

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**7:00 p.m.**

**JANUARY 6, 2010**

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

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**I. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Election of Officers – Chairman, Vice Chairman**

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to reappoint Chairman Dika as chairman for another term. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

Ms. Kozak made a motion to reappoint Vice Chairman Katz as vice chairman for another term. The motion was seconded by Councilor Coviello. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

**B. Approval of minutes – November 4, 2009**

It was moved, seconded, and passed by a 5-0 vote with Councilor Coviello and Mr. Wyckoff abstaining.

**Approval of minutes – December 2, 2009**

It was moved, seconded, and passed by a 5-0 vote with Councilor Coviello and Mr. Wyckoff abstaining.

**C. Request for Rehearing – 31 Richards Avenue, Certificate of Appropriateness rescinded on December 2, 2009 – submitted by Robert A. Ricci Revocable Trust and Elizabeth Batick-Ricci Revocable Trust**

Councilor Coviello stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion and vote.

Chairman Dika stated that the application had a railing system tied to the application as well. She said that she did not think there was an objection to the railing system, only the fence proposal, therefore, it was recommended that the Commission rehear the application and when making their motion, separate out the railing system.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the railing system was already completed. Chairman Dika did not think it had been done.

Mr. Almeida asked if this property would remain in the Historic District now that the new zoning ordinance was approved. Chairman Dika stated that all of the zoning changes the Commission recommended were adopted with the exception of the Middle Street proposal. She pointed out that the 150 foot setback would remain which would keep a portion of this property in the Historic District.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the Commission has had two lengthy discussions at two separate meetings concerning the application. He saw no new evidence and did not see any mistakes made concerning it; therefore, he would make a motion as such.

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to deny the request for rehearing. He suggested that the applicant come back for approval of the railing system.

Ms. Maltese pointed out that if they granted a rehearing, they could separate out the two projects. If they did not allow a rehearing, she wondered how they could come back with just one proposal. Mr. Clum said that they would have to reapply for just the deck railing. He added that the filing fees could be waived given the circumstances.

Vice Chairman Katz felt that they were going against procedure and that this application should have been made to the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Almeida asked if it was a mistake by the Commission to not separate out the two projects when they rescinded the Certificate of Appropriateness. He felt for that reason alone, they should rehear it and separate it properly.

Mr. Wyckoff felt it would be much cleaner to have the applicant come back for approval for the railing. He did not think it was the Commission responsibility to split the two projects.

Chairman Dika reminded the Commission that there was a motion on the table. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. Chairman Dika asked for discussion

Vice Chairman Katz recommended that the applicant reapply without a fee for the alterations to the railing system. Mr. Almeida asked for clarification. Vice Chairman Katz restated his recommendation. Ms. Maltese asked what would happen if the motion did not pass. Chairman Dika said another motion to rehear the application would need to be made and passed.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to deny the request for rehearing passed by a vote of 4-3 with Ms. Kozak, Chairman Dika, Vice Chairman Katz, and

Mr. Wyckoff voting in favor and Mr. Almeida, Ms. Maltese, and Mr. Melchior voting in opposition.

\*\*\*\*\*

D. Petition of **David J. and Vasilia Tooley, owners**, for property located at **166 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new garage with connector to house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 24 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed at the December 9, 2009 meeting to the January 6, 2010 meeting.)*

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Chairman Dika, Councilor Coviello, and Ms. Kozak recused themselves from the discussion and vote. Vice Chairman Katz conducted the public hearing.

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey, representing the applicants, was present to speak to the application. She reminded the Commission that they have had two work sessions and a site walk regarding the project. She read a summary of the work that has taken place with the Planning Department with regards to this project.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out that the new garage addition has been lowered by a foot and moved toward Fernald’s Court. She said they would be adding about 79 square feet to the existing home with the addition of the connector piece. The ridge of the new garage would align with the ridge on the front portion of the house. She was also proposing a custom garage door and Pella windows architect series.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the gutters would be matched to the existing house as well. Ms. Ramsey replied yes.

Mr. Clum asked if the architect series windows would be aluminum clad or wood exteriors. Ms. Ramsey said they would be aluminum clad and would match the other windows on the home.

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

Ms. Maltese said that this was an addition that was fully vetted by the HDC, which included a site walk. She added that it fit into the Historic District as designed.

Hearing no other discussion, Vice Chairman Katz called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Petition of **Sheri M. Keniston, owner**, for property located at **569 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (rebuild side stairs and railing, construct rear stairs and railing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 15 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Sheri Keniston and Mr. Seth Levine were present to speak to the application. Ms. Keniston stated that she would like to rebuild a set of stairs that were removed by the previous owner and also repair another set of stairs and railing on the side of the house.

Mr. Levine explained in detail the scope of the work. He said that he would like to put a more appropriate rail with balusters for safety and appearance. He said it would be constructed to meet building codes.

Ms. Maltese asked about the lattice work. Mr. Levine said that the lattice would be removed on the stairs. He added that he would be keeping the lattice skirting under the deck.

Mr. Coviello asked which type of baluster he would be using. Mr. Levine thought that the one they had chosen was 2 1/4" in width. Chairman Dika said that was satisfactory to the Commission.

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. Almeida 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.

Mr. Almeida stated that they had all of the details that they needed. The narrative was very clear about all of the dimensions.

Ms. Kozak said that it fit well with the architecture of the house. Chairman Dika added that it was an improvement.

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

2. Petition of **Catalpa Realty, LLC, Red Maple Realty, LLC, and David Short, owners**, for property located at **249 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear addition) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new rear addition, previous approval expired) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 43 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Chairman Dika asked how many Commissioners were present for the work sessions on this project. Six Commissioners stated that they had been involved with it.

Ms. Goodknight, representing the applicant, was present to speak to the application. She said that she was seeking re-approval of the unanimous approval in 2007. She explained that there have been no changes from the original application with the exception of adding the stipulations from the original approval. She said that those stipulations were that granite veneer was added to the front planter, the bronze tone metal roofing material be noted, and that the windows sills on the first and third floor windows be modified.

Mr. Almeida asked if the mechanical systems have changed. Ms. Goodknight said that they have not changed. Page 8 of the submitted plans showed the roof plan.

Mr. Wyckoff wondered why this garage was excluded from ventilation like some of the other garages that have come before the Commission. Ms. Goodknight explained that this was more of a residential garage instead of a parking garage.

Chairman Dika noted for the record that a letter from Mr. Brett Deschenes was received in opposition to the project. The Commissioners each received a copy.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

**SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Mr. Ray Littlefield of 43 Cornwall Street, was present to speak to some concerns he had. He asked if the proposed addition required any blasting of ledge. He was concerned with foundational damage to surrounding structures if blasting occurred. He also was concerned about the decrease in parking spaces. Chairman Dika explained that parking was not in the Commission’s purview. He wondered if someone has reviewed the parking issue. Mr. Clum replied that the City ordinance requires 1 ½ parking spaces per unit. Ms. Goodknight said that there would be 8 units.

Chairman Dika asked if there was anyone else wishing 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 the addition went a long way to duplicate the existing building on Islington Street. He did not see any great loss with the demolition of the back section. He pointed out that the applicant went through many meetings with the Commission in 2007. He felt it was appropriate for the Islington Street corridor.

Ms. Maltese added the building’s location was discussed at those meetings. She thought that the design was respectful to demonstrating the preservation of the historical structure itself that sits on Islington Street.

Mr. Coviello told the abutter that the questions he had would have more validity with the Planning Board. The issues would be resolved with them.

Mr. Almeida spoken in regards to Mr. Deschenes letter. He said that at the time, the Commission told the applicant how special this building proper was on Islington Street. He thought that the new designed respected it in every way, especially by keeping it down in height.

Chairman Dika commented that this was not a perfect project but the Commission worked long and hard with the architect to modify the original plan. She thought it was a good compromise and sensitively drawn.

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

3. Petition of **High Hanover Condominium Association, owner, and 93 High Street, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **93 High Street, Unit #4**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (reconfigure window locations, add new windows, entry door, and siding, reconfigure deck, misc. repairs to structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 23 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Almeida stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion and vote.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Jay Krupp, owner of the condominium unit, was present to speak to the application. He stated that he purchased the property in late November with the intention of renovating it. He

added that he was seeking re-approval for some exterior work that the previous owner had approved in 2006.

Mr. Krupp gave the Commission some background history of the property which involved a legal battle with the condominium association.

He explained that he would like to replace windows, a door, replace and repair one side wall that has sill and structural damage.

Mr. Wyckoff thought that a court battle would stop the clock on the one year time limit to begin a project. Mr. Clum said that was an excellent point and he was not aware of the situation. He said he would have to do some research on it. He suggested that they continue to review the application.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there were any changes from the original application. Mr. Krupp said there were some minor changes and he walked the Commission through the plans and pointed out the changes. He explained that the type of windows proposed has not changed and that they were planning to replace all of the windows in the unit. He pointed out that there was one window they would like to remove because a neighboring fire escape exit next runs right past the window and it does not allow for any privacy.

Mr. Krupp stated that the existing deck was rotting and so they were proposing to replace it and square it off to make it more functional. Chairman Dika asked what type of materials would be used for the deck. Mr. Krupp said that he was proposing a composite material which was requested and approved in 2006.

Mr. Coviello asked where the window that was to be removed was located. He showed the Commission on the submitted floor plan where it was located.

Mr. Coviello asked about the property line on the left elevation. Mr. Krupp replied that it was a few feet off of the building. Mr. Coviello asked Mr. Clum if windows would be allowed on that property line. He pointed out that the building code does not allow windows on a wall against a property line when the fire separation is less than three feet. Mr. Krupp showed the Commission an assessor's map showing the property line and said that there was four feet throughout the whole area between the buildings. Mr. Coviello commented that it was something to watch out for. Mr. Clum pointed out that what was important was the distance from the building to the property line. Mr. Krupp said that the building was essentially on the property line. Mr. Clum said that the building code would not allow new windows on a property line.

Chairman Dika explained that if the Commission gives approval of the application, it did not override other requirements. Mr. Clum said that the Commission could grant approval as long as they understand that a window might need to be eliminated. Mr. Krupp thought that the location in question was about 4 feet from the property line because the property line runs at an angle. He added that probably the window in question would be the one on the first floor.

Chairman Dika suggested leaving the window in the application with the understanding that it might have to be eliminated. She said that they should make it part of the motion.

Mr. Krupp said that they would be matching the existing trim and would be replacing the clapboard siding as well as adding clapboard on the left side.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Mr. Joe Almeida of 33 Blossom Street spoke in favor of the application. He stated that he owned the building adjacent to 93 High Street. The address of his building was 103-105 High Street. He said that he has been waiting a long time for someone like Mr. Krupp to come along and fix up the property. Mr. Almeida said that he did not have any issue with the window configuration between the buildings. He did question the location of the property line and had a surveyor's plan on the lot. He pointed out that the reason both buildings have suffered so much damage in the past was because a huge amount of water comes down into the alleyway and has rotted the sills in both structures. Mr. Almeida hoped that the gutter that currently runs the length of the unit would be put back in place.

Chairman Dika asked if there was anyone else wishing 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 with the following stipulations:

- 1) That any window changes on the left elevation dictated by the building code will be acceptable.

Chairman Dika asked about including the gutter in the motion. Ms. Maltese pointed out that Mr. Krupp did not ask to make any changes to the gutter so it must remain. Mr. Krupp confirmed that he would not be making any changes to the gutter.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese pointed out that the lot line did start at the corner of the building but then moves away from it as you go further back from the property. She had a concern that the proposal to replace one window with two windows on the left elevation might be a problem. If so, she hoped that the applicant would be allowed to keep the existing window. Mr. Wyckoff said that he would have the ability to fix or replace the existing window.



Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

- 1) That any window changes on the left elevation dictated by the building code will be acceptable.

\*\*\*\*\*

4. Petition of **335 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located a **335 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing fence, replace with new fence and gate) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace roof, siding, and windows, add additional insulation, remove existing gutters, add copper gutters, remove wood steps, add granite steps and railings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 26 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Kozak stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Chairman Dika informed the public that the Commission had an extensive work session on this project.

Mr. James Petersen, owner of the property and Mr. Michael Bruss of Bruss Construction spoke to the application.

Mr. Petersen explained that the roof, siding, windows, fence, and steps were in need of replacement. He said that they have already moved the overhead utilities to underground service and they plan to restore the front entrance to the building.

Page 3 showed an artist’s rendering of the proposed changes. He said that they did not want to change the appearance of the building. They were proposing a solid wood fence. They would also like to add more detail to the window headers.

Mr. Petersen walked the Commission through the elevation drawings. He pointed out that they were proposing a 6/3 window pattern on the back ell of the building.

There was considerable discussion on how the intersections of the old section of the building and the new building would be handled. Mr. Petersen pointed out that they planned to address the back section as soon as possible in the future. On the east and west elevation, there would be a setback between the renovated wall and the existing wall that would not be dealt with on this application. There was additional discussion on how the corner boards would be installed.

Mr. Petersen explained that they would also like to remove the existing fence and install a new fence in a slightly new location.

Mr. Almeida pointed out that there was concern at the work session about the overhang at the foundation. He thought it would extend over the foundation seven inches. Mr. Petersen gave the Commission some photos of existing foundations. Mr. Almeida commented that the granite foundation would now be in shadow. He said that this was his only concern with the application. Mr. Petersen stated that he shared that concern as well. He said that the photos of the foundations taken around town showed a lot of variety about how building walls met foundations.

Mr. Almeida said that some of the photos showed things that have been done wrong over the years. He asked if they had considered removing the water table all together. Mr. Petersen said that it was not considered because he liked the look of the water table but he thought it was worth considering. Councilor Coviello commented that the solid fencing and landscaping proposed would hide it. Ms. Maltese agreed that the building would look like it was floating but she did not think it was a sticking point but it was certainly worth stating. Vice Chairman Katz added that he was in favor of keeping the water table.

Mr. Wyckoff said that in the future they might be looking at another proposal like this and it might not be appropriate on another building in a different location. He felt it would work on this building. Chairman Dika added that if they approve this, they are not setting a precedent.

Mr. Petersen pointed out that they were proposing to add additional molding above the first floor windows on the south elevation only. He said it was not shown on the elevation drawings but was added to the artist's rendering.

Mr. Petersen said that they would be removing the front entrance, restoring it and putting it back in place.

Mr. Petersen stated that with the proposed improvements, they would be able to reduce the peak heat loss by 85%. He added that they felt they would improve the durability of the building by leaps and bound.

Vice Chairman Katz asked for specifications for the asphalt shingles. Mr. Bruss said that it was a 50 year architectural shingle. Chairman Dika asked if that was included in the application. Mr. Petersen replied no. Chairman Dika thought they should add it.

Mr. Almeida asked for detail concerning the fence. Mr. Petersen said that they had additional information on the fence and gave it to the Commission.

Mr. Clum pointed out that the previous zoning ordinance required that a fence on a corner lot be no taller than 2 ½ feet for a distance of 20 feet back from a street corner. He said that he did not know what the new zoning ordinance required. Mr. Petersen replied that requirement would definitely affect the fence he was proposing. Mr. Almeida wondered if the ordinance stipulated between an open fence and a solid fence. Mr. Clum did not think that it did. He added that he just wanted the Commission to be aware of the regulation. Mr. Wyckoff commented that the

applicant could simply repair the fence with like materials and still keep the fence in the current location.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what gutter fascia bracket was to be used. Mr. Petersen replied it would probably be the one labeled "Plain".

Mr. Almeida asked if the applicant should remove the fence from the application. Chairman Dika suggested that the application move forward as is and let the applicant take Mr. Clum's information under advisement. Mr. Petersen said that if the fence were not an issue, it was their plan to complete all of the work by June or July of this year. He added that they would be back for the rear portion of the building at an undetermined date.

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 with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the proposed fence will meet zoning ordinance requirements with regards to its proposed location on a corner lot.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida.

Ms. Maltese stated that she was hoping that they could look forward to more applications like this. This was a new one for the Commission at this level. She thought it was a phenomenal application and it speaks to what the Commission wants to do which is to maintain historic structures. She felt it would maintain the special character of the area for many years to come.

Chairman Dika added that it was a very exciting application. Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

- 1) That the proposed fence will meet zoning ordinance requirements with regards to its proposed location on a corner lot.

\*\*\*\*\*I

**III. WORK SESSIONS**

A. Work Session requested by **337 Pleasant Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **337 Pleasant Street**, with **Request To Postpone** renovations to an existing

structure (additions and renovations) and allow a new free standing structure (construct garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 62 and lies within General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application to the February 3, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Coviello. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Work Session requested by **South Mill Investments, LLC, owner**, for property located at **25 South Mill Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear addition) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 16 and lies within General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

Ms. Kozak stated that she would be recusing herself from the discussion.

- Mr. David Witham, architect for the project, and Jared (no last name given), general manager of the fish market and lobster pound, were present to speak to the application. Mr. Witham explained that the house was a duplex and had fallen into disrepair. The plan was to retain it as a duplex and add an addition to the rear of the structure to add additional bedrooms. He said that it would need to go to the Board of Adjustment.
- Mr. Witham stated that the proposal was to restore the front of the building back to original condition and construct an addition onto the rear of the building.
- On the front elevation, Mr. Witham explained that they would remove the siding and repair or replace the clapboards underneath. He thought they would be able to restore the original trim around the windows. He said that he was trying to locate a photograph that might show the original roof over the doorway. He sketched one out to present to the Commission. Mr. Witham commented that he had located a set of roof brackets that he may be able to use for this renovation. There was detailed discussion concerning the entryway. Mr. Witham pointed out that the front steps currently encroach on City property.
- Mr. Witham said that he was looking to replace the windows with sash replacement kits. The storm windows would be removed. He would also reintroduce basement sash windows.
- The left elevation showed a couple of existing additions. He stated that he was trying to treat the volumes of the house and the addition separately by changing the siding. He was looking to use cedar shakes on the addition to show a sequence.
- Mr. Almeida asked about what appeared to be a bulkhead. He wondered if he was going to address that. Mr. Witham said that it was not a bulkhead; it was a piece of plywood over a basement sash. He said he was not sure they would put a window there.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he thought that the massing of the addition made sense. Ms. Maltese agreed.
- Chairman Dika commented that she would like to go to the site and take a look at the situation.

- Vice Chairman Katz asked what type of material he was considering for the clapboards. Mr. Witham thought it would be either hardiplank or pine. Mr. Almeida said that they seemed to have limited success with additions that are shingled. He said that he understood the need to express the original structure but sometimes the line is crossed where the addition is such a different language that it looks awkward against the original structure.
- Mr. Witham thought the Pickering Marine building was well done with cedar shakes. He thought the cedar shakes would echo the nautical theme of the Portsmouth maritime. Ms. Maltese liked the definition of the two structures; however, she agreed with Chairman Dika that a site walk would be helpful. Mr. Melchior asked if the surrounding properties had clapboard. Mr. Witham said yes, but the house faced the fish market. Mr. Almeida commented that the shakes on the fish market were very successful. There was discussion about the aging of the shakes.
- Mr. Witham pointed out a four foot jog on the right side elevation that was currently one story and they were proposing to make it two story. Mr. Wyckoff thought it was awkward. There was considerable discussion on this detail.
- The rear elevation showed the wrapping with the cedar shakes. He said that he was forced into shorter windows to accommodate the interior use of the space.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that the whole renovation was driven by wanting to use a little bit of existing rock foundation. He wondered if the addition could be brought in a foot on each side. Mr. Witham said they considered that but it started to get very complicated. Mr. Almeida pointed out that excavation would be very difficult in that location.
- Councilor Coviello thought that holding a site walk would maybe change a lot of the Commission’s opinions because it might not even be visible.
- Mr. Almeida stated that it was very hard to alter a foundation. Mr. Witham thought that maybe the foundation had already been in place and the house was moved there. Chairman Dika said that she had thought that as well.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked the Commission if they were satisfied with the massing. The Commission was in agreement that the massing was fine.
- Mr. Almeida asked how the Commission felt about the skylights. Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that they would not want to see them on the front elevation.
- Chairman Dika commented that she was not sure if the shakes were appropriate on the addition. Mr. Wyckoff was not comfortable with the abundance of roof brackets.

\*\*\*\*\*

C. Work Session requested by **R and L Enterprises, owner**, for property located at **53 and 55 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add balcony structure) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove metal stairs, add new windows and doors, add mechanical equipment, renovate storage, add millwork at grade level). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 51 and lies within Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Councilor Coviello stated that he would be recusing himself from the discussion.

- Mr. Steve McHenry, architect, and Mr. Michael Labrie, owner of the property were present to speak to the application.
- Mr. Labrie said that the building currently houses the River House Restaurant and they would like to clean up the alleyway behind the building. He pointed out that drainage had been put in and it has been paved. They would also like to make changes to their floor plan.
- Mr. McHenry stated that the primary intent was to create a balcony that would come off of the first floor and extend over the alley. He explained that the kitchen and bar area are at the basement level. He added that they have talked with both the Health Inspector and Building Inspector about the feasibility of this project. Page 3 showed the plans for the renovations to the basement area.
- Mr. McHenry pointed out a proposed keg storage cooler area. He stated that the intent with the overall project was to make it as light and simple as possible with painted steel. The proposed keg storage cooler would be designed to be consistent with the doors and trim on the building. The brick work would be stripped and re-pointed in that area. A new gutter and downspout would be added as well as a chimney vent from the kitchen on the right side corner of the building. Mr. Almeida asked about the code requirements of the vent. Mr. McHenry said that the code requirements were distance from window openings. He said that in the past they have had to carry the vent across a portion of the sloped roof. He added that he was not sure what the height had to be but they did need a vent in that general area.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the stainless steel vent could be dark in color. He pointed out that color was beyond their purview but it would make it a lot easier to accept. Mr. Labrie stated that it was their desire to have it be darker in color. Mr. Almeida commented that the new vent at the Poco's restaurant was distracting. Ms. Kozak asked if they had explored an internal solution. Mr. McHenry replied that they have a very tight building profile and everything is built out on every floor all the way up. Mr. Labrie added that it would be very challenging.
- Mr. McHenry presented perspective views of the project. He also thought a site walk would be very helpful.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he had concerns with the cooler design. He said that he did not want it to look like a cooler. He thought vertical panels might work. Mr. McHenry talked about the possibility of an interlocking metal cladding.
- Ms. Maltese stated that she had a huge problem with the keg cooler extending out from the building. She said she would like to see them deal with the kegs internally. Mr. Almeida said that he did not share the same concern as Ms. Maltese. He pointed out that this was an important façade to the downtown and it was becoming smooth and slick and there was a danger of going too far that way. Because of that, the little expansion off of the face of it did not bother him. He added that the balcony fit beautifully. Mr. McHenry commented that the cooler was part of the overhang and not so much an extension of the building. Ms. Maltese said she would like a site walk. Mr. Labrie explained that they have explored interior solutions and they were using the only interior solution that there was currently. They would like to improve the functionality.
- Vice Chairman Katz commented that a structure with two double doors on it would be open to all types of interpretations so he wondered why it was so intrusive. Ms. Maltese and Chairman Dika both said the site walk would be important to answer that question.

- Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that balcony goes all the way out to the deck and covers the entire alley.
- Mr. Almeida asked Mr. McHenry to address the underside of the balcony at the next meeting.
- Mr. McHenry introduced Sarah Ruppel who was instrumental in producing the drawings.
- Mr. McHenry said that he would be in touch with the Planning Department about setting up a site walk before the next meeting.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:00 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 March 3, 2010.