

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

May 7, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Maltese; City Council Representative Eric Spear; Alternates Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector, David Holden, Planning Director

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – March 26, 2008

Chairman Dika asked that clarification be made on page five, paragraph seven of the minutes to reflect that the Commission voted to approve the recommendations of Bob Warner, of Merrie Sweep regarding chimney caps.

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

Approval of minutes – April 2, 2008

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

Approval of minutes – April 9, 2008

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

Jw – motion em – second all in favor

B. Request for one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for 195 Hanover Street application– requested by Parade Office, LLC

Mr. Wyckoff mentioned that it was pretty much standard procedure to grant a first extension for a project.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion. There was none.

The motion to grant a one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

C. Petition of **Riveredge Condominium Association, owner, and Tom and Susan Galligan**, applicants, for property located at **117 Bow Street, Unit A1SU**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add 20' X 22' rooftop deck, add structure to enclose access stairway) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 57A-1 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. (*This item was postponed at the March 12, 2008 and April 2, 2008 meetings.*)

Chairman Dika explained that they would hold a work session prior to a public hearing.

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey explained that she was before the Commission two months ago with the project. She introduced Joan and Arthur Jones who are abutters to the property.
- Ms. Ramsey stated that the project consisted of a roof deck and stair enclosure to access it. She said that it was suggested at the last meeting that they take into consideration some of the materials around the structure and make it more compatible to its surroundings. She explained that the owners were agreeable to the material changes but did not want to increase the size of the deck. Ms. Ramsey added that they have spoken with the abutters and tried to address some of their concerns.
- The building is next to the Seacoast Repertory Theatre and the Bow Street Inn.
- Ms. Ramsey showed the Commission the existing and proposed roof plans. The plans showed the location of the mechanicals and the vent stacks.
- She explained that the mahogany deck and the stairs would stay the same as its location is primarily being driven by the interior floor plan.
- Page 4 of the plans showed the west elevation. Ms. Ramsey said that they wanted to match some of the materials to the existing materials of the rooftop penthouse that sits beyond the proposed deck.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Clum if the penetrations through the roof which are the plumbing vent stacks would interfere with the proposed deck. Mr. Clum replied that he did not know, that the Plumbing Inspector would need to answer that question. Ms. Ramsey explained that once they have approval for the Commission, they will be looking at extending or relocating some of the vents stacks as necessary.
- Ms. Ramsey said that page 5 showed the new stair enclosure and roof deck. The roof will be slightly pitched to drain water. The eaves will be wrapped in metal and the siding will be a Centria profile product in a moss green color to match the building beyond. The rail system will be a black coated rail system to match what is currently on the existing roof and the penthouse.
- Ms. Ramsey pointed out that the eave of the penthouse is true copper that will patina. She said that they would be doing their eaves in wood and will wrap them in metal. She

added that they could paint the metal to match the siding or they could paint it a copper color for now.

- Mr. Wyckoff wondered why they did not choose to duplicate the cornice that is currently on the back addition. Ms. Ramsey explained that they were trying to keep the design simple and not duplicate on such a small structure.
- Page 6 of the plans showed the north elevation. She pointed out that the drawing showed the structure in relation to the buildings beyond.
- Ms. Ramsey said that there was concern from Mr. and Mrs. Jones that some of the views of the Bow Street Inn would be obstructed. She said that she feels the location of the structure would protect the views from their guest suites.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the Commission had a concern with using the same type siding with a different detail. Chairman Dika said that before they deal with that question, she asked if any of the Commissioners felt that the structure was inappropriate for a roof.
- Ms. Maltese pointed out that there are other roof decks in the historic district so she did not think it was inappropriate; however, she did have concern about its size and its appearance in that it was a small deck placed on a building, rather than it being part of a building.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that the vertical siding and the metal rail has taken away some of the reservations that he had initially.
- Chairman Dika asked what the enclosed stair was accessing. Ms. Ramsey replied that it accessed a foyer downstairs.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that when the original structure was added on to a year or so ago, the guiding precept was the fact that this was an industrial building and that any additions to the roof should mimic the industrial aspect of the building. He felt that that was what the applicant was trying to do with this project.
- Ms. Kozak felt that the cornice should be simple and it should not steal the show. Ms. Maltese agreed. Mr. Almeida added that he felt it was appropriate as designed but he asked Ms. Ramsey if they would consider going the extra step to make it copper. Ms. Ramsey said that they would be willing to make that change.
- Mrs. Jones asked if the Commission had any concerns about the Bow Street Inn business and the Joneses' concerns about the project. Chairman Dika replied that she did; however, the Commission could not protect views. She said that she understood that this may be hurtful to their business. Mrs. Jones said that it had been devastating two years ago with the first addition and will be even more devastating with this addition. She said that she did appreciate the fact that the applicant did not make the deck larger than it is but she still felt that their needs were being overlooked.
- There was considerable discussion with Mrs. Jones about the various views from rooms 6 and 7.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out a situation a few years ago about an applicant on Mechanic Street who petitioned to put an addition on his house and in so doing, blocked the view of a homeowner on Pickering Street. He explained that the Commission does not have a mechanism for dealing with situations like that.
- Ms. Maltese agreed with Vice Chairman Katz and spoke of the legal and economic realities of air rights.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to move into a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. The motion to move into a public hearing passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Ms. Ramsey stated that she wished to amend the application to include that the eaves would be wrapped in copper to match the abutting property.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it is an industrial building and the applicant has made a good effort to design it to fit in well with its surroundings.

The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as amended passed by a 6-1 vote with Ms. Maltese voting in opposition.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Irene Bartholomew, owner**, and **Henry Irons, applicant**, for property located at **90 Gates Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (window sash replacement) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 74 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Henry Irons, representing the applicant, was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was just proposing a sash replacement. He explained that they would be Marvin window replacements with wood exteriors and that the window trim and sills would remain the same.

Councilor Spear asked if there were aluminum storm windows. Mr. Irons said that there are existing ones but that they would be removed.

Ms. Kozak asked how wide the muntin bars were. Mr. Irons thought that they were 7/8 inches wide and they would be true divided light. Ms. Kozak mentioned that the light pattern of the muntin bars was specified in the plans that were submitted.

Mr. Irons clarified that it was a simulated divided light glass.

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 for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that she was fine with the design which recognized the architecture of the house.

Vice Chairman Katz added that in the gamut of window replacements, this treatment has in the past and should still stay at the very top due to the minimal impact on the original windows, frames and sills.

Ms. Kozak said that it was an appropriate window choice for the house.

Hearing no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

2. 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 (partial demolition) and new construction to an existing structure (repair and reconstruct garage with residence 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 was present to speak to the application. He stated that he wanted to briefly explain the evolution of the building to the new Commissioners. He explained that it was first seen in a 1920's insurance map as a glazing shop with a 10'x10' wharf extending down Custom House Court. This lot had access to Daniel and Penhallow Streets and served as an industrious terminus of Custom House Court. In 1980, the building was bought by Mr. Jay Smith. In the 1990's, the building was used as a garage. The garage was legally separated from a restaurant by Mr. Smith to another property, 49 Sheafe Street. Mr. Sobel said that in 2003, he bought the property and sought to resolve the conflict over the access to Custom House Court. He said that he purchased a narrow strip of land in front of the garage so that they would have access to it. In 2006, they started the process with the Historic District Commission to reconstruct the garage on Custom House Court as well as a smaller garage. It began with a site walk and was followed by six work sessions. Mr. Sobel stated that several suggestions were made concerning the design and as a result, the applicant retained Dean Rykerson as the architect for the project. Mr. Rykerson worked with the suggestions from the HDC to come up with final designs. He added that they had wanted to come up with a design for the larger garage that looked a little like a firehouse or a carriage house. The final design was presented and in the end, the smaller garage was approved but the larger one was not.

Mr. Sobel explained he is returning out of necessity and hardship. He explained that his property abuts 43 Sheafe Street. The property owner at 43 Sheafe Street received HDC approval for an ell addition but cannot begin work because of the Sobel's collapsing garage wall onto his property. He said that they are coming back with modifications to the original design. The proposed structure has been reduced in width by 8 feet, the height has been reduced by shrinking the cupola by at least 50%, have removed and simplified some windows, and simplified the overall design. Mr. Sobel stated that it was a 2 1/2 story structure that fits in well with the 2 1/2 and 3 story buildings that ring Custom House Court and Daniel Street.

Mr. Sobel stated that he has submitted 35 letters of support by individuals and businesses that support the project. He added that the Portsmouth Advocates support it as well.

Chairman Dika asked if the City has gone out to the property to assess the collapsing wall. Mr. Clum replied yes, that it is certainly a tired building but it probably was not going to fall down tomorrow.

Chairman Dika asked how many of the Commissioners have heard the presentation in the past. Four Commissioners stated that they were not familiar with the project.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why, with the changes that have been made, are they not having a work session. Mr. Sobel replied that the basic format of the building has not changed that much with the exception of the cupola, which he added was subject to negotiation. Also, Mr. Sobel said that they hesitated to go to another work session with such a similar design.

Chairman Dika pointed out that it was familiar to several on the Commission but for four Commissioners, it was not. She asked the four Commissioners if they felt comfortable voting in the affirmative on the application tonight. Mr. Almeida said he would not feel comfortable voting on it tonight. He added that he wants the applicant to be successful and would like at least one work session. Ms. Maltese agreed. She felt it would allow the applicant to speak to all aspects of the proposed structure. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a work session / public hearing at the next meeting.

Vice Chairman Katz commented that he has been privy to the application from the beginning. He said that he found objections to it in certain sections through the last work session. In reviewing this application, Vice Chairman Katz said that the applicant has answered most of his prior objections. He told Mr. Sobel that in his opinion, he has made progress.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the stick style was appropriate but his problem with it at the time was with the cupola. He said he would like to see more of a change to the cupola.

Mr. Sobel said that he felt the postponement to a work session / public hearing was appropriate.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to a work session / public hearing at the May 14, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

3. Petition of **Two Girls Realty, LLC, owner, and Laminda Puckett, applicant,** for property located at **261 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (signage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 34-2 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve Sanger and Ms. Karen Mazzari, owners of the property, as well as the applicant, Laminda Puckett were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Sanger stated that the wording of the request was not an accurate description of their request. He said that they were not seeking permission for a free standing structure but would be utilizing an existing sign post that is on the premises.

Mr. Sanger presented the Commission with 224 signatures from neighbors and abutters supporting the proposed sign. He said that he felt it was an attractive sign and would not create any trouble with the neighborhood.

Ms. Puckett explained that the sign would be made from MDO board with historic colors and a beige background. It would be hand painted.

Ms. Maltese asked about dimensions. Ms. Puckett said that the distance from the top of the post to the second post was 6' and from the top post out was 4'7". She added that the sign would be about 7' from the ground.

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 for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Councilor Spear asked why the Commission was approving an application for a sign. Mr. Clum explained that the Board of Adjustment required that the applicant come before the HDC.

Ms. Maltese stated that she had a concern with the phone number being on the sign. She asked if that was within the Commission's purview. Chairman Dika said that she did not think so.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that it was going to be a very attractive sign and joked that it might be a traffic hazard as people drive by and admire it.

Hearing no other questions, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Nip Lot 2, LLC and Nip Lot 5/6, LLC, owners**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish shed, loading dock and enclosure) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (change window and door fenestration) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 8 and lies within Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. She explained the plans that were submitted. Page 1 showed the aerial view and location of the site as well as the site plan. Page 2 and 3 contained context photos. Page 4 showed the location of all of the windows and door openings. Page 5 showed the existing front elevation along with drawings of the changes to the windows and doors. Ms. DeStefano pointed out that the only change that was made from the previous work session was on Page 8 where a window would be placed where the metal clad opening was. The rest of the pages showed existing and proposed

elevation drawings of the four facades as well as a detailed drawing of the entry system. Ms. DeStefano also talked about the framing around the windows to hide the cutting of the brick. She explained to the Commission how that would be accomplished.

Mr. Almeida asked what the building in the background on Page 9 was. Ms. DeStefano replied that it was a superimposed picture of the approved Westin parking garage.

Mr. Almeida asked about the drainage on the canopy on the front entrance. Ms. DeStefano explained that it had a slight slope so that the water would be pitching away from the front steps.

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 for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that this could be one of the projects where a Certificate of Inappropriateness, if they had one, might be in order. He explained that the structure did not meet their criteria but it was a great improvement. He said it will certainly not be turned into a colonial structure but added that the building looks a lot better.

Ms. Maltese said that it was very impressive that the owners will be using LEEDS certified materials. She did not think it would fall into the category of "inappropriate" as not all of the buildings downtown are historic.

Hearing no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

5. Petition of **Coventry Assets, Ltd., owner**, for property located at **10 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add glass and metal canopies above two building entrances) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 82 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. He stated that the proposal was for awnings to protect the entrances on the side of the building. He explained that Page 1 showed the location of the site and the view of the existing conditions on the corner of Church and Porter Streets. Page 2 showed the elevations that would be affected. Page 3 was a planned drawing of the first floor of the building. It also showed the dimensions of the canopies, 6'6"x 18' and 6'6"x 5'.

Mr. McHenry explained that he wanted to create something that was light, somewhat invisible, and ornamental and not of some other time period. He added that Page 6 showed the perspective views from either side which showed the mass of the awning. He also added that he wanted the awnings to look like they were floating. Page 7 showed the structural plans and how the awnings would attach to the building. In summary, he explained that the glass would be slightly green in tint so that it would not show dirt.

Mr. Almeida said that he liked the design. He asked about how the awnings would be attached to the building. Mr. McHenry explained in detail how it would be attached.

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

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that awnings were a nice innovative approach. He said he was particularly taken by the supports, rods, and brackets which offered an ornamental effect with very minimal manner. He added that it was a very tasty project.

Chairman Dika said that the minimalism of it was wonderful.

Ms. Maltese commented that the awnings would add to the streetscape and extends it in a lovely way. Chairman Dika said that it is not pretending to be something that it is not. It was a utilitarian appliance that would do what it was supposed to do without interfering with the design of the building.

Ms. Kozak said that this was a great example of how modern materials could be used in the Historic District.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he has always been pleased with the building and all of its design elements.

Hearing no other discussion Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

6. Petition of **Frank M. and Kiska B. Alexandropoulos, owners**, for property located at **699 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct 26' x 26' garage addition with living space above) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 35 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Frank Alexandropoulos was present to speak to the application. He explained that he wanted to construct a garage addition with a third living unit above.

Chairman Dika asked why he did not choose to have a work session prior to a public hearing. Mr. Alexandropoulos stated that he felt he was keeping the addition in style with the original structure and matching all of the details.

Ms. Maltese stated that due to the size of the addition, they should have a work session. She thought it would be very valuable to the applicant. Mr. Almeida agreed that a work session was needed.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. Alexandropoulos if he would be available next week for a work session / public hearing. Mr. Alexandropoulos replied yes.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to a work session / public hearing to the May 14, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

7. Petition of **Cristina J. Ljungberg, owner**, for property located at **47 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add first floor deck over existing basement level deck) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace basement door with double hung window, replace first floor window with door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 51 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. She pointed out that the only way to see the back side of the property was by the bridge on South Mill Pond. She explained that they were proposing to add a deck to the second floor level. She added that she would like to center the deck off of the existing bays. She was also proposing to take a window out and put a door in its place. On the lower level, they would like to remove one of the doors at that level and replace it with a window. They would also be adding a roof system between the upper and lower decks to prevent dripping.

Vice Chairman Katz asked what the material for the decking would be. Ms. Whitney replied that she would probably use a Phillipine Mahogany with the trim pieces being either wood or Asek which would be painted green.

Mr. Almeida said that he applauded the painting of the Asek. He asked Ms. Whitney how the ceiling on the bottom side of the deck would drain. She explained in detail how it would work. Mr. Almeida suggested using a composite sill instead of a wood sill.

Ms. Kozak commented that the columns were used in a very effective way and it did break down the scale, which was the desired result.

Ms. Whitney pointed out that the new deck would have to be set back so footings would be needed.

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 for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that it was a very respectful addition to the house.

Mr. Wyckoff added that it also encouraged the inventive use of new materials.

Hearing no more discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

8. Petition of **Nina Eshoo, owner**, for property located at **37 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows on front façade, add kitchen window, remove window on second floor, remove door on second floor and replace with window, repair roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 52 and lies within General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. She stated that with regards to the front elevation, most of the 15 or 16 windows were replaced approximately 15 years ago. She said that she was proposing to replace seven of the front windows with Andersen Woodright windows, simulated divided light with spacer bars. The exterior trim would not need to be changed. The other two windows would also be Andersen Woodright but they would be replacement windows.

Ms. Whitney explained that the two tall casement windows on the South Mill Pond elevation would be replaced with three two foot casement windows. They will be centered over the window above it. She also pointed out that when the chimney was redone, a window was left near the chimney and is currently almost total obscured by the chimney. It is currently located in a closet. Ms. Whitney said that they would like to remove it. Also on this elevation, she is proposing to replace a door with a double hung Andersen Woodright window.

Ms. Maltese asked when the last time work was done on the property. Ms. Whitney was not sure but thought it was in the 1980's. If that was the case, she did not know how it could have slipped by the HDC.

Mr. Almeida wanted to hear more about the removal of the window near the chimney. Ms. Whitney explained that the chimney was put in by the past owner. She said that there is no way to access the chimney. She said that it has never been finished on the inside as there was no real way to put a casing around it. Mr. Almeida said that he would like to see the window stay. He also expressed concern about the proposed triple casement window. Ms. Whitney thought the triple casement window was an improvement over the double casement window. Ms. Maltese asked if the windows were in front of a sink. Ms. Whitney replied yes.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not see the removal of the closet window as a great loss but he did have concern with the triple casement window. He wondered about the light pattern. Ms. Whitney said making it six panes would be acceptable to her. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the casements were simulated divided lights. Ms. Whitney replied yes.

Ms. Kozak was concerned about seeing a gap with the casement windows. Ms. Whitney said that she would use wood to fill it. Ms. Kozak also said that she had no problem with the removal of the window near the chimney. She said that the end result is what counts. With regards to the triple casement window, Ms. Kozak stated that she shared Mr. Almeida's concern because she did not like wrapping the three windows with one casing. Ms. Whitney said that they might be able to get mullions between them.

Chairman Dika mentioned that she was concerned with the symmetry of losing the window but it was not a deal breaker for her.

Ms. Maltese explained that she was aware of windows being sealed up but the window was left in place. Ms. Whitney replied that with this window, it was such a distant view she did not think it would have much of an impact. Mr. Almeida pointed out that the views from the other side of the pond are fantastic. He thought that sometimes these views are more important than the streetscape.

Mr. Wyckoff explained in detail how to keep the window but sheetrock over it on the inside.

Vice Chairman Katz felt too much time, angst, and ingenuity had been spent on saving a window that serves no function in a non historical back section of this house.

Mr. Almeida indicated that it was not a deal breaker for him either, but he was not in agreement that this was the back of the house. He felt that pond views were very important. Vice Chairman Katz said that he was not downplaying the back of the house; it was just that a lot of liberties have been taken with the house already.

Ms. Maltese stated that just because the window is not usable to the owner does not mean it does not provide balance on the back of the house. She felt it loses something with the window not being there. Chairman Dika agreed. Vice Chairman Katz did not think there was any symmetry or proportion being disturbed by removing the window.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that his approach to these types of applications is that when a professional is involved they usually have a good reason why they are asking to do something. He said that when he has doubts about something, he does not dig his heels in; he defers to the professionals.

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 for the application with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the triple casement window has the traditional six panes look and that a mullion is placed between each casement.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he felt the changes were an improvement for the neighborhood.

Chairman Dika added that she would vote in favor of the motion even though she was not in favor of the removal of the window. She felt that the other improvements were very worthwhile.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

1) That the triple casement window has the traditional six panes look and that a mullion is placed between each casement.

9. Petition of **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner**, for property located at **178 Fleet Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install cedar clapboards over existing barn board, trim out openings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 2-4 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jim Perin, president of the Jamer Realty was present to speak to the application. He explained that last year he received HDC approval to remove the barn board and expose the brick behind it. He said that when they started the process they found out that there was not a lot of brick behind it. So he was back to propose another solution. He stated that they would like to put clapboard over the barn board. He brought a mock up to show the Commission.

Mr. Perin explained that the clapboard would be cedar with a 3" reveal. The ledger boards would be 1"x 8" pine with a 2" corner board. He continued to say that under the frieze board was dentil molding and then underneath the soffit would be dentil molding.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the barn boards were solid enough to clapboard over. Mr. Perin replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff said that he was uncomfortable with what was chosen with regard to the trim and detailing. He thought that maybe it was too much.

Mr. Almeida stated there were a lot of things that he liked about the mock up but he felt that the dentil molding was more ornate.

Mr. Wyckoff thought that a work session would be helpful. Chairman Dika stated that they could adjourn to a work session right now since there was time.

Ms. Maltese made a motion to move into a work session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

- Mr. Perin asked if there was anything downtown to look at as a guide. Chairman Dika commented that it was a problematic building.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked if Mr. Perin wanted to keep the roof soffits. Mr. Perin replied yes.
- Ms. Maltese stated that the applicant's proposal looked residential and with the existing roof, they did not function together. Mr. Perin responded that the roof would be very complicated to replace.
- Vice Chairman Katz suggested the look of a late 19th century storefront similar to the South Street and Vine building, combining clapboard and panels.
- Mr. Wyckoff agreed but he still felt that the roof was a real problem.
- Ms. Maltese asked the Commission what they thought of using a more modern material on the structure, such as on the penthouse at 117 Bow Street.
- Ms. Kozak commented that whatever is done to the building has to be true to what it is. She said that there was not a lot to work with but they could find ways to improve it.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out the buildings in close proximity – Gilly's, 154 Fleet St. building which was slated for demolition, the Coat of Arms Restaurant, and the parking garage.

- Mr. Perin said that it was his intent to have the structure look like nothing around it so that it would not blend in with everything.
- Ms. Kozak thought that the materials that were being proposed were too nice. She felt that the focus should be on the storefront and the lower view rather than looking up. She added to keep it simple as well.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested bringing down a sign band below the roof that would go across the entire length of the building. Mr. Perin asked if bringing the lights down would be helpful also. Ms. Maltese suggested lights similar to the ones on the Franklin Block building.
- Vice Chairman Katz suggested treating all of the window and door openings the same. Ms. Maltese agreed that it may help. Mr. Wyckoff added that it might be a good solution to bring the window trim down to the ground with a flat panel underneath the window which would make the window and doors look like one unit. Vice Chairman Katz and Ms. Kozak thought it was a great design strategy.
- Mr. Perin said that the opening on the right could be closed up. The opening on the left was the entrance to Choozy Shoes. Mr. Wyckoff stated that the opening on the right could be closed up and a window put in. Mr. Perin suggested closing the area off and using it as a display showcase for Choozy Shoes. The Commission thought that was a good idea. Vice Chairman Katz felt it would add some sort of meaning to the façade. Mr. Melchior pointed out that if symmetry was what they were trying to achieve, it would make the sign band a little more difficult to achieve. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the sign band could be limited to just the storefront. Mr. Melchior also suggested making the clapboard exposure a little larger.
- Mr. Wyckoff advised Mr. Perin to take a look at the 304 Maplewood Avenue building as a guide.
- Mr. Perin did not think he would be ready to present his new design until the June meeting.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to the June 4, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

10. Petition of **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner, and Legends Billiards, applicant,** for property located at **80 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing patio windows with smaller, removable windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 2-4 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. James Perin, president of Jamer Realty, Inc. was present to speak to the application. He explained that when the outdoor deck was approved, it was approved for an outside bar area but because of issues with the Health Department he was not able to follow through with that plan. He said that a compromise was reached to locate the bar on the inside. Mr. Perin stated that he would like to remove the windows underneath the awning and replace them with smaller, removable windows. They would be raised up to bar height. He explained that originally he wanted to re-brick underneath but could not find brick that was a good match so instead he was proposing to use wood, either mahogany or teak underneath. It would also have a removable mullion. When the bar is closed, the windows and the mullion would be put back and locked into place to secure it.

Ms. Maltese asked if there would be a bar rail on the outside. Mr. Perin replied yes and said it would be made of either oak or teak wood. It would protrude out about 2-3 inches. Ms. Maltese asked the Commission if there were any other indoor/outdoor counters like the one being proposed. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that eventually Poco's was going to have one. Mr. Perin pointed out that the Blue Claw on Ceres Street had one.

Ms. Kozak asked what the material would be of the adjacent door frame. Mr. Perin replied that it was metal. He indicated that the window casings would also be metal to match the door casing. Ms. Kozak pointed out that drawing #4 of the plans was not applicable anymore.

Mr. Almeida stated that he felt the Commission needed more details. He said that he was trying to find a balance with this building and what will be coming with the proposed Port Walk across the street. He does not think it quite fits in. Ms. Maltese said that she did not think this was appropriate in this location. Mr. Almeida responded by saying that he did not think the Commission had purview over what the use of the space would be. Ms. Maltese clarified that she felt that the physical bar on the exterior of the building was inappropriate. Chairman Dika said that they did need to look at what the appearance will look like. She did not have an objection to its usage.

Chairman Dika thought they needed more information. Vice Chairman Katz stated that they could stipulate that the window detailing will match what is there now. Mr. Wyckoff felt that the application was very straightforward.

Councilor Spear asked how the windows would be handled to be removed. Mr. Perin replied that they would be made with tempered glass with handles on the inside that will not be visible from the outside. They would weigh about 40 pounds.

Mr. Melchior felt that they needed more information because the site could be potentially viewed by the guests of the approved hotel going in across the street.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested postponing the application to the June 4, 2008 meeting to give the applicant time to submit more information.

Mr. Perin said that he would bring with him next month a working display.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to the June 4, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. 157 Deer Street – Deer Street Associates and Public Service of New Hampshire – review of switch cabinets to determine if screening is desired.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to recommend that no screening be required at this time for the switch cabinets. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

In other business, Chairman Dika stated that she was hoping to get a report from the City concerning the plans for the Lafayette School. She said the City was also to give them a briefing on what they consider to be involved with overlay districts within the historic areas.

Mr. Wyckoff commented on the joint Planning Board meeting that was held on April 24. He was unable to attend. Chairman Dika stated that it was not a good situation. She explained that it was her understanding that the Commission would have one more meeting before meeting with the Planning Board and that Mr. Taintor would come and present a draft of the Historic District section to the Commission. She said that the draft was barely ready for review for the April 24th meeting. Because if that, she felt it was not an effective meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on June 4, 2008.