Adams and Mr. Golumb about not wanting to lose another slate roof. He said he is also struck by the fact that asphalt roofs are so vernacular in the Historic District. He said that he could support this application reluctantly because it is in character with the District.

Mr. Katz stated that with the imitation slate, they would be asking the owners to invest an amount equal to almost 20 percent of the value of the building. He said that he too would be reluctantly supporting the application.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any more questions. There was no more discussion so Chairman Rice called for the vote. Four members voted in favor of the application, with Mr. Adams and Mr. Golumb voting in opposition. Ms. Fineberg abstained.

Mr. Adams asked for a clarification as to what they voted to approve. Chairman Rice said that they approved an asphalt roof, the one that was presented last week, with the amendment of the copper ridge cap.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

11) Petition of **Robert A. Finney and Jane A. McIlvaine, owners**, for property located at **93 High Street #4**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (railing for entry deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 23 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *This item was tabled at the August 2, 2006 meeting to the August 9, 2006 meeting.*

Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the petition from the table. It was seconded by Ms. Fineberg. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jane McIlvaine spoke to the petition. She stated that she is seeking approval of a railing design from a previously approved application. She also informed the Commission that in the process of pursuing this project, they have uncovered substantial structural difficulties and so she plans to be back in front of the Commission for a work session in the near future.

Ms. McIlvaine said she would like to put a railing on her unit, #4, that will match the front railing of the building.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if anyone in the public wished to speak to, for, or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. It was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. The motion passed as presented by a unanimous vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A) Petition of **Four Hundred Forty Six Four Hundred Fifty Two Market Street Condominium Association, owner** and **Bryan C. Pappas, applicant**, for property located at **446-452 Market Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood clapboard with vinyl cedar shakes; install building corners & new gutters) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 1-4 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A Districts. *This item was tabled to a work session at the July 5, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Bryan Pappas stated that he had a Power Point presentation prepared for the Commissions review.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if this application was tabled because of a window situation. Mr. Pappas replied yes. Chairman Rice suggested that they view the presentation and discuss the windows afterwards.
- Mr. Pappas said that it was not his intention to bypass the Board on the installation of windows. He said that he did not realize that installing windows was something that was to be approved by the Historical District Commission. He offered his apology for the oversight.
- Mr. Pappas pointed out that they have replaced the existing wooden windows and metal doors with vinyl equivalents. He said that they used top of the line Harvey windows and ThermaTru doors. He added that the windows were the exact 12 pane style of the original windows and the 9 panel of the original doors. He stated that the condo owners spent \$16,000 to replace the 25 windows and over \$8,000 to replace the 8 doors. He showed with the Power Point presentation the old windows as compared with the new windows.
- He also showed the old doors as compared to the new doors and stated that they would be painting the new doors.
- Chairman Rice asked if the mullions are in between the panes of glass.
- Mr. Charles Tripp, the contractor, replied that the mullions were in between the panes of glass.
- Mr. Pappas said that the benefits of the vinyl windows and doors are that they are weather resistance and help to reduce the noise from the surrounding operations.
- Mr. Pappas said that the owners took great care to maintain the integrity of the doors and windows. He also said that he felt it increased the value of the building.
- Mr. Pappas stated that they are looking for the Commission's approval for the windows and doors.
- Chairman Rice asked if they had a sample of the windows. Mr. Tripp presented the sample. Mr. Tripp pointed out that the mullions on the windows and the doors.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that these are not the type of windows the Commission would normally approve but he felt that they looked exactly like the old windows and did not feel that anyone would notice when driving by the building. He went on to say that Harvey does make a window with the mullions attached permanently to the outside of the glass.
- Chairman Rice agreed that the windows are not glaringly obvious since there is some detail to them. He said that he did not believe that the building was historic. It was believed that it was around 75 years old. Chairman Rice said that he draws

the line on the windows but beyond that he is not sure about the vinyl siding. He continued that the building is at the gateway to the Historic District and he didn't think that the Commission wanted to send a message that Portsmouth is a town wrapped in plastic.

- Mr. Pappas said that their application was a request for a vinyl siding installation using a top of the line Nail-lite brand rough sawn shakes with the color being antique gray. He presented a sample to the Commission.
- Chairman Rice asked what was currently on the building. Mr. Pappas replied clapboard.
- Mr. Pappas said that the project details are to replace the rotting wood clapboard with new wood so that they are not stripping the building down of all its clapboard. The vinyl siding would be applied over the clapboards. They will also install foam board for insulation. They would also install 5" corners and seamless gutters. They also are proposing to replace rotting wood window sills and wrap them in aluminum coil to prevent weather damage.
- Mr. Pappas reported on the current condition of the building. He said the paint is faded and peeling. It was painted just five years ago. He also said that the clapboards are rotted and ant infested. The windowsills are rotted and water damaged. He added that dirt and grime from the metal scrap piles across the road, constant road traffic, and salt air has caused considerable damage as well.
- Mr. Pappas said in regards to being the gateway to the Historic District, he feels that what they are proposing is a huge improvement over what is there now.
- Mr. Pappas added that another reason he and the owners wanted to replace the windows and doors was for their own health.
- Mr. Pappas said that power washing would ruin the clapboards. As a result, they are looking for something easier to clean. He showed the Commission a picture of his view across the street. He said that he did not feel that a vinyl installation across from the metal scrap piles would be detrimental.
- Mr. Pappas pointed out that the owners are spending over \$61,000 and he felt that was a significant investment to beautify the property.
- Chairman Rice reminded Mr. Pappas that this was a work session and that no voting takes place.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested that he bring it back to a public hearing for a vote.
- Chairman Rice asked if the Commission was comfortable with this.
- Mr. Wyckoff said he was. Mr. Katz said he couldn't think of a more appropriate place for this type of application.
- Mr. Golumb asked if they looked at cementitious clapboard.
- Mr. Tripp said that they did look at a hardiplank but it needs to be painted. Mr. Katz interjected that it has to be caulked and he thought the existing conditions would not be conducive to that type of application.
- Mr. Katz gave them great credit for enduring the conditions that they have to contend with every day with the pollution, the noise, and the metal dust. He did not think they should be held to a higher standard. Mr. Katz stated that he would not oppose this application.

- Chairman Rice asked if the proposed siding would hold up better than the cementitious siding or wood. Mr. Wyckoff said he felt the color might fade on the sunny side. He said that there are products for vinyl that when applied, does help to bring the color back.
- Chairman Rice asked the Commissioners if the applicant comes back would he get approval. Three Commissioners said they would probably vote for it.
- The applicant was advised to come back for a Public Hearing at the September 6 meeting.

B) Petition of **Strawbery Banke Inc., owner**, for property located at **420 Court Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7 and lies with the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts. *This item was tabled to a work session at the July 5, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the petition from the table. It was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.
- Mr. Rodney Rowlands stated that they would like to remove a deteriorating cedar shake roof from the Shapleigh House and replace it with an architectural asphalt shingle roof. The Shapleigh House houses the office of the president. He presented a map showing all of the houses at Strawberry Banke. He pointed out that the houses highlighted in pink were buildings used for the educational program of Strawberry Banke. The houses highlighted in yellow were support buildings or rental buildings.
- Mr. Larry Yerdon, president of Strawberry Banke was present and spoke to the maintenance needs. He said the buildings highlighted in pink receive their highest priority.
- He pointed out that the Martin Abbott house has a store and garage. It is an 18th century building but it is interpreted to its 1940's use and it has an asphalt roof. He continued that the Aldrich Museum also has an asphalt roof and it is interpreted as a Colonial Revival building. He said the Chase House has a mixed roof, asphalt and cedar shakes.
- Mr. Yourdon mentioned that Shapleigh House has shakes in the front with a connector building with architectural asphalt shingles.
- Mr. Yourdon stated that they are careful in spending their money and care to spend the larger amounts of money on the pink buildings. They strive to do good quality maintenance but do not always restore them to their original look.
- Chairman Rice summarized the issue by saying that at the last meeting they said they did not want to lose another cedar roof. He continued that they felt that in Strawberry Banke there should be a cedar roof and not an asphalt roof. But he pointed out that there are asphalt roofs in Strawberry Banke and mixtures of roofs.
- Mr. Adams said that he had hoped that there would be an opportunity to review an alternative material. He said that Mr. Yourdon was helpful in pointing out the interpretations of the buildings. Mr. Adams said that the wood shingle roof is an appropriate material for the buildings. He also thinks the texture is important.

- Mr. Yourdon asked that if they come to the Commission with a house like the Abbott house which they are interpreting as 1940 but it is clearly an 18th century house, what is the Commission going to tell them?
- Mr. Adams said he understands the issue of interpretation. He said he feels the community has a better unified identity as an old town of architecture. Mr. Adams said that he recognizes the limit to resources. He continued that one of the limits to resources that we have in our community is a limit to historic material.
- Mr. Yourdon said that he was under the assumption from the last meeting that the Commission did not want an alternative material.
- Mr. Rowlands interjected that the missions of the houses are very clear.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he did not feel that the building functions are something that the Commission should concern themselves with. He said that makes their decision very difficult. Mr. Wyckoff said that he would be more inclined to vote for this if the more visible parts of the roof were wood shingles and the rest was a matching woodscape.
- Mr. Rowland pointed out that three other buildings surrounding it with the same visibility have asphalt already.
- Mr. Katz said that he voted against this at the last meeting but he said that after reading the minutes of that meeting he was struck by what Ms. Dika said. She said that if this were anybody else, it would probably be approved. Mr. Katz said that he agreed with her. He pointed out that they voted for an asphalt replacement for a wood shingle roof on State Street. He said that he would support this application.
- Mr. Yourdon stated that Strawberry Banke has faced very significant financial issues over a very long time. He said that over the last two years, they now have a balanced budget. He continued to say that as they look to the work they will be doing in the future, they just have to be very careful with a tight financial situation right now.
- Chairman Rice said that he looked forward to seeing them next month for a public hearing.

C) Petition of **Michael J. Lacroix, owner** for property located at **lot behind 151 High Street** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of existing structure and new free standing structure. (remove garage and construct a three story structure with deck) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118, Lot 19 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *This item was tabled at the July 12, 2006 meeting to a work session at the August 2, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the petition from the table. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.
- Mr. Chris Redmond and Ms. Edie Brock, spoke to the petition. Ms. Brock stated that the concerns from the last meeting was that the proposed building looked too much like a barn and it was too busy in the front. She said that with Mr. Redmond's help, they have made some significant changes.
- Mr. Redmond pointed out the changes to the plans. He said that he tried to make the front look more like a carriage house. He added that they tried to incorporate

design ideas gleaned from area carriage houses. Because the owners want two garage doors, they want to remove the center door and add windows and a stairway.

- Mr. Redmond said that they would be using cedar shingles and clapboards on the bottom of the building except on the front elevation which will be stone with cedar shingles.
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission their overall impressions of the proposal.
- Mr. Wyckoff and Ms. Fineberg commented that it was an improvement over the last proposal and felt that they were moving in the right direction.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that on the south elevation, he does not like the siding coming down in the center. He said that if a portion of it was going to be stone, then it all should be stone. He also felt that it should be stone going around the sides too. He stated that he did not like the mix of materials.
- Ms. Dika stated that the proportion is off on the south side of the building. Mr. Wyckoff and Mr. Katz agreed.
- Mr. Katz pointed out that their design could be a little more dramatic.
- Ms. Brock said that they wanted the building to fit in with the neighboring houses and so they didn't want to make it too dramatic.
- Ms. Feinberg felt that the two side windows were too small.
- Ms. Brock said that they tried to put in some transoms but it was too much.
- Mr. Redmond pointed out that on the west elevation they originally had stone going all around it. He asked the Commission for their suggestions on how to save on materials on the west elevation.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if they could side the entire area with wood shingles and put in a double hung windows to break it up.
- Mr. Golumb asked about the small windows on that side of the building. Mr. Redmond said that there is an interior reason they are small. There is a fireplace between the windows.
- Ms. Brock pointed out that that elevation will not be too visible.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that under all of the gables and details there should be frieze boards. He said that it would add depth to the building. He added that it is not expensive and would make a big difference.
- Mr. Golumb mentioned that he is concerned about the window sizes on the west elevation.
- Mr. Adams said that the windows floating in the walls as they do are characteristic of the carriages houses that you see and he feels it a nice thing to see. He felt that as an outbuilding it was a reasonable approach.
- Mr. Adams had concerns about the balcony supporting itself. He also mentioned that he feels that the materials proposed for the south elevation are too much.
- Mr. Katz asked if the applicants needed another work session. The applicants said that they have a good idea as to where they are going and will consider their options.

D) Petition of **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) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126, Lot 51 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *This item was tabled at the July 12, 2006 meeting to a work session at the August 2, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the item from the table. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.
- Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture and Jen Ramsey of Somma presented the proposal. Mr. McHenry stated that this was his fourth work session with the Commission. He said that in the first work session, they discussed various zoning issues associated with the project as it impacts several buildings around it as well as its neighbors. He continued that at the second work session, they presented some designs to determine what was favorable and what wasn't. At the third work session, they presented a completely different design that they felt had a favorable reaction from the Commission. He stated that at this meeting, they hoped to discuss refinements of that design and also discuss the impact on the Buckminster building. Mr. McHenry talked about the plans that were presented to the Commission.
- Ms. Ramsey said that they planned to replace the windows on the second and third floors on all four sides of the building as well as the cupola. She said that they also plan to rebuild the widows walk that was removed. She said that they will be relying on historic photographs for this. They are also adding a handicapped assessable ramp to the left side of the building toward the back of the building.
- She said that most of the changes are occurring on the back of the building. She stated that they plan to take down the last addition of the Buckminster House to make way for the new addition. They will be doing some regrading and will rebuild the existing stairs that enter the first floor. She added that they would be putting a one story addition on the inside area of the building. Additionally they will be rebuilding the covered entry of the back door which will be more similar to the front elevation with the flat covered roof and column.
- Ms. Ramsey said that the one story addition in the back courtyard will serve as the kitchen to the new restaurant.
- Mr. Adams asked how they planned to ventilate the restaurant.
- Ms. Ramsey said that there will be mechanical systems that will vent up through the roof which is still in the design phase. They are working to keep it to the back elevation.
- Mr. Adams asked about compressors. Ms. Ramsey replied that she did not have information on that. She added that they will have a grease trap sunk underground.
- Mr. Adams asked what they planned to use for their sash. Ms. Ramsey said that they are thinking about Eagle clad windows.
- Ms. Fineberg asked about the design in the area between the second and third floors. Ms. Ramsey pointed out that it is a dormered door and will remain the

same, coming out onto the deck. She added that they are trying to clean up and simplify that area.

- Mr. McHenry pointed out the site plan that showed the ground level floor plan for the structure. He said it showed the vehicular circulation path. He added that it is still something that they are working on with the City. He felt that it gave them a good idea of the scale of the building.
- Mr. McHenry mentioned some of the issues that were mentioned in the prior work sessions. He said that the scale of the windows was one issue. He said that they've addressed that in their new plans. They also created a grilled gate entry into the garage level. He also noted that they are proposing vegetative roofing. He said it was an "added on" series of boxes that lay on top of the membrane roof. He said that there are environmental advantages to doing this on the roof. He stated that the plants are absorbing radiation, mitigating rain run off, and keeping the building cooler in summer.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked about the casement windows over the gated entry. Mr. McHenry replied that that was an area that didn't require regular window size. They wanted to create some variety and eccentricity. Mr. Wyckoff thought that the windows were too small.
- Chairman Rice asked if it was a clapboard exterior. Mr. McHenry replied yes. He said that they were proposing some variety by using different colors with the change and spacing of the clapboards. Mr. McHenry asked the Commission their thoughts about the use of metal horizontal paneling materials. He showed them some samples of buildings with that type of siding.
- Ms. Fineberg asked about the windows on the east elevation. She pointed out the windows on the right of the building. She felt that they were very plain compared to other windows in the design. She also mentioned that she was concerned about the west elevation. She felt it was too plain for its location. Mr. McHenry said that at the center of west elevation is a large stairwell. Ms. Fineberg suggested dressing up the windows. Mr. McHenry said that he would note that suggestion.
- Mr. Golumb commented that he appreciated that fact that they put the entry gate into the design.
- Mr. Wyckoff thought that some of the windows should have stained glass in them.
- Ms. Dika said that she is struck by the size of the building compared to the existing homes in the area.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked the height of specific areas of the building. He mentioned the Martindale project where the building was sloped down at the end. He felt that might help with the mass of the building.
- Mr. Katz said that he felt the proposed height of the building worked very well.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that there are two different stories and it seems to tower over the new construction.
- Chairman Rice asked if Mr. Wyckoff was suggesting that that may not be the case. He replied yes.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that they have run into these height issues before and he felt it was worth discussing.

- Mr. McHenry said that when they come back for the public hearing, they will verify their heights and make sure that the drawings are compatible with the CAD drawings. He stated that the CAD drawings are the accurate drawings.
- Mr. McHenry said that he takes exception with the comment that a section of the building towers over its neighbors. He said that they have taken great effort in keeping the scale compatible with its neighbors on a difficult site.
- Mr. Adams mentioned that at the last work session it was explained that the building on Tanner Street no longer fit into the plans. He stated that he went down to Tanner Street. He said that it is a diminutive street with a number of diminutive buildings in various states of repair. He pointed out that the metal garage and the commercial building slated for demolition represent the character of that neighborhood. Mr. Adams said he questions whether this project has merit. He said he did feel that the proposed building would have a street presence and provide texture but he did not feel that the proposed building respects, accentuates, enhances or reflects the scale of the buildings down the street from it and it also doesn't enhance the buildings directly in proximity of it. He continued by saying that the proposed building is so long that he requires that you drive through it. He stated that he doesn't see how the building is going to fit into that neighborhood. He added that the elements proposed for this building is not useful to the community and not appropriate for its location.
- Mr. McHenry said he didn't agree with Mr. Adams that the buildings like the metal garage and the Harbor Lights building were examples of buildings that needed to be mitigated. He added that he did agree that the Tanner Street building which is not part of the Historic District needs to be considered. He pointed out that the properties lie in various districts and so that makes it difficult to put a simple, easy building type in that space. He stated that they have been very careful in bringing down the scale of the building to reflect the scale of the buildings around it because it is in a difficult context.
- Chairman Rice stated that he felt that at the core of the issue is how well this design fits into the context of the neighborhood. He suggested that the Commission take an unusual step and have a site walk before the next meeting. He also suggested that Mr. McHenry set up some easels in the area with the drawings on them so the Commission could get a better perspective of the context of the area.
- Mr. Golumb felt that it was a good idea and added that showing the height proposals of not only the proposed building but also of the buildings in the area would be helpful to them as well.
- Mr. Katz said that he respected every one of Mr. Adam's comments. He said that the problem of adhering to a hard and fast set of criteria is that ultimately it ends up as failed architecture. He pointed out as an example the addition to the Mark Wentworth Home where by following a strong set of criteria; they ended up with a building that is uninspired but safe. Mr. Katz added that he felt this proposed building was an attempt to introduce new ideas on a small scale into an area with a variety of building styles. He felt this area was the most appropriate area to do this. He added that he is still enthusiastic about this project.

- Mr. McHenry said that this kind of discussion is helpful. He also said that at the last work session, the feedback that they gathered was very positive and they felt they were going in a good direction. As a result, they refined the design with the attempt to go forward with a public hearing.
- Chairman Rice suggested that they were better off with a site walk and another work session.
- Mr. Adams asked Chairman Rice what work he was attempting to do with another work session.
- Chairman Rice replied that he wanted to look at the design in the context of the neighborhood and look at the massing to see how they felt about it.
- Mr. McHenry asked that if what he is hearing is that they should not come back for a public hearing but for a work session instead.
- Chairman Rice said that it was up to him but it was his recommendation to put it off for 30 days.
- Ms. Fineberg asked for clarification about the site walk with a work session.
- Chairman Rice said that they don't normally do a site walk followed by a work session but that this would be an exception.
- Mr. McHenry said that they would have to consult with their client and decide which direction to go.

E) Petition of **Market Wharf Condominiums, owner** and **Thomas Magruder, applicant** for property located at **59 Deer Street** wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, decks, and railings with new composite materials) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1B and lies within the Central Business B, Historic District A and Downtown Overlay Districts. *This item was tabled at the July 12, 2006 meeting to a work session at the August 2, 2006 meeting.*

- Mr. Adams made a motion to remove the application from the table. It was seconded by Ms. Fineberg. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.
- Ms. Wendy Welton and Carolyn McGee spoke to the application. Ms. Welton stated that at the last meeting, the discussion was about what to do with the curve of the building. She said that they have determined that they can put hardiplank on the curve. She pointed out that within the week they will be able to see it installed on a curve at Sanford Savings Bank in York.
- Mr. Katz pointed out that they have been told that they can't stand behind it. Ms. Welton said that is correct but there is no other product that would have any warranty either.
- Mr. Katz asked if this was the constant dimension hardiplank or the tapered hardiplank. Mr. Welton said that she did not know the answer to that question yet but by the time they come for a public hearing she will know.
- Ms. Welton showed the Commission a picture of a house on the corner of Thaxter and Islington with hardiplank with a similar alignment.
- Mr. Golumb asked Ms. Welton the exact location of the bank she mentioned earlier. Ms. Welton replied the new Sanford Bank is on the corner of Rt. 91 and Rt. 1 in York.

- Ms. Welton said that the curved pediments that are currently on the building will be replaced with square ones so as to better accept the hardiplank. She said it would all be worked out ahead of time so that all of the parts and pieces go together.
- Mr. Adams asked that it will be worked out ahead of time so that there will be unbroken horizontal lines. Ms. Welton replied yes, that you will not see a single break.
- Ms. Welton said that there are two places on the front of the building where there are railings, on the exterior second floor. She said that the railings on the front façade is on a street that is well traveled and that clearly relates to the Historic District.
- Ms. Welton said they have determined that they will do the railings out of wood and will be painted. She added that metal railings were not a good option because of the salt piles nearby.
- Ms. Welton talked about the railings on the back of the building. She pointed out the back of the building is part of a different world. She said that it faces the Sheraton courtyard. She said she is proposing a resin railing. She added that there is a tremendous amount of railing on the back of the building.
- Ms. Welton said that she is proposing low maintenance materials so that the condo association can concentrate more on more serious maintenance issues of the building.
- Mr. Katz said that his reservation to a material like that was that even the best vinyl can get a bit wobbly. Ms. Welton said she felt that her proposed material is very solid.
- Mr. Adams asked how the proposed railing would respond to angles.
- Ms. Welton said that she did not know yet, she will have details on that by the public hearing.
- Chairman Rice said that he thought they could approve the material she has presented.
- Ms. Welton told the Commission that the manufacturer name for one of the railings is Trademark by Selectwood.
- Ms. Welton indicated that she would be back for a public hearing.

F) Petition of **Chad and Laura Morin, LLC, owners**, for property located at **36 Market Street** wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (revisions to design and a rear addition) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 29 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Julie McDonald from DeStefano Architects spoke to the project. She mentioned that they had been before the Commission about a year ago for a work session pertaining to the first floor of this project. She showed the Commission drawings of the existing and proposed roof plans. She suggested that a site walk in the near future would be helpful to get an understanding of the project.
- Ms. McDonald introduced Mr. Butch Ricci who will be developing the second and third floors.

- Ms. McDonald pointed out that on sheet two of the plans show the existing building. She said that they are proposing the addition of a third floor to the existing “L” part of the building which is currently two stories.
- Ms. McDonald also proposed a three story addition in the “court” area which would house a new elevator and stair. She mentioned that they have been meeting with the abutter who is directly above where the proposed addition will go. The area is currently being used for snow removal.
- Ms. McDonald pointed out that page 5 show the back and the “court” area. She said that the two story portion is currently covered with siding. She mentioned that it is a real mishmash of things going on in that small area and that it will tight.
- Ms. McDonald pointed out that page 7 showed the existing site elevation. She said that on Ladd Street they propose the addition of windows of the same size. She stated that there are four existing windows above the first floor which will be replaced and they will be adding eight more.
- Mr. Ricci interjected that there where actually windows at one time where they plan to add the additional windows.
- Ms. McDonald said that would be looking to match as best they can to the existing material on the building.
- Chairman Rice pointed out a door on the proposed plan. He asked if it was an existing door.
- Ms. McDonald said no, it was a new door.
- Ms. McDonald stated that on page 10 they show that they will use cementitious clapboard. She stated that the brick is in very bad condition. She also mentioned that above the new third floor addition, they would like to do a roof deck.
- Mr. Adams asked if the roof that it is abutting is pitched. Ms. McDonald said yes. She added that this roof deck would be on a new roof.
- Mr. Adams asked if the shuttered windows were because they were on zero lot line. Ms. McDonald responded yes on that side elevation and the back elevation.
- Mr. Adams asked if the two story building as is stands right now is on its lot line. Ms. McDonald replied no.
- Chairman Rice asked about the wall of clapboard on page 12. Ms. McDonald said that the wall would be facing the abutter’s roof. Chairman Rice stated that if you are standing on Hanover Street, you will not see that area. Chairman Rice suggested that a window or two would break the wall up. Ms. McDonald said it was up against the zero lot line. She added that they are showing trim and plan to carry it across the area.

G) Petition of **213 Pleasant Holdings, LLC**, for property located at **213 Pleasant Street** wherein permission is requested for a new free standing structure (new two story house with attached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 16 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

- Mr. Tom Emerson of Platt and Hichborn Architects spoke to the application. He presented plans for a new home on the corner of Richmond and Pleasant Streets.

He added that the lot it is currently a parking lot. He would like to put a two story clapboard structure on it. He said that they plan to keep the existing trees on the front of the lot and hopefully an existing tree on the side. He pointed out that the entrance will continue to be off Pleasant Street. There is an existing granite post and a bit of a curved sidewalk that they will be retaining. He mentioned that it looked like there was once a fence on the property so they plan to put in a rod iron fence that looks similar to the fence at the Thompson house. Two of the neighbors' houses, to the west and to the east, are Georgian style houses. The house to the back of the lot is a Cape. He stated that most of these houses were on the 1830 map of the city.

- Mr. Katz asked if the house was right next to the Thompson house. Mr. Emerson replied yes.
- Mr. Emerson said that when designing the house, they looked more at the Georgians and the rest of the block going west as opposed to the east side which is more of a mishmash of styles. He pointed out that they took various styles from area historic homes and incorporated them into the design plan for this home. Mr. Emerson said that although the house looks tall, it is actually a couple of feet shorter than the houses on both sides of it. He said they are planning to put a cupola on the top that will raise the height to 35 feet.
- Mr. Emerson pointed out that the garage will be placed on the high side of the lot and will be accessed in the back.
- Mr. Emerson stated that the house across the front is 36 feet, which is 8 – 10 feet shorter than the Thompson house. He pointed out that they are pushing out the lower floor to accommodate more space. He stated that the materials that they are looking at clapboard. The windows on the lower level will be 9 over 6. The roof will be architectural asphalt shingles.
- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that it is not a Georgian style. Mr. Emerson said that it leans a little more to the Federal style. Mr. Wyckoff said that it is missing a chimney on the right hand side of the front façade.
- Mr. Adams said that he liked the sense of detailing and he can see the Mr. Emerson's expression. He said he was troubled by a couple things. Mr. Adams pointed out the angled skirt on the cupola. He said that skirts are plum. He also pointed out the curved porticos and one second floor porch over the portico but it does not have both together. He said he also felt that the moderate pitch to the roof was not a Federal pitch. He felt that it was uncharacteristic. He added that the two story bay on the side of the house was distracting.
- Mr. Emerson asked Mr. Adams if he would rather see nothing there at all or to marry the two better. Mr. Adams replied that he felt the building would be improved to have less on that corner.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he agreed with Mr. Adams. He felt that the roof line didn't play well with the two story bay. He felt perhaps a one story would be better. He added that the garage pediments seemed to be overdone. Mr. Emerson said that it seemed lost without something. Mr. Wyckoff said they seemed large. Chairman Rice suggested cutting them in half or connect them.
- Chairman Rice asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. An abutter who resides in the Tibbetts House gave her thoughts on the project. She felt it was a

quite presumptuous house. She said what took her eye was the entry. She pointed out the elegant simplicity of the houses on Pleasant Street. She felt it would be best to make the entry flat. She advised that she would err on the side of simplicity rather than excessiveness.

- Mr. Adams pointed out that the entry portico on the Governor Langdon house is quite massive.
- Mr. Emerson pointed out that there is a sitting room on the 2nd floor of that bay area.
- Mr. Adams pointed out that if he plans to come back for a public hearing; they would need all of the cut sheets. Chairman Rice said that he felt they could go for a public hearing.
- Mr. Katz said that he was holding back his comments because there are people on the Commission who are more knowledgeable about the details. He added that his overall impression is very good. He would like to see the house go up.

Chairman Rice informed the Commissioners about an invitation to participate in the NH Preservation Alliance's training program in September. They are looking for a panel member presenter from Portsmouth to take part. He said that if anyone is interested, contact Liz Good.

III. A DJOURNMENT

At 10:40 p.m., Mr. Adams made a motion to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded by Mr. Golumb. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on October 4, 2006.