

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**7:00 p.m.**

**November 14, 2007  
reconvened from November 7, 2007**

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

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Planning Board Representative Jerry Hejtmanek

**ALSO PRESENT:** Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

-----  
**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

October 10, 2007

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

**V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

8. Petition of **One Middle Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **154 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace and reconfigure second floor windows, add new window, re-stucco upper elevation) and allow new construction to an existing structure (add canopy over front entrance) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 11 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Kelly Davis, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. He said that since their last meeting with the Commission, he had talked to the Planning Department and Department of Public Works and as a result, have decided to remove the canopy from consideration due to traffic and safety considerations.

Councilor Reynolds arrived at this point in the meeting.

Ms. Maltese asked if the Commission could approve a partial application. Ms. Dika replied that it was acceptable to do if the intent was stated prior to the presentation.

Mr. Kelly stated that they have reduced the size of the round window at the corner of the building and have articulated the angle piece in the front.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the picture windows had muntins in the centers. Mr. Kelly replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff also asked if the large crown on the storefront band would remain. Mr. Kelly replied, yes, they would not be changing any details.

Ms. Kozak asked what materials would be used on the upper portion on the canted wall. Mr. Kelly said that it would be stucco. Ms. Kozak asked if there would be any trim or moulding profile on the existing panels on the lower floor. Mr. Kelly explained that there was a little bit of trim profile. Ms. Kozak asked if the headers over the windows projected out. Mr. Kelly replied, yes, that there would be a 1/2" projection.

Councilor Reynolds asked what material would be used for the headers and footers. Mr. Kelly said that it would be the stucco system.

Ms. Kozak asked if there would be any texture differentiation between the stucco trim and the exterior façade. Mr. Kelly replied no. Ms. Kozak said that she had a concern that the trim, if it was rough like stucco, would not read as trim. Mr. Kelly said that he was willing to use a smooth texture for the trim. He thought that was a good suggestion.

Mr. Almeida asked about a sign on the Middle Street elevation. Mr. Kelly explained that they have not worked out the signage yet and so it was not a part of this application.

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 and awaited a motion.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was not 100% pleased with the EFIS material proposed for the second floor. He said that the same material is being proposed and probably did not fall under their purview since it was a like material. He felt there was no significant historical value of the structure. He added that the windows were a great improvement over what was there now.

There being no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

9. Petition of **Joseph G. Cunningham, owner**, for property located at **195 Washington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (permanently remove door, reframe and re-shingle) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 78 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Joseph Cunningham was present to speak to the application. He explained this was the only change that they were proposing to make to the exterior of the building at this time. He said that they would like to remove the side door which was not original to the structure. He explained that they would like to rebuild the wall and the wind brace. They would reframe the insert wall studs

using two by fours and cover with plywood sheathing and attach a composite siding material, left over from the material that they have.

Mr. Cunningham explained that they went to their neighbors to explain the scope of the project and received their signatures in support of the project.

Chairman Dika mentioned that the house had a very interesting roof angle.

Chairman Dika asked where the siding was found to replace the door with. Mr. Cunningham said he had extra siding in the garage. Chairman Dika asked if the material had been tested.

Mr. Cunningham replied no. Chairman Dika explained that it looked like asbestos siding. She asked who would be doing the work. Mr. Cunningham replied he would be with another person. Chairman Dika explained that if he does the work as a homeowner, he can work with the siding without having special permits. If a contractor works with it, they will have to be certified. She cautioned him to be very careful in handling the material.

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 and awaited a motion.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Ms. Maltese made a motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that the applicant was bringing back some of the historic realities to the building. She added that safety was not within the purview of the Commission, but she stressed to the applicant the importance of keeping safe when working with the materials. She also pointed out that the existing door had no benefit where it was currently located.

Mr. Cunningham said that the gentleman who would be helping him with the project had extensive experience with restoration projects so he felt that the end result would be something that everyone would be proud of.

The motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

10. Petition of **DiLorenzo Real Estate, LLC, owner**, for property located at **37 Bow Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing window b, windows, door, deck rail D), and exterior cladding, replace with new windows, doors, d, and exterior on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 a Lot 49 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

This item was postponed, at the request of the applicant, to the February 2008 meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

11. Petition of **DiLorenzo Real Estate, LLC, owner**, for property located at **37 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (new mechanical shaft enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 49 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Vice Chairman Golumb stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion and vote.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Robert Harbeson with DeStefano Architects, was present to speak to the application. He stated that he had an addendum to submit.

He explained that they had previously been looking to build an enclosed clad wall around the mechanical shaft but it was determined due to fire safety issues, that there was not enough space to build the enclosure so they will be replacing it in kind.

Mr. Harbeson showed the Commission an existing photo of the mechanical shaft and said that they would be eliminating the yellow motor on the shaft as well as the blue box and the tan fan cover.

Mr. Harbeson pointed out that pages 4 and 5 of the addendum showed the replacement blower at the top of the shaft and the motor at the base of the shaft. He said that the height of the mechanical shaft would be lowered slightly.

Mr. Almeida asked if there was another alternative to the shiny duct proposed. Mr. Harbeson said that it was paintable and could be painted the same color as the building. Mr. Almeida thought that might be a good solution for hiding it. Mr. Katz stated that he did not know how this would work and pointed out that the Commission has no purview over color. Mr. Almeida said that he asked the question because the application stated aluminized material. Chairman Dika agreed that paint color was not within the Commission's purview but she felt they could certainly recommend that it be painted in an agreeable color.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he was disappointed that they could not cover the mechanical shaft but he hoped that they could make an effort to disguise it in a darker color.

Mr. Almeida said that from the water, the shaft looked like a rocket ship. Chairman Dika wondered if there was a different design or a different way of handling the proposal. Mr. Harbeson stated that the Commission's concerns were valid and had been considered at the outset of the project. That was why they had originally proposed to build an enclosure but they have since determined that they do not have the space around it to meet fire codes.

Ms. Kozak asked whether mechanical equipment was within the Commission's purview. Mr. Clum replied that the only mechanical equipment exempt from the Commission's purview is something that is wall mounted and does not extend more than 1 foot out from the wall plane, or something that is roof mounted and does not extend more than 4 feet above the roof plane and is less than 27 cubic feet. He felt that this application was within the Commission's purview.

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 and awaited a motion.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Ms. Maltese made a motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that the application was clearly bringing new technology into the situation. She said that the shininess was a valid concern. She felt that the current appearance of the mechanical

shaft was not seen clearly from the water but by more on foot. She added that the changing the top made sense and felt it was a step forward.

Ms. Kozak agreed and felt it was not significantly different from what is there right now and is certainly not worse.

Chairman Dika asked if there was any more discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote.

The motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

12. Petition of **Michael Delacruz, owner, and Brandy Higgins, applicant**, for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install exterior lighting, add three glass display cases) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 5 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Brandy Higgins, new tenant in Suite 103 of the Franklin Block was present to speak to the application. She stated that she was opening a women’s retail apparel shop on the Vaughan Mall side of the Franklin Block building. She felt that there was not a lot of exterior lighting in that area and would like to install sconce lighting on either side of the doorway as well as gooseneck lighting up above.

In addition, Ms. Higgins showed an old picture of the Franklin Block in the 1920’s where it showed art boxes on the side of the building. They were taken off at some point, and Ms. Higgins said that she would like to install display cases to showcase art posters.

Ms. Maltese thought that the original boxes were in place for advertising for the Olympia Theatre.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what would go into the display cases. Ms. Higgins said that she would like to showcase local artists. She added that it would fill a huge expanse of brick and draw people closer to her store.

Mr. Wyckoff asked for details of the display cases. Ms. Higgins said that they would be trimmed out in mahogany, would be 4” deep with waterproof glass. Mr. Katz asked for a detail of the display cases.

Mr. Almeida said that he understood the need for lighting and thought that it was a good idea although he thought an electrician might want a surface mount conduit across the face of the building. Mr. Michael Delacruz, owner of the building, explained that the way they wired it was that it would go directly through the brick.

Mr. Almeida asked if the plate that the fixture mounts to would be flush with the building. Mr. Delacruz replied yes, that they are trying to make it look as clean as possible. He explained in detail how the wires would enter the building.

Ms. Maltese if there was any historic lighting on the old photo that the Commission viewed at the beginning of the presentation. Mr. Almeida looked at the photo and said that only lamp posts on the street that was visible in the picture.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if she was concerned with the gooseneck lighting or the sconce lighting. Ms. Maltese replied that she was concerned about both. She felt that there was lighting language for the building and could probably be found in the Portsmouth archives. Mr. Delacruz replied that he has not seen any photos of the building with external lighting.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the gooseneck lights are commercial, early 20<sup>th</sup> century design and could have been on a building like this. He continued to say that he was taken aback by the design of the wall sconce. He wondered if any other Commissioners felt the same way.

Mr. Delacruz stated that the lights were approved a long time ago. Mr. Wyckoff said that approvals last only one year. Mr. Clum said that he would have to do some research to determine the timeline.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. Katz if he remembered approving the sconce. Mr. Katz said that he didn't, but he did not have any objection to it. Vice Chairman Golumb said that he was on the Commission back then and he did not recall it either.

Chairman Dika felt a postponement was in order and that would give the Commission time to research the sconces.

Ms. Kozak said that it would be helpful to have a scale drawing showing where the gooseneck lighting would be. She pointed out that they are big fixtures and would be projecting out about two feet. Mr. Delacruz said that he has been working with Rockingham Electric and the lights are proportioned correctly.

Chairman Dika wondered if a site walk would be helpful. Mr. Katz said that that would make sense if they did a mock up. Mr. Almeida suggested getting a sample of the fixture and placing it on the side of the building.

Mr. Katz stated that the lighting would be a dramatic change to the building but he thought it would be a change for the better. So he felt the Commission should have some idea of what it would look like. Ms. Maltese also agreed that it was a change for the better.

Chairman Dika said that the date of the next meeting would be December 12 and a site walk would probably take place the Saturday before the meeting. She explained that they would like to have the dimensions of the lighting fixtures and the display cases for the next meeting.

Mr. Wyckoff reiterated that he has questions about whether the sconces have run their course and are beyond the active approval date. He suggested that they start over with the application. Chairman Dika said that they would need to verify if the approval was still in effect.

Mr. Delacruz explained that the scones were custom made, 3 feet tall and made of solid copper.

Ms. Maltese commented that the display cases would be very coveted because of their location. She cautioned the application to submit information on locking mechanisms for the cases as well.

Chairman Dika asked the applicant if she was planning to use the cases for advertising. Ms. Higgins replied no, it was for artwork.

Mr. Clum asked Mr. Delacruz if the cases and the lighting would be extending over City property. If they did, he might have to have City Council approval as well.

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 and awaited a motion.

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to the December 12, 2007 meeting with a site walk to be scheduled prior to the December 12, 2007 meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golumb. There being no discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to postpone the application to the December 12, 2007 with a site walk scheduled passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Sean M. and Lina Tracey, owners**, for property located at **24 Johnson Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations and new construction to an existing structure (expand and reconfigure front porch and deck area, expand kitchen area at rear of property). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 47 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

- Mr. Robert Rodier, architect, and Mr. and Mrs. Tracey were present to speak to the project.
- Mr. Rodier explained that the house has two gabled end forms that form the house. There is a small shed that comes off of the house.
- At the front entrance, currently there is a small entrance deck that is covered over the front door. Mr. Rodier said they would like to add a single story addition with a shed roof with the dimensions of 7'6" by 12' 6". It will serve as entranceway to the house.
- Mr. Almeida suggested mulling the windows together. Mr. Rodier said that he would like to do that, but it had been his experience that it was not an acceptable practice in the past with the Commission.
- Mr. Rodier said that they were trying to come up with a detail to hide the trash barrels. He said he was proposing a small shed attached to the house, coming out from under the windows. Mr. Almeida thought it was a fine idea, but just cautioned him to say away from the window sills.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked the height of the entryway. Mr. Rodier replied that it would have three risers. Mr. Wyckoff asked what type of column he was proposing. Mr. Rodier said that they were proposing a square column trimmed out. Mr. Wyckoff thought that made sense.
- Chairman Dika stated that she did not like the idea for the trash storage.
- Mr. Rodier explained the plans for the rear of the house. He said that they would like to add a one story addition that would come out 5 feet and extend along the back of the house 18 feet. In addition, they would like to put a balcony above it. This addition would be facing directly into the back yard.
- Mr. Almeida stated that he was did not like the mulling of the windows on this elevation.
- Mr. Rodier asked the Commission what they thought of the single story bump out with a balcony above. Ms. Maltese she liked the contemporary language coming into the historic structure. Ms. Kozak added that the massing was sympathetic to the whole scale of the design. Mr. Rodier asked about the balcony. The Commission was okay with it.
- Ms. Kozak felt that the placement of the windows and the French doors seemed disorganized with regards to the second and first floor. Mr. Rodier replied that they have problems with the sill heights causing the situation with the windows and French doors. There was detailed discussion about how to solve the situation.

- Mr. Rodier explained the third addition. He said that they were trying to get seven more feet of space to create a new hallway that will serve two of the bedrooms. It would be an ell off of the house with a covered porch on the existing deck. There would be two columns on the lower level.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that the top window on this elevation had a sill at the eave height. He suggested bumping it up and keep it the same size. Mr. Rodier explained that there was an internal reason for all of the windows.
- Ms. Kozak said that what was unusual was that the gable was not centered over the front door. Mr. Rodier explained that it was a very complicated connection. He said that he liked the asymmetrical look of the gable.
- Mr. Almeida made a suggestion for the roof line.
- Chairman Dika stated that she did not like the columns. Mr. Wyckoff said that it was extremely busy. Mr. Rodier replied that they needed to be treated very simply. There was detailed discussion about where to place the columns. Mr. Rodier pointed out that the door was centered on the lower section.
- Mr. Katz said that the model has been very helpful.
- The Commission felt the applicant was ready for a public hearing.

B. Work Session requested by **Sanders Family Corporation, owner**, for property located at **367 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing siding, restore to clapboards, reconfigure existing windows). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 27 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Kozak recused herself from the discussion.

- Mr. David Witham, architect for the project
- Mr. Witham stated that they were looking to do some cosmetic upgrades. He said that they would be addressing three sides of the building, the left and right sides and the Marcy Street elevations.
- He explained that they are proposing to remove the asbestos siding and to restore the clapboards underneath. They would remove the storm windows and put in replacement sash kits. He said that the window locations on the front of the building would be staying where they are but they will be putting in replacement windows with muntin bars to create a more traditional look. He explained that they would be custom ordered. Underneath the windows, they are proposing a panelized look with more detail.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the roofing material would remain. Mr. Witham replied yes.
- Mr. Witham pointed out that what is driving the exterior changes is that there will be a major overhaul on the interior of the building.
- On the right side elevation, they are proposing to change out the sash kits and add shutters.
- Mr. Witham pointed out that the picture windows on the right elevation would be retained. Mr. Almeida asked if there would be a sill with windows. Mr. Witham said he could do one if the Commission preferred. Chairman Dika said she would prefer a sill.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not see any left side elevation plans. Mr. Witham said he had not drawn that since it was just removing the siding and changing out the windows.
- Mr. Witham pointed out that a small shed on the second floor will be removed. It used to be a housing unit for a compressor.
- The Commission felt the changes were appropriate.

C. Work Session requested by **Jean H. White Revocable Trust 1992, Paul H. White Realty Trust, and Janet H. White-Nay Revocable Trust 1992, owners**, for property located at **13 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition, exterior renovations, and new construction to an existing structure (convert 5 unit apartment building to a single family residence



with apartment over garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 28 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

Vice Chairman Golumb recused himself from the discussion.

- Ms. Lisa DeStefano, architect for the project and Mr. Paul White, property owner, were present to speak to the project. Ms. DeStefano mentioned that ownership of the property would be changing soon.
- Ms. DeStefano pointed out that 13 Salter Street was an unusually large parcel in the South end. She said that they have a lot of approvals to go through with the project. She indicated that they had met with the Conservation Commission that morning and had received good reviews. They will be going to the Board of Adjustment next.
- Ms. DeStefano submitted a packet of plans. She explained that the building was a unique gambrel with a three story structure at the rear of the building. It currently has five apartment units. She said that the new owner would like to make it a single family residence with an in-law apartment over the garage.
- Page 3 of the plans showed some hatched areas that indicated areas to be demolished.
- Ms. DeStefano said that Page 4 showed the proposed additions to the structure. The right side addition would be a garage and would eliminate all of the parking at the rear of the structure. She also pointed out a covered porch addition on the left side of the house. There would also be a rear and deck addition on the back of the house.
- Page 5 shows the existing and proposed southeast elevation. Ms. DeStefano pointed out that they chose to eliminate the dormer above the entry and plan to center the windows on the front façade.
- Mr. Almeida asked why the small dormer was being removed. Ms. DeStefano felt it was out of place. Ms. Kozak felt it was original to the structure. She said that she saw some renderings of the house from the late 1800's and the dormer was there. Ms. DeStefano said that they would be amendable to keeping it. Chairman Dika pointed out that this was one of the most historic buildings in Portsmouth.
- Ms. DeStefano explained that they would be replacing windows throughout the building.
- Chairman Dika asked if there had been a second chimney. Mr. White replied yes and that he had helped to remove it.
- Page 6 showed the right side elevation. Ms. DeStefano said that they would be removing the ell addition and the existing back addition and decks.
- Mr. Almeida commented that there is rarely the opportunity to use 12 over 12 windows so he said to not be shy about using more.
- Ms. Maltese stated that she liked the idea of the historic part of the house having the most detail and the additions being understated.
- Ms. DeStefano said that on the interior, there is a low ceiling height on the first floor and even less on the second floor. She said that they would be dropping the first floor level 14 inches into the basement. On the second floor, they would be taking out the upper attic space to gain more volume.
- On the southwest elevation, Ms. DeStefano said the goal of the side porch addition was to allow the homeowner to feel like they are a part of the neighborhood. There is living space above it.
- Mr. Almeida stated that seeing a lot of change all at once with this property was difficult for him. He said that after seeing the plans, he sees a brand new house.
- Ms. Kozak made some comments as to the history of the house. She said that it was one of the most significant historical houses left in Portsmouth. It was a fine example of Georgian architecture, built around 1745. She said that most of the exterior material was original, the clapboards, the window frames, the casings, and the front door but some of the great features are lost. She thought it was exciting to see someone buy it and give it some attention. She explained that the house was built by Captain Titus Salter. He was active in shipping, became a commander in the Revolutionary War, and was active in local politics.

- Ms. Kozak said that there are opportunities on this property to expand and bring it into the future but she was concerned about the protection of the primary facades that face the public. She explained that she had a problem with the loss of the elevation that faces Marcy Street. She felt that the flat austere façade was the essence of the building.
- Ms. Maltese pointed out that the waterfront view was no longer historic as it had been altered. She felt that one of the defining characters of the house is the front. She added that the massing size was an issue for her.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was bothered by the garage. He said just calling it a garage was a problem. It is a 20<sup>th</sup> century addition. He would want it to look like a separate structure connected with an ell or a barn.
- Mr. Almeida agreed with Mr. Wyckoff. Mr. White said that there used to be a barn down by the water.
- Chairman Dika thought that the mass of the garage overtakes the main structure.
- Ms. DeStefano replied that they have struggled with this. She said that they have side yard setbacks that they have to get a variance for.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested a carriage house or barn structure located closer to the house.
- Mr. Almeida said that the Commission was not afraid of large structures on the site.
- Mr. Katz asked if the gambrel roof over the garage doors was necessary for interior space. Ms. DeStefano replied that it was certainly preferable. He asked if shed dormers would do as well for space. Ms. DeStefano said they could try it. Mr. Katz felt that some alternatives would be helpful.
- Mr. Katz said that they have to respect the original structure. The covered porch on the other side of the house did not bother him. Ms. Maltese thought that side was a defining character of the structure and it should remain unchanged. Ms. Kozak and Mr. Almeida agreed. Mr. Katz said that this is not a museum quality restoration. This is an individual who has decided to put his resources into a structure to meet his personal needs. Mr. Almeida interjected that he appreciated Mr. Katz's comment. He that this building might be one of the most significant pieces of architecture possibly in all of New Hampshire.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not like the roof on the rear elevation. He did not think it was appropriate at all. Ms. Kozak said that the scale of the detailing overpowered the fenestration. She added that she would not like to see it overshadow the original façade and language.
- Chairman Dika asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to weigh in on the project.
- Mrs. Elena Ewing of 24 Salter Street stated that she had a problem with the garage. She mentioned that her house was originally the living quarters for the servants working at the 13 Salter Street property. She said she was pleased that it would become a single family residence.
- Ms. DeStefano said that they would like to come back for another work session on December 12, 2007.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:45 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 December 19, 2007.