

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**October 3, 2007
reconvened on October 10, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika, Vice-Chairman John F. Golumb; Richard Katz, John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak; Planning Board Representative Jerry Hejtmanek, City Council Representative Edward Reynolds, Alternates Elena Maltese and Joseph Almeida

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – September 5, 2007

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

B. Petition of **Harbor Place, LLC, owner, and Two International Construction Co., LLC**, for property located at **2 Harbor Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace front doors with wood and glass doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. (*This item was postponed at the September 12, 2007 meeting to the October 3, 2007 meeting.*)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Dawn David, representative for Two International Construction Company was present to speak to the application. She said that the cut sheet she submitted showed the proposed doors. She explained that the exterior door handles that were originally chosen would not work with the current three point locking system, so she was proposing different hardware. Ms. David gave the Commissioners a cut sheet of the proposed hardware for their review.

Mr. Golumb asked if the proposed hardware was the top or bottom example on the cut sheet. Ms. David replied that it was the bottom example with the straight handle.

Mr. Almeida thanked the applicant for submitting the additional information. He asked if the window grill on the doors was a fixed or an applied unit. Ms. David replied that it was a grill that was affixed from the inside and matched the existing windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the doors had single panes of glass. Ms. David replied yes, that it was not true divided light. She explained that the grill was a snap-in grill. She added that the windows also had snap-in grills. Chairman Dika said that snap-in grills are something that the Commission does not normally approve. Ms. David replied that they tried to mimic the windows that were already in place.

Mr. Katz stated that they could probably make the request work if they specified permanent grills affixed to the exterior. Mr. Wyckoff said that he was surprised that the Brosco door chosen did not have a true divided light option. He added that he did not see any detail concerning the bottom panel of the door. Ms. David replied that it would be a solid, flat panel.

Chairman Dika asked Ms. David if she would be willing to amend the application to indicate that the door have true divided lights. Ms. David said that she would have to speak to the owners.

Mr. Almeida suggested that they approve the design of the door as drawn in the submitted plans and to include true divided lights. The Commission felt comfortable with that.

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 awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Hejtmanek made a motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulations that the door design and specifications indicated on the elevation drawing submitted on September 21, 2007 be used and that the doors have true divided lights or permanently applied muntins affixed to the exterior. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golumb.

Mr. Wyckoff explained that the reason that the Commission specifies either true divided light or simulated divided light is because the muntins can be seen from many different angles. He said that just to have that look on the inside of the building was not acceptable. He added that the muntins must show from the outside of the glass, whether they are applied or real.

Ms. David asked if it would be acceptable to get another grill for the outside of the door. Mr. Wyckoff said that he did not see a problem with that as long as the grill was permanently applied.

The motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulations that the door design and specifications indicated on the elevation drawing submitted on September 21, 2007 be used and that the doors have true divided lights or permanently applied muntins affixed to the exterior passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

C. Petition of **B. Allen and Barbara B. Rowland, owners,** and **Bruce Oronte, applicant,** for property located **33-35 Richmond Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace entrance gates) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 17 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed to a time indefinite at the September 12, 2007 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

There was no one present to speak to the application.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Golumb made a motion to postpone the hearing to the end of the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **T'Rouge, LLC, owner,** for property located at **213-215 Gates Street, 20 Mechanic Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove vinyl and aluminum siding, repair clapboards on rear elevation, replace windows and doors on rear elevation, replace skylights on front elevation) and allow new construction to an existing structure (add dormers and decks) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 8 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Carla Goodknight of CJ Architects was present to speak to the application. She stated that this was her second time before them concerning this project. She reminded the Commission that at the last meeting the side and front elevation changes were reviewed and received approval. She added that what was yet to be approval were the dormers, the skylights on the front of the house, and the decks on the rear.

Ms. Goodknight stated that on the rear elevation, she was proposing Andersen sliding patio doors on the second floor and Andersen swinging patio doors for the first floor. She said that they were also proposing a wider head casing to match the window head heights that are currently in the building. She explained that the deck construction would have pressure treated framing wrapped in painted pine with cedar balusters and handrails and mahogany decking.

Ms. Goodknight said that they adjusted the roof dormers down and out from the ridge. She explained that they were centered on the building, centered on each other, and the end wall.

Ms. Goodknight said that there are two existing roof hatches in the roof that they would like to infill with skylights.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they had questions for the applicant.

Mr. Almeida asked about the underside of the deck. He wondered what one would see when they looked up at the second floor deck. Ms. Goodknight said that the pressure treated framing for that area was not proposed to be wrapped. Mr. Katz said that the decking probably allows the weather through so putting up bead board would not work.

Mr. Almeida asked if there were replacement windows at the basement level. Ms. Goodknight replied no.

Mr. Almeida asked why she was proposing sliding doors on the second floor. Ms. Goodknight explained that there was living space just inside the sliding doors so it was a space issue.

Mr. Katz mentioned that he went by the building a few weeks ago. He asked the other Commissioners if the proposed skylights were in the same location of the roof scuttles. He said that the Commission has rejected skylights on the front of a building on a fairly regular basis. He said that he would be willing to accept the skylights if those openings are there now in the exact location. He pointed out that he did not want to set a precedence of allowing skylights on the front of buildings.

Ms. Maltese noted that the left hatch lines up but the right one is unclear. Ms. Goodknight stated that the right hatch is boarded up and roofed over. She pointed out that both openings are present in the framing. It was their intention to restore them both. Mr. Katz pointed out that they can not force the applicant to roof over the existing skylight. Chairman Dika said that the symmetry may be important to the appearance.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they were comfortable with the two skylights. Mr. Almeida and Vice Chairman Golumb responded that they were. Mr. Almeida asked about the material of the skylight. Ms. Goodknight replied that she would be using a Velux brand.

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.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Joe Capobianco, an abutter, stated that he was in agreement with what was being proposed.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone else from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Mr. Katz stated that all in all, the project will enhance the neighborhood. He felt that the project did not distract from the historic nature of the neighborhood.

Ms. Maltese agreed with Mr. Katz. She said that the building has needed serious TLC and is pleased to see it move forward.

Chairman Dika called for the vote.

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

2. Petition of **Peter G. Morin Trust, owner**, for property located at **49 Pickering Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace window and rake trim and corner boards) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 6 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Peter Morin was present to speak to the application. He stated that he would like to replace window and rake trim and corner boards with a wood alternative called KOMA. He added that he has spoken with most of his abutters about the project. Mr. Morin brought a sample of the product for the Commission to review.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they had seen this product before. Mr. Katz replied that he was not familiar with this particular brand. Ms. Kozak said it was like Azek.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that Mr. Morin’s house was built twelve years ago and that it was unfortunate that the wood trim needed to be replaced already.

Ms. Kozak asked what type of fasteners he would be using. Mr. Morin replied that he thought they would be using finish nails. Ms. Kozak said that with Azek, pneumatic driven screws are recommended for runs over a certain number of feet to prevent buckling. She added that if the applicant were to use the pneumatic screws then she would recommend the boards be painted or the screw holes are filled and sanded. Mr. Morin said that the boards would be painted. Mr. Katz also mentioned that there was a dedicated nail that resembles a serrated stainless steel siding nail that is longer with thicker wire. He thought that would work well also.

Mr. Almeida asked if the sills would be replaced also. Mr. Morin replied that they were not planning to but asked if they required replacing, would the Commission be okay with that. Chairman Dika said that if he was changing materials he would need permission to do it. Mr.

Katz suggested that the Commission could give him permission to replace any sills if the need arises.

Chairman Dika pointed out that Mr. Morin’s house was built just twelve years but looked like an antique and fit perfectly into the neighborhood. She commented him on the use of clapboards with shingles on the sides and the back of the ell - a design that was approved by past Commission members.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented with additional permission to replace sills with the same composite material if necessary. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the Commission was to encourage the innovative use of new products and he felt they were doing that with this application.

Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented with additional permission to replace sills with the same composite material if necessary passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

- 3. Petition of **Jolanda Fannin, owner**, for property located at **7 Brackett Lane**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 13 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jolanda Fannin, owner, was present to speak to the application. She stated that she would like to remove the chimney from the structure. She said that it was not in use and the removal of it would allow her to open up a small space inside the house.

Ms. Maltese asked if there was a fireplace associated with the chimney. Ms. Fannin replied no.

Mr. Almeida asked if the re-roofing would match the existing roof. Ms. Fannin explained that she would be replacing the entire roof with the same materials.

Chairman Dika asked if the furnace was vented through the chimney. Ms. Fannin replied no.

Chairman Dika stated that she hated to lose a chimney as they are architectural features as well as being useful.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked Ms. Fannin if she would consider capping the chimney and leaving the exterior chimney in place. Ms. Fannin said that she would have to check with her contractor. Vice Chairman Golumb pointed out that the house to right of Ms. Fannin's was the same type of house and had a chimney on it. He reminded the Commission that they required the capping of a chimney on Islington Street a while back. Mr. Katz explained that the structure on Islington Street was a historical building with a massive chimney. He said that this is a house with one flu surrounded by a course of bricks. He did not think that anyone would notice that it was gone. Ms. Kozak agreed. Vice Chairman Golumb said that he disagreed. He felt that his suggestion was a good compromise.

Ms. Fannin stated that the house next to her was not in the Historic District and was deteriorating rapidly. She said the Commission could not be certain that it would still be standing in the future.

Mr. Katz said that he did not see the need for all of the work and expense with all of the potential problems down the road for a chimney that is non functional. He added that the chimney did not define this structure. Chairman Dika stated that she felt the chimney was an architectural feature of a 1950's ranch. She did not feel that the structure would look appropriate without the chimney.

Mr. Wyckoff said that Mr. Katz makes a good argument and he was in agreement that it could be taken down.

Ms. Kozak stated that the typical essence of a 1950's ranch was not its chimney; it was about the low roof line and the small size and scale. She said that she did not think that the character of the house would be compromised by the removal of the chimney. She felt it would not be noticed. Mr. Almeida agreed and questioned whether the chimney was even original to the house because a chimney of the vintage of this house would be on the end, it would be external to the house and it would be much larger.

Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had 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 awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Mr. Katz said that 1950's ranch style architecture runs the gamut from very modest to quite spectacular. He said that he agreed with Mr. Almeida that the chimney looks like an afterthought. He did not think the chimney would be a great loss to Portsmouth historic preservation.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a vote of 6-1 with Ms. Maltese voting in opposition.

4. Petition of **Daniel R. and Xanthi M. Gray, owners**, for property located at **251 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 35 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Daniel Gray was present to speak to the application. He said that he would like to replace twenty-one windows in his home. He explained that the house was aluminum sided and so they have chosen wooden windows with aluminum cladding. He added that the outer trim would remain untouched. Mr. Gray explained that he felt they might have some rotting trim that would need to be replaced and if that was the case, he would replace it “in kind.” He said that they would like to use a 6 over 1 grill pattern but that they were open to the Commission’s suggestions. Currently there are 2 over 2 patterns on most of the windows with the exception of 6 over 6 on the front of the house.

Chairman Dika asked the age of the house. Mr. Gray replied that he thought it was built around 1800.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked for clarification on the grill pattern. Mr. Gray replied they were proposing 6 over 1.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the 6 over 1 grill pattern was commonly called “cottage style.” He did not think that that was appropriate for the age of the house. He felt that the house was probably built in the early 19th century with a new section in the rear. He added that the 6 over 6 pattern was more appropriate. Chairman Dika and Vice Chairman Golumb agreed with Mr. Wyckoff.

Ms. Kozak mentioned that the 6 over 1 cottage style was more of a 20th century feature. She felt the 6 over 6 pattern was more appropriate.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. Gray if the 6 over 6 pattern was agreeable to him. Mr. Gray replied that they were looking at other older homes in the area and a lot of them had the 6 over 1 grill pattern. He thought maybe those homes were out of the Historic District but they did like that look and they were easier to maintain. He added that he was open to other options as well.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the windows have a 6 over 6 grill pattern.

Mr. Gray asked the Commission if it would be acceptable to leave the window configurations as they are with the 2 over 2 in one section of the house and 6 over 6 in the other section.

Ms. Kozak thought this would be a great opportunity to tie the house together with a common pattern.

Mr. Wyckoff amended the motion to include that all repairs to the trim be done "in kind". The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese said that she understood the desire to have all of the windows the same but the addition was clearly a new section of the house and preservation wise, she said that she felt more comfortable keeping the old the old and the new the new to show the clarity of age.

Mr. Katz stated that he did not have a chance to see the house so he was drawing his conclusions primarily on the submitted pictures. He observed that the addition was emulating a lot of the features of the original building. He said that he could not see a clear delineation between the addition and the original house. He understood Ms. Maltese's observation and said he felt comfortable supporting either choice.

Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that the applicant indicated that he would like to have all of the windows the same.

Hearing no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to approve the application as presented with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

- 1) That all of the windows have a 6 over 6 grill configuration.
- 2) That any trim repairs be done "in kind."

Councilor Reynolds arrived at this point in the meeting.

5. Petition of **Pier II, LLC, owner**, for property located at **10 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (changes to various arched entryways, reposition exit door of Unit 1, remove various windows, reposition new windows, add second garage door and add two patio doors to Unit 4, remove wood ramp, and install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 4 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A Districts.

Mr. Katz asked if the applicant brought a rendering of the original approval to refresh their memories. The presenters replied yes. Chairman Dika asked how many Commissioners were not serving on the Commission when the applicant received the original approval. Five Commissioners were not serving at that time.

At this point in the meeting, the Commissioners moved down to the floor to review the images presented prior to the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Malcolm McNeill, representing the applicant, and Mr. Paul Gosselin, of Salmon Falls Architects were present to speak to the application. Attorney McNeill stated that the project was a four unit condominium complex which received approval on December 19, 2005 after an extensive review by the Commission. There were many modifications as they proceeded through six work sessions and a number of other meetings. He pointed out that an industrial type of appearance consistent with the historical development of the area was what was of great importance to the Commission as they proceeded through the process.

Attorney McNeill said that after the approval in 2005, there have been many issues with the Department of Environmental Services (DES) because of its location over water. It has taken a great deal of time and resolve to work out these issues. He informed the Commission that on December 13, 2006 the Commission granted a one year extension to the Certificate of Appropriateness. In the interim, the owners of the property are proposing minor changes to accommodate some of their tastes regarding the project as well as to accommodate some matters that became apparent as the interior of the building was developed.

Attorney McNeill explained that one unit had a one car garage while the other units had two car garages. They went before the Board of Adjustment on April 17, 2007 and received approval for a second garage for the one unit. He explained that that decision granted approval for both vehicles to back out onto the street. Attorney McNeill said that in terms of the Commission's review, they are to review the one garage door. He then proceeded to go through all of the proposed changes: the arched entry way on the west elevation to be moved to the right one bay, a second garage door to be added to unit 4 and a wood ramp removed, a fence added on the south elevation, arched entry to unit 4 changed, two patio doors added to unit 4 on south and east elevations, two windows added to the narrow face of the building facing the bridge, one on the first floor and one on the second floor, an exit door from the back of unit 1 garage and window flipped on the east elevation so that the door is closer to the main building and accesses the rear waterfront deck, entry exit arched recessed opening for access to second floor fire stair added (west elevation) to blank side nearest the bridge, and overall detailing to match previous approval.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked about the four windows on the south elevation. Mr. Gosselin replied that the original south elevation had three double windows and a single window and the proposed south elevation has two windows and a door to the deck, then two windows and a window around the corner.

Mr. Almeida asked where the original concept of an industrial look came from. Mr. Gosselin replied that it was an HDC idea. Attorney McNeill explained that this was the second approved building. The previous building was very traditional and approved approximately two years prior to the most recent approval. He said that there was a considerable design change and he felt it fair to say that the design change was driven by the HDC.

Mr. Almeida asked if the current height and the footprint of the building were dictated by current zoning, DES, or Historic District restrictions. Attorney McNeill replied that they did not exceed the existing volume which they could not do. He explained that some of the DES issues did not pertain to the structure although a portion of the structure is over water. He added that it did not require Planning Board approval because it was less than 5 units.

Mr. Gosselin said that some of the odd angles of the building are a result of some of the site issues, being partially over the water and partially on land.

Ms. Kozak asked if the proposed future River walk would connect around the south façade of the building. Attorney McNeill pointed out that the decks on the building are private. He said that there is public access on one side of the building that provides access to the water. He added that the public would have access from a small area at the end of State Street. Attorney McNeill said that this was not to be confused with the River walk because the River walk does not extend to this property.

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 awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Councilor Reynolds stated that there was nothing in the proposed changes that was substantive.

Vice Chairman Golumb said that some of the reconfigurations of the windows and doors add more symmetry to the project.

Ms. Kozak commented that what she finds troubling about the concept is that it is a very private building in a very public area. She thought the change on the west elevation was an enhancement but what was lacking on the building, was a presence in relationship to the public, to the park, and to the street.

Mr. Katz pointed out that the Historic District Commission was looking for a structure that would be appropriate next to a monumental structure of masonry and steel. He thought the proposed building would live well in its location.

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

6. Petition of **George C. Hurtt Revocable Trust 2006, owner**, for property located at **69 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove vinyl siding from house and barn, replace with cedar clapboards) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 49 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Heather Hurtt, owner of the property, was present to speak to the application. She stated that she would like to remove the vinyl siding that is currently on the house and barn and replace it with pre-primed red cedar clapboards with a 4” exposure.

Mr. Almeida stated that he applauded her efforts. He asked the applicant if she would consider a spacing change of slightly less than 4”. Ms. Hurtt replied yes, if the Commission would prefer that. Mr. Wyckoff said that the vinyl currently on the house has a 3” exposure. He felt that a 4” exposure made more sense. He thought that when they vinyl was removed, they might find an even greater exposure underneath.

Mr. Katz made a suggestion to mirror the exposure that was underneath. Ms. Hurtt was agreeable to that and said that she thought the original exposure underneath was 4”.

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 awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Raynolds made a motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the clapboard exposure match the existing original exposure. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Katz said that it was a laudable undertaking and he wished the applicant well.

Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the clapboard exposure match the existing original exposure passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

7. Petition of **George C. Hurtt Revocable Trust 2006, owner**, for property located at **69 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing

structure (remove deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two stoops with wraparound steps and railings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 49 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Heather Hurtt spoke to the application. She explained that the deck on the back of her property was poorly constructed and was probably not original to the house. She said they would like to remove it and add two stoops using pressure treated framing wrapped in cedar with mahogany decking and hand railings. She pointed out that there would only be three risers so it was not required to have hand rails but she wanted to add them for safety reasons.

Ms. Maltese asked if the proposed stoops would be behind the fence on the property and not visible to the public. Ms. Hurtt replied yes.

Mr. Wyckoff questioned the putting of 4"x 4" posts next to the house with the railings pressed against the house. Ms. Hurtt felt the railings would provide security. Mr. Wyckoff thought it seemed awkward. He asked if she could just apply brackets and handrails. Ms. Hurtt said that she would be happy to do that and that it might be a better solution.

Mr. Almeida thought that the Commission was open to either design. He asked what the applicant would prefer. Ms. Hurtt asked if she could decide on the design when the construction commences and she gets a better picture of what is needed. The Commission was in agreement with that.

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 awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Raynold made a motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the handrail design (attached or unattached to the house) was at the applicant's discretion. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golomb. There was no discussion.

The motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the handrail design (attached or unattached to the house) was at the applicant's discretion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Chairman Dika asked for a motion to postpone the application of 33-35 Richmond Street.

Vice Chairman Golumb made a motion to postpone the application of 33-35 Richmond Street to the October 10, 2007 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katz. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

In other business, Mr. Clum asked the Commission if they wished to discontinue reviewing applications where the uses of non-wood materials were requested to replace rotting wood. He thought that the composite materials looked like wood after they are painted. He felt it would save the Commission time.

Vice Chairman Golumb stated that he appreciated the learning experience tonight because he could not believe how much the composite materials looked like wood. Mr. Clum pointed out that the Commission has approved cementitious siding, Azek, and other products. He said that he was just trying to save the Commission time.

Mr. Katz asked Mr. Clum for clarification. He asked if he meant in the event of a replacement. Mr. Clum replied yes. Mr. Katz said that his view on the subject was if it was a product that the Commission has seen and approved in the past, he saw no problem with it.

Ms. Maltese stated that the installation of the product would be something that should not be overlooked. She said that she did not have a problem with the product. Her concern was that the product be installed correctly. Ms. Kozak interjected that there could be a stipulation in the approval that the products be fastened with either finish nails or larger fasteners.

Chairman Dika asked Ms. Kozak if she would be willing to write up some specifications for the product and its approval that the Commission could take a look at.

Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that the Commission has never examined fasteners before. He said that he has installed a lot of Azek and he has never used any screws. He added that with long runs, it has been recommended that a glue product be placed between the two pieces.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that Mr. Clum has brought up a good point. He said that anything that can be done with wood can essentially be done with this composite material.

Mr. Katz said that he saw nothing wrong with working up a specification sheet for the use of Azek. Mr. Almeida added that they would have to be very specific about the products because some of the cementitious boards have a fake wood grain to it that does not look natural.

Vice Chairman Golumb said that he was on board with the idea as long as it did not compromise the integrity of the Historic District and he did not feel that that was the intent. He wondered if this would be for large as well as small projects. Mr. Clum replied that he had not given that much thought. He pointed out that large projects would most likely be coming before the Commission for the project as a whole.

Mr. Wyckoff added that this would not only save the Commission time, but it would give the homeowner the freedom to replace boards without having to take the time to come before the Commission. Mr. Clum also added that applicants are having to come before the Commission for extremely simple changes that look exactly like the existing materials.

Chairman Dika again asked Ms. Kozak to write up a specification document. Ms. Kozak agreed to do that.

III. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:10 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Historic District Commission Secretary

These minutes were approved at the November 7, 2007 Historic District Commission meeting.