

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**7:00 p.m.**

**December 10, 2008  
reconvened from December 3, 2008**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Maltese; Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts; City Council Representative Eric Spear

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Alternates Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

A. Approval of minutes – November 12, 2008

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to approve the minutes as presented.

B. Petition of **James C. and Amy M. Baker, owners**, for property located at **75 Humphrey's Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovate outbuilding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed at the December 3, 2008 meeting to the December 10, 2008 for a Work Session/Public Hearing.)*

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

- Chairman Dika stated that the Commission had questions about how the work would be performed. She asked the applicants to explain the process.
- Mr. Baker said that they would be leaving some of the windows, taking one window and replacing it with a door, and adding some windows. Page three of the submitted plans showed the proposed windows which would have a nine over nine light pattern. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he thought that the windows were appropriate. Vice Chairman Katz asked about the sills and the surrounding trim. Mr. Baker answered that there would be 6" flat pine board trim that would be flush with the shingles. All of the trim would be uniform. Pages 5, 6, and 7 showed what it would look like.
- Mr. Baker explained that the other windows in the structure would have a six over six light pattern. The door would be a wood door with a nine light window pattern. He added that the shingles would have a 5" exposure.
- Mr. Baker offered a roof alternative which was a steel standing seam metal roof. Ms. Baker said that their first choice was still the corrugated metal roof that they presented

last week. Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that the corrugated roofing has been around for a number of years in various parts of the country. He did not think they were that prevalent here but he has seen them. He said that the corrugated roof would not be a deal breaker for him. Chairman Dika agreed. She did not think it was an unusual material for an outbuilding. Ms. Kozak stated that she was not convinced that the corrugated roof was the way to go. She said that she would be okay with a flat or folded seam metal roof.

- Ms. Baker commented that her neighbors were excited about the project. She said that they were happy with the proposal because they are the ones that will be looking at it. Mr. Baker pointed out that the building used to be used for welding and sandblasting. He thought a fancy standing seam roof was inconsistent with what the building is all about.
- Ms. Maltese pointed out that the changes they were proposing would give the building a whole different look from how it sits right now. Mr. Wyckoff said that despite what it was it was very visible now in a residential neighborhood. He said he would like to see a dulled down standing seam metal roof. Mr. Baker said that the cost of the roof would triple with a standing seam roof.
- Ms. Roberts stated that she was uncomfortable with approving a metal roof of any sort in the Historic District. She felt it was inappropriate to the District. She also pointed out that although the Commission does not have purview over color, color could play a contributing factor. Councilor Spear agreed with Ms. Roberts.
- Chairman Dika stated that she thought the Commission was in some agreement on the second choice of roof. Vice Chairman Katz agreed that he would like to see a standing seam roof.
- Mr. Wyckoff suggested to the applicants that they could put on regular shingles. Mr. Baker and Ms. Baker said that they were not excited about shingles. Mr. Baker pointed out that shingles were no more historic than anything else.

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

Chairman Dika asked the Bakers if they were going to go with the proposal in front of them. Mr. Baker replied that he wanted to put forth every component that they were in agreement on and then vote on the roof separately. Chairman Dika explained that they could not separate the application out like that. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that they could remove the roof from the application and have the Bakers come back at a later date with a roof proposal.

Chairman Dika suggested to Mr. Baker that he put forth the alternative roof material and if at a later date he wished to change it, he could come back before the Commission to request it. Mr. Baker stated that that made sense.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika 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 as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That a standing seam metal roof is used.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt the standing seam roof was appropriate for the Historic District. He felt that everything else proposed was appropriate.

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

- 1) That a standing seam metal roof is used.

\*\*\*\*\*

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

8. Petition of **Nicole R. Gregg Revocable Trust, owner, Nicole R. Gregg Trustee**, for property located at **13 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct additions on front and rear elevations, construct covered porch) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. changes to convert from multi family to single family dwelling) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 28 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Rob Harbeson of DeStefano Architects and Mr. Zachary Gregg were present to speak to the application.

Vice Chairman Katz asked Mr. Harbeson if he had made any changes to the design since the last work session. Mr. Harbeson explained that some details were in the last work session but he did not think they were noted. He also said that they have added the material descriptions at the back of the packet. Also, they have added a bit more railing on the porch by carrying it around to the other sides.

At this point, Mr. Harbeson walked the Commission page by page through the packet.

Vice Chairman Katz commented that when the Commission was on a site walk, there was talk about leaving the existing windows on the front of the house. Mr. Harbeson explained that they have decided to replace all of the windows. He added that the homeowner was not entirely sure that he would replace those windows but they decided to go ahead and get approval for them in case they did decide to replace them. He said that they would have the same mullion appearance, simulated divided lights with a spacer bar.

Ms. Roberts asked if they had Zoning Board approval for their setback on the right hand side of the structure. Mr. Harbeson informed the Commission that they did go before the board and received approval.

Ms. Roberts asked about their plans for the gravel driveway. Mr. Harbeson replied that the gravel driveway will go away and he added that they have received wetland approvals.

Ms. Kozak asked about the copper roof they were proposing. Mr. Harbeson said they did not include a cut sheet on it but explained that they would leave it as natural copper so that it would age to a green patina. The roof would also have a standing seam and not a flat seam. Ms. Kozak

asked if there would be a transition at the edge. Mr. Harbeson said that there would likely be a drip edge.

Mr. Wyckoff expressed concern for the eave detail on the garage. Mr. Harbeson said that they could carry the corner board up and the trim board down. Mr. Wyckoff felt it was a contemporary carpentry detail the way it was proposed. Mr. Harbeson said he would be happy to amend the application.

Mr. Wyckoff wondered why the cornices on the porch did not contain more detail. Mr. Harbeson replied that in looking at the rest of the house, there was almost no detail. Everything was simple, flat trim. He said it was his opinion to keep it simple. Ms. Kozak, Ms. Maltese, and Vice Chairman Katz felt it should remain simple.

Ms. Kozak asked if they were doing anything with the chimney. Mr. Harbeson answered that they planned to leave it as it is.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika 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 with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the 6 5/8” trim board on the front of the garage is carried down to the edge of the eave and that the 7 1/4” corner board is carried up to meet it. (Sheet 10, Eave Detail 2)
- 2) That the copper roof over the porch has a standing seam with a drip edge.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese commented that the application has been a long process between the applicant and the Commission. She appreciated the work that was done to leave the historical details intact. She found the contemporary addition to respect the significant characteristics of the house.

Ms. Kozak commended the architect and the applicant on a thorough job and on a long, arduous journey. She said that she was disappointed to see that there was still a porch on the end of the structure but she felt it was a graceful and delicate addition that did not hide the historic building behind it.

Vice Chairman Katz added that he was pleased that the applicant was willing to compromise when the Commission had doubts. He hoped that they were as happy with the outcome as he was.

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

- 1) That the 6 5/8” trim board on the front of the garage is carried down to the edge of the eave and that the 7 1/4” corner board is carried up to meet it. (Sheet 10, Eave Detail 2)
- 2) That the copper roof over the porch has a standing seam with a drip edge.

\*\*\*\*\*

9. Petition of **Christine A. Davidson Trust, owner, Christine A. Davidson, Trustee, and David White, applicant**, for property located at **127 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct second story dormers on left and right side elevations, construct deck on right side elevation) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace three windows on right side elevation with French doors, replace window with door on left side elevation, reconfigure and add windows on rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 54 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. David White was present to speak to the application. He explained that he was also proposing work that needed to be done on the chimney which they would find on page A-1 of the submitted plans. Ms. Maltese pointed out that the chimney information could be found on the submitted floor plan.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. White why he did not request a work session. Mr. White said that he thought a lot of the proposed changes were fairly straight forward. There was a significant amount of rot and as a result, water was pouring through the windows into the walls. He said that there was a sense of urgency with the project. Chairman Dika commented that it was a very thorough application but it was unusual to be dealing with such a large application without a prior work session.

Mr. White explained that the plan was to stay within the current site plan. They would not be requesting any variances for the project. On the side of the house, they would like to remove a small entry way. Mr. White said that on the front of the building, windows would be replaced. They will be replacement windows with no changes to the exterior trim or to the siding.

Ms. Maltese pointed out that she was not seeing any of the choices circled on any of the cut sheets. Chairman Dika asked the Commission how they were feeling about the application. Ms. Maltese said that all of the details are there its just that nothing has been chosen. Mr. Wyckoff added that he thought they needed a work session.

Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that a work session is initiated by an applicant. He said that the applicant has to say he would like a work session. There was discussion as to whether the Commission could hold a work session at the end of the meeting. Vice Chairman Katz asked Mr. White if he felt he would be capable of answering the materials questions that the Commission would have. Mr. White said his builder was supposed to be present this evening. Vice Chairman Katz recommended to the applicant that he come back in two weeks for a work session/public hearing.

Mr. White asked if the windows could be approved this evening so that he could get started on that. Chairman Dika said that the application could not be separated.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to a work session/public hearing at the January 7, 2009 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

10. Petition of **LBJ Properties, LLC, owner**, for properties located at **22-26 Market Square**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove

chimney) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (installation/replacement of rooftop mechanical equipment) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lots 30 and 30-1 and lie within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Arilda Densch of McHenry Architecture was present to speak to the application. She explained that the application concerned only the roof top. She pointed out in the submitted photos the chimney that they would like to remove.

Ms. Densch stated that photo #6 showed the HVAC unit that they were proposing to replace with another heating unit. She pointed out that page 4 showed a new exhaust fan that will be installed in the space that the chimney occupied and a new make up air unit. She told the Commission the dimensions of all of the proposed units.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission if they had any concern about the removal of the chimney. Ms. Maltese asked the height of the chimney. Ms. Densch said that it was 4' 6" high.

Mr. Clum commented that the units were not very visible from the street.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika 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. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Kozak said that you could not see the chimney except from the back of the building. She added that the mechanical units would not been seen either.

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

11. Petition of **North Mill Realty Trust, owner, and Bob Lynch, applicant**, for property located at **319 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install walls and garage doors to loading dock area, install stairs) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install door on left side of loading dock) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 9 and lies within Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Bob Lynch was present to speak to the application. He stated that he would like to install a food grade dock extension that would create a sanitary barrier when ingredient trucks back up to the dock to unload. He said that it was a requirement from a couple of regulatory agencies, one being the American Institute of Baking. Also, they would like to upgrade a metal ladder with a set of OSHA approved stairs.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any changes to the application since the work session. Mr. Lynch replied no.

Hearing no more questions, Chairman Dika 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 Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that this is a case of new technology and new standards. She added that the applicant has done little alteration to the building while allowing the health standards to be increased.

Ms. Kozak commented on the context of it being a loading dock in an industrial area. The proposal fit the setting and the intent.

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ms. Maltese made a motion to declare the public hearings closed and to move into work sessions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

**V. WORK SESSIONS**

A. Work session requested by **51 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow new free standing structures (a mixed use, multi-story building and a residential multi-story building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey, representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. She stated that this was the final work session with hopes of applying for a public hearing in January.
- Ms. Ramsey said that she would be reviewing materials and explaining a few changes to front building. She also had some elevation drawings for the Parker Street elevation which would be called Phase B.
- Page 1 showed the back of the Islington Street elevation. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the ell on the right hand side was angled. Ms. Ramsey said that it was angled to follow Parker Street.
- Ms. Ramsey said that one change to this elevation was the railing that was running along the top front floor. She felt it added a nice cap to that space. Mr. Wyckoff asked how far the precast columns projected out. Ms. Ramsey replied 6" all around the building.

- Page 2 showed the Parker Street elevation. Ms. Ramsey said that she has spoken with the developer and the contractor and they have agreed to put in actual windows and take them out carefully when Phase C comes.
- Ms. Ramsey said that she did not bring the back elevation since it has been reviewed frequently and has not changed.
- Councilor Spear asked about the transformer. Ms. Ramsey said that it had been moved. It will be more of a challenge from a construction approach. Ms. Maltese commented that the new location was a huge improvement from where it was originally located.
- The Tanner Street elevation showed the length of the building as five feet shorter than originally proposed.
- Mr. Wyckoff mentioned that he still had concern over the flat metal projecting bays. He felt they were a contemporary element. Ms. Kozak stated that she really liked them. She added that the detailing would be critical. Ms. Maltese commented that this was not an 1815 building. This was going to be built in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and she felt it was important to see the old and the new. Ms. Kozak said that it was important for new buildings to be historically sensitive but they are not reproductions. She thought that the metal panels could be the key to success in bridging the old and the new. Mr. Wyckoff asked about how water was directed away from the bays. Ms. Ramsey replied that there would be internal roof drains. Vice Chairman Katz commented that he hoped that any reservations that he has will be allayed by a sample or a picture of the material.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if they needed to see a model of the building. Ms. Maltese thought that was a tall order to ask of an applicant who has been to so many work sessions and revisions. Ms. Roberts thought the model would be helpful in getting a sense of the massing and scale within the topography of the neighborhood. Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that they have had elevations of the surrounding buildings at other work sessions.
- Mr. Dan Rawling, a member of the public interjected that he felt that the first floor had the appearance of being squashed. He wondered if the banding or the sign board could be adjusted to make the first floor appear taller. Ms. Ramsey said that the first floor double hung windows were eight feet in height and the ceilings were ten feet in height. Ms. Maltese commented that she would have concern about making a change to the sign bands.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked about the front Islington Street elevation. Ms. Ramsey said it was not in the plans this evening because nothing has changed on it.
- Ms. Ramsey showed spec sheets for the precast masonry base. She was looking at a mocha color for the base. Chairman Dika pointed out that the Commission did not have purview over color. Councilor Spear felt that the “no purview over color” applied to paint choices. He said that with some materials, you cannot change the color over time. He thought they should have purview over color with this project. Ms. Kozak pointed out that the Commission chooses brick color. Ms. Roberts thought that was an important distinction.
- Mr. Clum said that in the past, the Commission has always had the chance to view the brick and mortar samples.
- Ms. Ramsey showed some pictures of existing buildings with the materials that they will be proposing for the project. The top layer of the proposed building would be charcoal brick. She also had a cut sheet showing the metal panel product. She said they were

leaning toward the gray or smoky blue color. Mr. Wyckoff stated that the preferred more of bronze color. Ms. Maltese said that she was not happy about having purview over the color of these materials but she cautioned about choosing color by committee. She felt it would be better to have options in terms of the whole context. Mr. Ramsey said she could do that.

- Ms. Ramsey said that she would be back for a public hearing in January.
- Ms. Kozak asked when construction might start. Ms. Ramsey said that it might start by the end of the summer with Phase A.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Work session requested by **Touati and Barnes, LLC, owner**, and **Robert Dockham, applicant**, for property located at **198 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovate existing building) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new addition). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 20 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Carla Goodknight, architect, and Mr. Robert Dockham, applicant, were present to speak to the application. She stated that she would like to cover as much as possible so that they can move forward with a public hearing in January.
- Page 1 showed the footprint of the building and the planter beds that would be wrapping around the structure.
- Page 3 showed a change to the window grill pattern to a six over six pattern. New windows will be in the small gable end and at the top of the peak. Page 3 also showed the new brick planters.
- Page 4 showed the Islington Street elevation. The decks were visible in this elevation. Ms. Goodknight explained that the brick veneer would extend around the garage door openings but not around the entire foundation of the new structure. Ms. Roberts asked what the foundation material would be where there was no brick. Ms. Goodknight said it would be a concrete foundation. She pointed out that the planters would keep the visibility low.
- Page 5 showed the dormer connection. The connector piece between the old and the new buildings are dormered on one side but not on the other side.
- Ms. Goodknight presented a 3D image of the project for the Commission's review. Ms. Kozak commented that it was very helpful in showing the massing.
- Ms. Goodknight pointed out that the materials they were proposing were on Page M. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was glad that the applicant brought a sample window with him but he said that he was not 100% pleased with the JELD-WEN product. He felt it showed too many lines, especially on the top sash. Ms. Goodknight pointed out that the windows in the new structure would be quite a distance away from the street. Mr. Wyckoff felt they would be very visible on the existing structure which is located right on the street. He said he would prefer other options.
- A brick sample of Old Port blend was presented to the Commission for review.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked if the garage doors would be manufactured doors. Ms. Goodknight replied yes. He suggested a cut sheet for the public hearing.

- Ms. Goodknight stated that they would like to use a maintenance free composite material for the decking. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the railings would be prefabricated. Ms. Goodknight said that pieces of them could be.
- Chairman Dika asked the Commissioners how they felt about the project as a whole. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was happy that the existing building would be preserved. He also said that he was happy with the AR&T side of the new structure. Ms. Kozak said it looked great although she was trying to get a comfort level with the two shed dormers that face Islington Street. Ms. Goodknight said that there was probably an opportunity to move the shed dormers down a bit.
- Ms. Goodknight pointed out that the front door on the existing house was an odd size. They had not decided yet as to whether they would restore it but said it would be resolved by the public hearing.
- Ms. Maltese stated that she was still struggling with the massing of the project. She said it was such a large structure behind a small house. She added that she was very aware of the amount of work that had been done with the design.
- Vice Chairman Katz said that the project has come a long way from the first work session. He thought it was a sensitive approach to utilize the building within the parameters of the site and that one can make money with. He said money was what was driving almost all of the projects in the commercial areas. He added that he would the project.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:15 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 February 4, 2009.