

**MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**June 13, 2007
reconvened to June 20, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika, Vice-Chairman John Golumb; David Adams, Ellen Fineberg, Richard Katz; City Council Representative Edward Reynolds, and Alternates John Wyckoff and Elena Maltese

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Planning Board Representative Jerry Hejtmanek

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Approval of minutes – April 25, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.

Approval of minutes – May 2, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.

B) Request for one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for 10 Commercial Alley and at Penhallow Street.

Councilor Reynolds made a motion to extend the Certificate of Appropriateness for one year. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golumb. The motion to extend the Certificate of Appropriateness for an additional year passed by a unanimous vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Robert F. and Diane R. Vieira, owners**, for property located at **32 Manning Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install condenser at corner of house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 68 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jon Sherrill, of Key Heating and Air Conditioning spoke to the petition. He stated that the applicant would like to install a condenser on the right side of the rear of the house. He said that the proposed condenser falls within the sound perimeters of the zoning ordinance. It was a typical outdoor condenser.

Mr. Adams asked if the piping would be through a cellar window. Mr. Sherrill replied that the cellar window did not exist anymore. He said that the piping would connect directly to the condenser and that there would be about two feet of exposed pipe.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fineberg. Chairman Dika asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Adams stated that the location was a tidy and out of the way location. Councilor Raynolds added that it was preferable to the alternatives.

Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented passed (7-0) by unanimous vote.

-
2. Petition of **National Block II, LLC, owner**, for property located at **111 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace double entrance doors, replace single door, replace four first floor windows with custom operable folding windows) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct portico over entrance) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 50 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Mark McNabb, owner of the building, spoke to the petition. He pointed out to the Commission that the plan submitted was a CAD generated plan because all of the work proposed would be custom work. He said that the window opening would remain the same width and height, but it would be lowered. He referenced the Kittery restaurant, Anneke Jans, as having the type of folding window design that he was proposing. Similar windows can be found in Europe and Canada. He commented that they were trying to bring more light into the old building.

Mr. McNabb stated that the front double doors have been a real problem. They open up out onto the sidewalk. The existing doors are solid wood that egress out and as a result, do not give pedestrians any warning when they are opened. He said that the proposed doors would be

mahogany with the upper part of the doors being glass. He said that the proposed kitchen door would have seeded glass to let light in but no visibility into the kitchen area. The transoms above the doors would not be removed.

Mr. McNabb stated that they were also proposing a low profile portico that would give the building a sense of arrival. He added that they would also be installing shutters on the second floor of the building.

Chairman Dika asked if there were questions for the applicant.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked about the folding window. Mr. McNabb explained that when the window is closed, it will be all glass. When the window is open, they will fold inside the window frame. They will be hinged in the middle section. Vice Chairman Golumb asked if there would be screens. Mr. McNabb replied that at this point they were not planning to have screens.

Mr. Clum responded and said that the Health Officer indicated that screens would be required in accordance with a State regulation. Mr. McNabb replied that they would be amenable to screens.

Vice Chairman Golumb wondered how the screens would work with the function of the window. Mr. McNabb replied that the windows would fold inside so the installation of screens should not change the operation of the window. He reminded the Commission that the windows would be custom made.

Chairman Dika asked if any of the Commissioners were familiar with this type of window. Ms. Fineberg and Ms. Maltese said that they were. Ms. Fineberg said that she has not seen them with screens. Mr. McNabb commented that it would be unlikely that it would be one big screen, that it would probably be multiple screens.

Councilor Reynolds stated that these type of windows are all up and down the north end of Boston. He was not sure if they had screens but that the point of the window was to provide an open air experience. He felt it was an interesting concept but he was not sure how it would work with screens. Mr. McNabb thought there might be alternatives and that he would talk with the Health Department about those alternatives.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the height of the window is 7'3" and so he felt that they should have a look at the screens. Chairman Dika felt that they should also have a look at what this type of window would look like. Mr. McNabb replied that he would be happy to provide shop drawings if the Commission wanted to make that a stipulation.

Ms. Fineberg wondered whether the proposed door surround was the right design for that building. Mr. McNabb replied that they wanted something that was durable so they settled for the conventional shape. He added that the glass in the doors would be true divided lights.

Mr. Katz stated that he could not oppose the application because of the doors but it was his opinion that the design would cause the loss of the simple arch that is existing. He said that he

would not object to the application but that they should have a better idea of what the screens are going to look like.

Chairman Dika said that she could not support the application because she was not familiar with the type of window proposed. She added that she would like to see it before she voted in favor of it.

Mr. McNabb stated that the kitchen door needs replacing immediately. He asked if he could remove the window proposal from the application and have the Commission vote on the doors. Mr. Adams felt that the application could be broken into separate parts. Mr. McNabb stated that he was willing to remove the window to a future meeting.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the doors and the door surround with the removal of the folding window from the application. The motion was seconded by Councilor Raynolds.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Adams stated that the glazed door with the nine lights of glass was handsome and vernacular to the downtown. He said that he appreciated the applicant's interest in maintaining the fan lights over the doors. He said that he was having a problem with the architectural surround for the entry doors. He added that when he looked at door openings in the area, he found many bare, plain, arched masonry openings. He pointed out that residential doorways had more detailed openings and that the commercial door openings were largely bare framed. Mr. Adams said that he finds this building charming in its plainness and that the proposed opening was too much.

Mr. McNabb pointed out that the Victory Restaurant had a different door surround on the side of its building.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked the applicant if he was willing to go with the glass in the doors and forego the portico.

Chairman Dika wondered if the motion should be withdrawn and go to a work session. Ms. Fineberg proposed that the applicant withdraw the portico so that a work session could be scheduled at a later time. That would give the applicant the opportunity to move forward with the doors.

Mr. McNabb responded that he did not want the main entrance to be like the single door entrance. He said that he was willing to let the application pass or be denied. He felt that the proposal was an enhancement to the building and did not think that they were inappropriate to the building.

Mr. Wyckoff said in defense of the portico, the roof projects out 11” and the portico serves a function of keeping rainwater away. He felt that it was an aesthetic improvement and that it was appropriate for an 1810 brick building. He thought it should receive approval.

Mr. Katz said that he did not like the alteration to the opening but it was appropriate and he would have to support it.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she would not be supporting it and would like to see some more options. She explained that she was not opposed to a portico, just this portico.

Chairman Dika said that she was not sure how she felt about the portico. She liked the current design and the proposed portico was too ornate and so she would not support the motion.

After hearing no other comments, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to approve the doors and the door surround with the removal of the folding window from the application failed by a vote of 5-2 with Chairman Dika, Vice Chairman Golumb, Mr. Adams, Ms. Fineberg, and Councilor Raynolds voting in opposition and Mr. Katz and Mr. Wyckoff voting in favor.

Chairman Dika stated Article 10, Section 10-1004, B 1. as the reason for her opposition. Vice Chairman Golumb and Ms. Fineberg were in agreement.

3. Petition of **Middle Street Townhouse Association, owner, and Brian Maguire, applicant**, for property located at **774 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install wall mounted fence, install privacy fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 153 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Brian Maguire spoke to the application. He said that they would like to install two fences. One was a wall mounted fence and the other was a privacy fence. He pointed out that there used to be a wall mounted fence in the proposed area but it was demolished by a car accidentally driving through it. He said that they would additionally like a privacy fence along the driveway

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Adams made a motion, for the purposes of discussion, to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Raynolds.

Mr. Adams said he was wondering how the privacy fence worked architecturally. Privacy fences between properties makes sense, however, this fence would be serving as a visual screen. He added that he understands the applicant's issues but he felt it was in an odd place.

Ms. Fineberg asked what if the applicant moved the privacy fence to the other side of the walkway. She said that it would make the door and walkway more visible but would also screen the backyard. Mr. Adams replied that that made sense although the applicant would need a gate.

Mr. Maguire stated that there was a front door to the structure. The door in question is a side door. Ms. Fineberg commented that tall fences are used to screen something out and to cordon off a part of the yard. The public part of the yard includes the entryway. The private part is when it becomes your yard.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the fence starts at the beginning of the stairs leaving a 3' or 4' gap between the fence and the house. He would like to see the fence started at the corner of entryway. Mr. Maguire said that it would be flush with the house.

Ms. Fineberg stated that she preferred the fence on the other side. Mr. Maguire said that he was amenable to that. Mr. Wyckoff thought that it was an awkward situation.

Ms. Fineberg asked if they could postpone the application and have the applicant come back with a drawing showing what the fence would look like on the other side.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not understand the objections. He felt they were redesigning the project for the applicant. Chairman Dika thought they should sit down at the work table. She added that fences are new to the Commission.

Mr. Maguire asked if the wall mounted fence was acceptable to the Commission and if so, was it possible to strike the privacy fence from the application. The Commission was in agreement.

Mr. Adams withdrew his motion and Councilor Raynolds withdrew the second.

Mr. Adams made a new motion to approve the wall mounted fence with the withdrawal of the privacy fence from the application. The motion was seconded by Councilor Raynolds. The motion to approve the wall mounted fence with the withdrawal of the privacy fence from the application passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Kathryn C. Saunders, owner**, for property located at **140 Newcastle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove aluminum siding to expose existing wood clapboards, restore door surround and replace corbels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 26 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Kathryn Saunders, owner, spoke to the application. She explained that in the process of installing new windows some of the existing aluminum siding had to be removed, thus exposing the wood clapboards underneath. She discovered that the clapboard was in good condition and that there was only about one coat of paint on them. Ms. Saunders also pointed out that the door surround would need to be replaced as well as the corbels.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the two window units that were replaced did not have sills thick enough and did not have the right projection. The casings on the windows were also narrower than the casings on the original windows.

Mr. Wyckoff discussed with Ms. Saunders about how best to approach the repair of the entryway.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Reynolds. Chairman Dika asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he felt that the carpenter involved in the project would find a safe way around the problem areas.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

5. Petition of **March Twenty-Two, LLC, owner**, for property located at **58 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (add spiral staircase from 3rd floor deck to 4th floor deck, change door and window combination to a pair of windows on 3rd floor, add masonry opening in faux firewall on 3rd floor, combine two shed dormers into one on 4th floor, change single French door to double French doors on 4th floor, change pair of windows to a door and window on 4th floor) 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.

Chairman Dika recused herself from the discussion and vote. Vice Chairman Golumb led the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jen Ramsey spoke to the application. She explained that the proposed changes were the suggestions of a potential buyer of the property. She said that the proposed buyer was interested

in combining the third and fourth floor units into one unit. Ms. Ramsey led the Commission through the plans explaining the proposed changes.

Ms. Fineberg asked the reason for the spiral staircase. Ms. Ramsey it would allow exterior access to both floors.

Mr. Adams pointed out that there was an unavoidable conflict between the sash and door combination in their mullion layout but there was no reducing it.

Mr. Adams asked if there was a material that could be used on the recessed sidewall of the dormers. Ms. Ramsey replied that it would be clapboards. Mr. Adams wondered if there was another material other than clapboard that could be put there. Ms. Ramsey explained that the other dormers around the building had clapboard on them. Mr. Adams asked Mr. Clum if roofing material was allowed on a vertical wall. Mr. Clum responded that he did not think it was disallowed. Ms. Maltese stated that she did not see the change in the material as a necessary need. Mr. Wyckoff wondered if the dormers in question were visible from Court Street. Mr. Adams said that it was in an area where there was parking for the building. Vice Chairman Golumb said that he did not think that it was the clapboard material that was the problem. He felt it was the roof line that was awkward.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. There was no discussion. The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a 6-1 vote with Mr. Adams voting in opposition.

6. Petition of **Kyle Engle, owner**, for property located at **24 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct 5' x 7' storage shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is located on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Kyle Engle, owner, spoke to the application. He explained that he would like to build a 5'X7' storage shed that would be located at the rear of the property. He said that he received Board of Adjustment approval to place it 2' from his property line. He added that the materials, clapboard on the front, cedar shingles on the side, and architectural asphalt shingles, as well as the color scheme would be in keeping with the main house.

Mr. Adams asked if the roof pitch would be a 45 degree angle. Mr. Engle replied that it would be. Mr. Adams thought that the location was very appropriate.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application with the clarification that the roof pitch be 12/12. Councilor Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion to approve the application with the clarification that the roof pitch be 12/12 passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

7. Petition of **Jonathan Watson Sobel Revocable Trust, owner**, for property located at **49 Sheafe Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish 49 Sheafe Street garage) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (repair and reconstruct garage on Custom House Court with single family dwelling above) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 21 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jonathan Sobel, owner of the property, spoke to the application. He stated that they have been coming before the Commission since last October and have made many changes to their design. They have reduced the height, improved the massing and improved the historical style of the design.

Mr. Sobel explained that the 49 Sheafe Street garage proposal did not have any significant changes from the last meeting. He pointed out that the garage plays a subordinate role to the main house and the adjacent house.

Mr. Sobel spoke to the changes to the Custom House Court garage. He pointed out that the cupola had been centered on the roof and that the roof line had been cut on the left side which allowed for a lower roof line on the north side. Mr. Sobel stated that the main changes have taken place on the west elevation which is the main streetscape. He said that the changes were a direct result of the comments from the Commission and the public.

Mr. Sobel explained in detail the style of doors and windows that were being proposed. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the doors were natural wood. Mr. Sobel replied that they were insulated metal doors that could be painted a wood tone.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any questions pertaining to the 49 Sheafe Street garage. There were none. She then asked for questions regarding the Custom House Court residential dwelling garage.

Ms. Maltese wondered what the age of the existing garage was. Mr. Sobel replied that it shows up in a 1923 insurance map as a glazing shop.

Mr. Sobel had information in regard to the plot plan. He said that there was an issue of the bay extending over the garage doors and an easement. Mr. Clum pointed out that it was not the Commission's purview to resolve land disputes. Mr. Sobel replied that he did not see it as a land dispute and so did not want it to become an issue in regarding the project.

Mr. Sobel presented a petition that contained the names and addresses of neighbors, abutters, and business people who supported the proposal. He also referenced a letter from Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture who said that the proposed design was in keeping with the neighborhood streetscape.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. She pointed out that issues pertaining to water problems, parking, and lot line disputes would not be appropriate to the Commission.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. James Russo of 97 Daniel Street spoke in opposition. He showed the Commission an aerial view of the neighborhood. He pointed out that the alleyway provides access to all of the neighborhood buildings with 13-16 cars parking there on a daily basis. He felt that the proposed building should blend in with the area and not be a stand alone building. Mr. Russo showed the Commission a rendering of a more modest design that would fit within the neighborhood. He asked the Commission to consider the neighbors who will have to look at the building.

Mr. Todd Spencer of 37 Sheafe Street spoke in opposition to the Custom House Court residential dwelling. He said that he was in favor of the Sheafe Street garage because that structure fit the property. However, the Custom House Court garage does not. He thought a brick design would fit better and he thought Mr. Russo's rendering was a nice alternative. He said that the alleyway did not need a signature building in it. It would block the skyline and the sunlight. Chairman Dika reminded the public that views are not within the Commission's purview.

Ms. Marikya Ford of 61 Penhallow Street spoke in opposition to the application because of the size of the Custom House Court garage. She felt that the design was too large for the alleyway. She appreciated the applicant's work but felt it should be a simple one story garage or a service building.

Mr. Dick Duchard, speaking for the Portsmouth Advocates, spoke in favor of the application. He said that he recalled occasions where the Commission said that there were few innovative designs that would fit into a historic theme. He felt that the Custom House Court garage was one that did fit. He said it was a unique and handsome structure. He added that it was a shame that when it is built, it will be in a back alley where no one will see it. Mr. Duchard added that this could be the start of an architectural renaissance in the city.

Mr. Bill Evans, owner of a Federal townhouse at 17 Sheafe Street, spoke in opposition. He felt that the garage was way too high. He said that cupolas were used on mansions and that this garage was far too grand for the alleyway.

Ms. Stephanie Lane, owner of a business at 99 Daniel Street spoke in opposition to the application. She felt that the building was inappropriate for the area. She thought that the stick style design would be a fire hazard in the area. This structure would not be easily accessible for fire trucks. She felt that Mr. Russo's design was more appropriate.

Ms. Kim Katie, owner of Ambrosia Gardens also spoke in opposition. She said that the alley is used everyday for loading and unloading. She felt that it does not belong in that area.

Ms. Karen Wiese, owner of the Colby building, spoke against the application. She stated that she had strong concern about what Mr. Sobel wants to build on top of the brick wall that they share. She was worried about supporting the structure.

A neighbor who lived in the Federal townhouse at 19 Sheafe Street stated that she would like Mr. Sobel to come up with a new design. She was concerned with the height.

Ms. Jennifer Winkleman of 31 Sheafe Street stated that she was opposed to the overall height of the building and thought that the style was not appropriate to its surroundings.

Mr. John Russo stated that he has lived and worked on Daniel Street and Custom House Court. He said that it was too big and out of place in the alley. He felt it would create problems for all of the neighbors. He asked the Commission to do the right thing and vote the petition down.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone else from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Katz stated that the contention that was presented by most of objectors were two-fold. The first objection was that the proposed building was too high. He said that he was looking at the projected streetscape and he did not see it towering over any building that was close to it. The second objection was that its style did not mirror the adjoining buildings. He pointed out that there are a lot of areas like this in Portsmouth where there are a hodge podge of building designs. He did not think that the proposed building was a sore thumb and so he would be supporting it.

Mr. Adams stated that there were many well meaning opinions shared about the proposal. He said that he has suspected for some time that his ultimate opinion of this was that the proposal was going to be too dressy. He said that it is hard to build shabby, decayed, and hodge podge. Mr. Adams stated that he was not going to support the motion because it was an overwhelming structure for the end of the alleyway.

Vice Chairman Golumb stated that Mr. Sobel submitted a handsome design but that it was out of place in that area. He felt a brick building would be more appropriate. He added that he would not be supporting the motion and cited Section 10-1004, B, 1 and 3 as his reasons.

Chairman Dika stated that they spent a lot of time at work sessions. She felt that the Custom House Court garage and dwelling design has been pushed and prodded to accommodate the applicant's needs for interior space and as a result, she felt it was too awkward and too tall for that space. She stated that she would not be supporting it either.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he was looking back at the minutes and he stated that he was having trouble with the height and that maybe it was the cupola with the four windows in it. He also said that he stated that the stick style was appropriate and he still felt that way. He added that if the building were brought back without a cupola and the original style, he would support it.

Chairman Dika mentioned that there were other aspects of the proposal to consider such as the demolition. She said that she had not heard any objections to the demolition and the Sheafe Street garage. Mr. Clum suggested separating the two projects. Mr. Adams felt that that would be appropriate. Mr. Clum just wanted it to be clear that it was one piece of property with two separate structures.

Mr. Sobel stated that he would welcome an amended application to separate the two projects.

Mr. Katz withdrew his motion to approve the application as presented.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to approve the Sheafe Street garage proposal. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he is a lifelong resident of Portsmouth and he has seen a lot come and go. He said as much as we want to hold onto that "funkiness" that exists in little pockets, they cannot hold on to funkiness that does not belong here. He said that everyone has the right to speak out but we must realize that people have a right to change their buildings.

The motion to approve the Sheafe Street garage proposal passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

8. Petition of **Jeffrey H. Marple, owner**, for property located at **37, 39 and 51 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood clapboard with cementitious clapboard, replace all windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 24 and 24-1 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jeffrey Marple, owner of the property, spoke to the application. He stated that the building was a brick Federal building. There was a wing connected on the back that has an outer layer of

clapboards with an under layer of tar paper, and an under layer of clapboards under that. He said that loud music from across the street as well as conserving heat were the main reasons for the proposal. He added that the windows he was proposing were the same windows that were approved in his State Street building and the Rockingham Condominiums. Mr. Marple suggested to the Commission that once they approve a specific project that the building department would be able to issue a permit to someone else with the same type project.

Mr. Marple explained that he would like to replace the clapboard with hardiplank. He pointed out that the Wentworth By the Sea hotel is a historic building and it has hardiplank on it.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked Mr. Marple if he would consider using the smooth hardiplank. Mr. Marple replied that he would be happy to, he had no preference.

Mr. Adams asked what the windows would be made out of. Mr. Marple said that they were wood interiors with aluminum clad exteriors.

Mr. Adams asked what kind of exposure would there be with the hardiplank siding. Mr. Marple replied that it would be the same as the original building. Mr. Adams asked Mr. Marple how he would deal with corner boards, rakes, and water boards. Mr. Marple said that they make the same kind of material for those and he would be using that material. He added that they would put back what was there.

Mr. Katz offered a word of advice that hardiplank is locked into a fixed exposure.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Vice Chairman Golumb amended the motion to include the use of smooth hardiplank and that aluminum clad windows with wood interiors be used.

The motion to approve the application with the stipulation that the applicant use smooth hardiplank and that aluminum clad windows with wood interiors be used passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

- A) Work Session requested by **Catalpa Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **249 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing addition) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new addition with residential units). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 43 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Carla Fritz, architect, spoke to the project. She stated that they were proposing to remove the existing addition to the back of the building and construct a new addition with parking in the rear. The original building would remain the same.

She said that at the last work session, they talked about the scale of the building. They were trying to incorporate banding details and are proposing cementitious siding.

Vice Chairman Golumb commented that the new design has been cleaned up a bit and was much improved from the last meeting. He noticed that there were not balconies with this new drawing.

Mr. Wyckoff stated he liked the glass pattern from the original design. He felt that they had over simplified it. He felt that the picture windows were inappropriate for the building. He also felt that they oversimplified the corners. He thought they should try to copy some of the more important elements of the original building.

Mr. Katz commented that he did not like the windows either because you do not see much window trim. He felt that the addition should be an outgrowth of the original structure and not compete with it.

Mr. Adams added that the triple window was a difficult element. He said that he understands wanting to have light but it is challenging. He thought it was a modern interpretation and it was creating tension for him. He added that he thought they were making a mistake by putting a heavy element as the base. He asked Ms. Fritz why they were not matching the roof pitch. Ms. Fritz replied that they would like to have a roof deck.

Mr. Adams said that he was not bothered by the pediment. The height and the setback all make sense to him. He also appreciated the design of the entryway.

Ms. Maltese commented that she agreed with Mr. Adams. She said that the broken pediment change was a different language to her.

Mr. Katz asked how much of the first floor was garage space. Ms. Fritz replied that there was living space on the first floor in addition to the garage area.

The Commission talked at length about ideas for the roof deck. Mr. Adams stated that it should have some sense of uniformity. He wondered if it could be seen from the street. Ms. Fritz replied that she did not think it was visible from any area.

Mr. Katz asked about the entrance on the first floor. Chairman Dika wondered if some sort of lintel would be better.

In closing, Mr. Katz said that he would like to see an alternative window treatment. Vice Chairman Golumb suggested that the windows be closer together. Mr. Adams suggested smaller windows. Ms. Fritz pointed out that the window changes could drive the height of the building up.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:35 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on July 11, 2007.