

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**July 14, 2010
reconvened from July 7, 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:

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....
IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – June 2, 2010

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

B. Approval of minutes – June 9, 2010

The approval of the minutes of the June 9, 2010 meeting were postponed to the August 4, 2010 meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

9. Petition of **Harbour Place Group, LLC, owner**, for property located at **1 Harbour Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (convert misc. windows to recessed balconies, install operable windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business A, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Bernard Pelech, representing the applicant, and Mr. Dann Bating, architect for the project were present to speak to the application. Attorney Pelech stated that they were before the Commission two years ago and received approval for balconies on the 5th floor of the building. The fifth floor was converted from office space to residential units. The balconies replaced existing windows and were recessed into the building. He said that they were now proposing to

do the same thing with the fourth floor although he pointed out that the windows on the fourth floor were rectangular where the fifth floor windows were half round.

Attorney Pelech explained that they do not know which windows would be converted into balconies. He said that the floor units were dictated by the owners and that there would be approximately 6 to 8 condominium units with approximately 5-7 balconies. He said that it would be difficult to tell them today where those balconies would be located. He could tell them what they would look like and what they would be constructed of. Attorney Pelech also stated that they were seeking approval to change some stationary windows into operable windows.

Attorney Pelech introduced Mr. Dann Batting, architect, and Mr. Dan Plummer, one of the principals of Harbour Place, LLC and stated they would be available to answer questions.

Councilor Coviello asked how water would drain from the balcony areas. Mr. Batting stated that there would be an internal drain from each balcony. They would not be drained through a scupper.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that two types of windows were being proposed. Mr. Batting replied that in the original approval, it was for the Eagle product. He said that they came back to the Commission for approval for the Unilux product because some owners preferred that window. He pointed out that the fifth floor currently had both types of windows installed. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he had some confusion with the proposal because they could not tell them which windows would be used where. Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Batting if a building should have scattered missing windows. He was referring to the balconies which would create black holes in the building. Mr. Batting replied that currently they do not have the opportunity to tell where a buyer might want to put a balcony. Chairman Dika pointed out that this may be a concern of the Commission whether the balconies are symmetrical or not. Mr. Batting told the Commission that they have one buyer to date and showed the Commission where their balcony would be located. That balcony would be located directly below the balcony on the fifth floor.

Ms. Maltese stated that she had a concern because the Commission had to look at the building as whole. She was not comfortable not knowing where the balconies would be located.

Vice Chairman Katz wondered if there could be an approval in concept of the balconies and then every time there was a definite proposal, they could come back before the Commission with the balcony locations.

Mr. Wyckoff thought that was a good idea. Councilor Coviello did not think that was the wisest use of the Commission's or the applicants' time. He pointed out that this was an old mill building and was converted into office/residential. He wondered what language they were trying to protect. He did not have a problem with the balconies but he understood the other Commissioners' problem with the fenestration. He also understood that applicant's need to have choices for their buyers.

Chairman Dika suggested that the applicant submit a plan showing where the balconies might be and then amend the approval as needed.

Mr. Almeida stated that he did not have any objections to the balconies but he said it was hard to approve the balconies not knowing where they would be located.

Attorney Pelech said that he did not have a problem with submitting a conceptual master plan and then if a unit owner would like balconies in a different place, they would come back to amend the master plan. He did not want to come back every time for every unit.

Mr. Almeida wondered if they should give the applicant feedback on patterns that they may or may not want to see. He said that he would not mind seeing balconies all over the building in a regular pattern. Attorney Pelech mentioned that when they were before the Commission with this proposal a couple of years ago, they got the feeling that the Commission did not want to see the balconies lined up vertically.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission how they felt about the proposed operable windows. Mr. Wyckoff said that they needed to make a decision about what type of windows they were going to use and in what location.

Chairman Dika stated that it sounded like they were leaning toward a postponement and the balconies and windows could be clarified at next month's meeting.

Mr. Batting said that their drawings showed six balconies, a concept layout of the fourth floor as they know it to date. He wondered if they could have the application approved as presented and then come back to the Commission when they needed to amend it.

Mr. Batting added that when they started this project, they ran into a couple of issues. He explained that the arched openings of the windows made it very difficult to make them operable. He said that the Unilux manufacturer was able to make an operable product that has an arched component to it. They are more expensive. He pointed out that on the fifth floor; there were two owners who wanted these windows. Mr. Batting said that the Eagle product had limitations as to how big you can make an operable sash. The Eagle and Unilux products were very different products. He pointed out that the photo of the building taken from Memorial Bridge showed both types of windows on the fifth floor.

Mr. Almeida commented that they would be hard pressed to tell the difference. He did think the Commission should approve one or both of the windows. Mr. Batting said that they were seeking approval of both to give them the opportunity to offer both to potential buyers.

Councilor Coviello asked if they were only talking about the windows within the recessed balconies. Mr. Batting replied no, they were seeking approval for all of the windows.

Ms. Maltese pointed out that some of the windows had awnings and some did not. She asked if that was a way to tell the difference between the two windows manufacturers. Mr. Batting said yes.

Ms. Maltese asked if they were seeking approval for the fifth floor windows or the fourth floor windows. Mr. Batting explained that they already had their approval for the fifth floor; they were now seeking approval for the fourth floor. Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that the fourth floor had rectangular openings.

Councilor Coviello asked what the benefit would be with the Unilux window since it does not have the arch. Mr. Batting explained in detail how the Unilux window operated. Councilor Coviello asked if the entire fourth floor windows would be replaced. Mr. Batting replied yes, as they complete it out as finished project.

Ms. Kozak suggested that since the Commission has approved both types of windows and the balconies in the past, that they approve the application as drawn on the submitted plans.

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 as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff.

Mr. Almeida asked of clarification of the motion to mean “as drawn” rather than “as submitted.”

Ms. Maltese restated her motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as drawn.

Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that this was echoing something that the Commission has already approved.

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

10. Petition of **Piscataqua Savings Bank, owner**, for property located at **15 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install generator) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 32 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Richard Johnson of Pine Brook Corporation, representing the applicant, was present to speak to the application. He stated that the bank would like a standby generator for emergency use. He said that they have provided pictures to show the proposed location which was on the roof. He

pointed out that the generator would be behind a parapet wall and only about 25-28 inches of the generator would be seen.

Mr. Almeida asked if there would be any curbing that the unit would be sitting on. Mr. Johnson said that there were steel beams that it would sit on and that height had been taken into consideration.

Mr. Almeida asked if they had considered rotating the unit to pull the generator back further from the parapet. Mr. Johnson replied yes but said that it created a worse condition with exhaust.

Mr. Almeida wondered if a rail would be required. Mr. Clum stated that a guard rail would be required if the servicing person would be six feet or closer to the roof edge. Mr. Johnson said that they could slide the unit to the left to meet that concern. There was considerable discussion concerning the new location of the generator.

Mr. Johnson stated that they were now proposing to move the generator to meet the six foot requirement of the mechanical code. He added that if they could not meet that requirement, they would come back to the Commission to propose a railing.

Councilor Coviello said that if the unit had to be flipped to meet the requirement, he was not satisfied with the way it would look.

Ms. Kozak asked what color the generator would be when installed. Mr. Johnson said that it would be beige in color but they had talked about painting it brick red.

Councilor Coviello asked if there was a distance requirement from the existing condenser. Mr. Johnson said no, not that he was aware of.

Mr. Melchior asked about white flanges and asked if they would be visible. Mr. Johnson replied no.

Mr. Almeida asked that if a railing was required, would it be installed on top of the parapet wall. Mr. Johnson replied yes. Mr. Almeida said that they would need to have Mr. Johnson specify what the railing would look like. Mr. Johnson said that a single pipe rail would work.

Mr. Almeida stated that he was comfortable with allowing some type of a pipe rail on the building. Mr. Wyckoff said he was not comfortable with it.

Mr. Johnson said he would be happy to work with Mr. Clum to meet the requirements.

Councilor Coviello stated that this was a dark alley but very well kept. He said that he did not want to change it into an area where everything is vented into it. He pointed out that the alleyway was used frequently. Mr. Johnson pointed out that this was a standby generator.

Chairman Dika stated that this was becoming a work session. She asked for a proposal that the Commission could vote on.

Mr. Johnson said that he would work with the building department to satisfy the six foot code clearance and further slide everything to left as far as they can to satisfy Councilor Coviello's concern.

Mr. Melchior stated that the drawings did not show a beam that was inset into the masonry. He said he wanted to be assured that when he walks through the alley, he was not going to see ends of white flanges. Mr. Johnson stated that to avoid that, they could redesign it. He explained in detail how it could be done.

Chairman Dika felt they needed to postpone the application so that the applicant could work out the details.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to postpone the application to the August 4, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilor Coviello. The motion to postpone the application to the August 4, 2010 meeting passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

11. Petition of **Gary S. and Margaret E. Hatch, owners**, for property located at **19 Ball Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (raise roof height, add rear addition, misc. changes to façade and windows) as per plans on file in Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 52 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

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

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Joe Paquet, contractor for the project, and Mr. Gary and Ms. Margaret Hatch, owners of the property were present to speak to the application. Mr. Paquet stated that they would like to raise the roof structure and change the roof pitch from a nine pitch to an eight pitch to allow full head room on the second floor. He also said they would like to remove a rear deck and put a small addition with a small overhang and small entry porch in its place. The existing siding would be replace with cedar clapboard siding, they would return the corner boards and trim details to the exterior of the windows, and replace all of the windows.

Chairman Dika asked what windows they would like to use. Mr. Paquet said that they would like to use Pella Proline series windows.

Mr. Paquet showed the Commission elevation drawings of the project on a large projector screen.

Mr. Hatch stated that the home was smaller than a two car garage. He explained the difficulties with the home. He said that from the work session was borne the plan that was before the Commission. He felt that they now had a plan that they liked and was consistent with the neighborhood.

Ms. Hatch said that house had a mishmash of original, casement, and replacement windows. She said that they would like to use the Pella Proline series window because it had a grill on the inside and the outside of the window. It had a vinyl clad casing over the wood and would be a six over one window pattern.

Chairman Dika said that she was surprised that they did not come back to the Commission for another work session. Ms. Hatch stated that she thought this was going to be a work session/public hearing. Chairman Dika stated that she recalled that discussion at the last meeting.

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

WORK SESSION

- Ms. Kozak asked if the origin of the house was known. Ms. Hatch said that she did know it was built in the early 1900's and that at some point in time, there was an addition to the house.
- Mr. Almeida asked about the eave details and gutters. Mr. Paquet stated that they were not shown because that was a limitation of the software he used. He said there would be those details. Mr. Paquet said there would be gutters as well.
- Mr. Almeida asked if there was any railing details to review. Mr. Paquet replied that the railing would match the existing. It would be of a composite material and painted white to match the door.
- Ms. Maltese wondered why the applicants did not choose the two over one window pattern. Mr. Hatch said that all of the window patterns in the neighborhood were two over one. Vice Chairman Katz commented that he thought the six over one window pattern was the typical cottage style and that it was appropriate to this application.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the Azek would have a smooth finish. Mr. Paquet replied yes.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the chimney would be extended. Mr. Paquet said that they would like to keep the chimney as is and possibly corbel it to a slightly different location. Chairman Dika said that if it was going to moved, they would need to know where it was going to be moved to. Mr. Paquet said it would only be moved about an inch or two. Mr. Almeida asked if the new chimney would match the existing. Mr. Paquet replied yes.
- There was considerable discussion concerning the window sizes on the second floor.
- Mr. Almeida asked if they were proposing front steps. Ms. Hatch said they would retain the existing granite steps.
- Mr. Paquet stated that they were planning to install a detailed molding around the front windows.

Hearing no other discussion, the Commission moved into a public hearing.

Mr. Paquet stated that he would like to amend the design to include the following:

- 1) That a brick chimney will be maintained.
- 2) That the gutters will match the existing gutters in size.
- 3) That the current overhangs will remain the same size and that a frieze board will be added below the overhangs.
- 4) That the front rakes and fascia boards will have 1"x 3" shadow board detail.
- 5) That the front window casing detail will have a cove molding that will sit above the head casing.

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 for the application with the following amendments:

- 1) That a brick chimney will be maintained.
- 2) That the gutters will match the existing gutters in size.
- 3) That the current overhangs will remain the same size and that a frieze board will be added below the overhangs.
- 4) That the front rakes and fascia boards will have 1"x 3" shadow board detail.
- 5) That the front window casing detail will have a cove molding that will sit above the head casing.

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

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the project maintained the character of the area and was an improvement to the building.

Chairman Dika commented that it was sad to lose a cute little cottage but she understood that the applicants had to live in it.

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

- 1) That a brick chimney will be maintained.
- 2) That the gutters will match the existing gutters in size.
- 3) That the current overhangs will remain the same size and that a frieze board will be added below the overhangs.
- 4) That the front rakes and fascia boards will have 1"x 3" shadow board detail.
- 5) That the front window casing detail will have a cove molding that will sit above the

head casing.

12. Petition of **Peirce Block Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **3 Market Square**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace misc. **Withdrawn** Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 17 and lies within Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

This application was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

13. Petition of **Two Bow Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **2 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace trim and siding on dormers with composite materials, replace shingles and flashing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 23 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. J. P. Brown, contractor for the project was present to speak to the application. He stated that the five doghouse dormers on the building were run down and in need of repair. He said he would like to strip them down, put in proper flashing, replace the shingles, remove the trim, replace it with Azek, and replace the siding with composite siding.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the copper was to remain. Mr. Brown replied yes.

Mr. Wyckoff thought that the peak of the dormers looked awkward. Mr. Brown said that he would use MDO or MDF in the peak and would use Azek for the trim.

Mr. Almeida asked if the flashing would be exposed. Mr. Brown said there would be about a two inch exposure and the flashing would be copper.

Councilor Coviello asked about the flashing in the peak area. Mr. Brown explained in detail how it would be accomplished.

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. Almeida made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kozak.

Mr. Almeida stated the applicant has given details on how the project will be accomplished. He said that these were important dormers in the Historic District and he was glad that they were getting attention.

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 stated that it was important to have the actual measurements and details concerning all projects in order for the Commission to make their decisions. She said that photos are nice but the details are much more helpful. She felt they have gotten bogged down this evening trying to get the details of some projects. Mr. Almeida agreed.

14. Petition of **Kristin Alexander, owner**, for property located at **64 Mt. Vernon Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove side steps) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct deck and stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 30 and lies within General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Kristin Alexander, owner of the property and Mr. Tom Herman, contractor for the project were present to speak to the application. Ms. Alexander stated that she would like to remove the rotting entrance to her home and construct a deck. She pointed out that the plans were drawn to scale. She said that she would like to use a composite material because the deck would be set back quite far from the street.

Ms. Kozak asked if the deck would be located on the side of the house. Ms. Alexander replied yes. Mr. Almeida commented that it was a very prominent view of the house as one drives up the street. He felt it was very clearly visible. Ms. Alexander said that it was set back from the road.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission how they felt about the railing system. Mr. Almeida said the existing railing was very traditional. He added that the deck system seemed very large to him.

Mr. Almeida asked if the structure beneath would be visible. Mr. Herman said that the posts would be exposed. He explained that there would be a few steps down to the deck which would be 30 inches off the ground.

Councilor Coviello commented that it appeared that the posts would be blocking windows. Mr. Herman said that the exact locations of the posts were not accurate in the submitted plan. He had an additional plan that showed the accurate locations.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be any lattice work or shielding and if so, where would it be located. He was concerned about the visibility of the posts. Mr. Herman said that there was overgrown vegetation to shield the posts. He said that he would rather not have lattice. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the right hand side of the stairs would have lattice. Mr. Herman replied yes and it would look like the existing porch area.

Mr. Wyckoff pointed out that on the left side of the structure; the posts were seven or eight feet high. Mr. Herman said that they were less than seven feet. He added that that section of the deck was not visible from the street.

Mr. Almeida wondered if site visit would be helpful. He said that the house was of a very high quality and was beautifully sited on the street and the addition of this deck style porch that was open below was not in keeping with the character of the house.

Chairman Dika stated that she had concerns about the design of the deck. She suggested a work session and site walk.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that the angles and the various levels of the deck gave it a contemporary look.

Ms. Alexander suggested that they postpone the application so that a site walk and work session could be scheduled.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to postpone the application for a site walk and a work session/public hearing at the August 4, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. The motion passed by unanimous (7-0) vote.

15. Petition of **Strawbery Banke, Inc. owner**, for property located at **55 Atkinson Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood shake roof with asphalt roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 10 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

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

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Rodney Rowland, director of facilities and special projects at Strawbery Banke was present to speak to the application. He stated that this building was attached to another building that currently had architectural asphalt shingles. He said that they would like to match this roof to the attached building and two other buildings within close proximity of the structure. Mr. Rowland walked the Commission through the submitted plans.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that he remembered when the front building received approval to the remove the cedar shakes and replace them with asphalt.

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

Councilor Coviello made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Councilor Coviello stated that this was where the reality of cost meets the reality of what we want. He said they probably all wanted to see wood shakes here but if that was a requirement of the City, they would probably see buildings deteriorating because of costly repairs. He felt the applicant would probably like to see wood shakes also but there was the reality of cost.

Chairman Dika said that looking at the two facades with one building having asphalt shingles and the other having cedar shakes; she could see the architectural beauty in the quality. But the reality was that the two buildings were attached. She added that maybe some of them regret the vote allowing the asphalt on the first building but practicality was such that she would not vote against the motion.

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 vote of 5-2 with Ms. Maltese and Mr. Wyckoff voting in opposition.

16. Petition of **Stephen C. Smith, owner**, for property located at **46 Park Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct deck with stairs) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows and door, replace window with French doors, add railings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 43 and lies within General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Paul Stone, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. He stated that they would like to construct a 24'x24' deck with railing. They would also like to replace all of the windows in their existing frames. They would also like to add two French doors.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that this was a big project which he felt should have a site walk and work session. Chairman Dika commented that it looked like the applicant was already underway and this was the first they were seeing it. Mr. Stone explained that they received a demolition permit and a permit to begin work on the interior.

Councilor Coviello agreed that a site walk with a work session/public hearing would be helpful.

Mr. Stone stated that he was agreeable to a postponement for a site walk and work session/public hearing at the next meeting.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Coviello made a motion to postpone the application to the August 4, 2010 meeting for a site walk and work session/public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

VI. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

B. Work Session requested by **Nicholas Gegas Revocable Trust 2007, Nicholas Gegas, trustee, owner**, for property located at **128 Penhallow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to the front façade). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 21 and lies within Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Mr. Wayne Rawley, architect for the project and Mr. Larry Dukes, contractor for the project were present to speak to the application. Mr. Rawley discussed all of the changes made to the design since the last work session.
- He pointed out that the wood structure to the right of the main structure would be clapboarded to look like a townhouse. He also added wooden shutters to the second story windows. The front wood columns would have a bronze finish.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the wood shutters would be hung properly. Mr. Dukes said yes and added that they would use the curved hangers.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the columns were on the same plane as the storefront. Mr. Rawley replied yes. There was discussion on granite columns. Mr. Rawley stated that their preference was wood columns.
- Mr. Rawley commented that the Commission had an objection to one long awning. He was now proposing an awning just over the door. Mr. Almeida thought it was a much nicer look. Mr. Rawley said that the awning was retractable.
- Mr. Dukes pointed out that there will be areas where brick is removed. They plan to use that brick in other areas.
- Mr. Rawley said that they would be putting the basement windows back in. They would like to reuse the granite lintel over the basement windows.
- There was discussion as to whether the new brick sidewalks would extend in front of the building because of the City's budget concerns. Councilor Coviello confirmed that the brick sidewalks would continue in the downtown.
- Chairman Dika complimented Mr. Rawley for a very successful rendering. She thanked them for listening to the Commission's concerns.
- Mr. Dukes explained how the vents would be installed. He said that the venting would not be seen from the alley. They would only be seen behind the building. He said he would bring some photos of them to the public hearing.

C. Work Session requested by **Houston Holdings, LLC**, for property located **653 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 164 as Lot 5 and lies within the Business and Historic A Districts.

- Mr. Dan Houston, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that his business was in need of more storage space because the City has asked him to removed two storage containers on the property. He explained that the addition would be on the left side of the building and would be an increase of 496 square feet. The shaded area in the plan showed the expansion.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the addition would be a continuation of the same siding, roof details, and colors. Mr. Houston replied yes.
- Chairman Dika complimented Mr. Houston on doing a nice job fixing up the building.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that it was a nice addition. He added that they would need details on the doors, light fixtures, the glass, and awning when he comes for a public hearing. Mr. Houston said that the doors and windows would match the existing ones on the building.

D. Work Session requested by **Elisabeth H. Blaisdell, owner**, for property located at **77 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 50 and lies within General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Elisabeth Blaisdell, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. She stated that the existing barn was rotting, had broken glass and the roof was leaking. She did not think that a lot of the structure could be salvaged. She was proposing to tear it down and build a new garage to serve as storage space and a studio with an indoor/outdoor fireplace and photovoltaic panels. Ms. Blaisdell pointed out that the barn was right on the property line and she would like to keep the same footprint. She said that keeping the same footprint would probably require Board of Adjustment approval.
- Ms. Kozak asked how tall the structure would be. Ms. Blaisdell said it would be 23 feet high to the peak. The existing structure was currently just a little over 10 feet. Vice Chairman Katz asked about the height of the neighbor's barn. Ms. Blaisdell said her barn would not be as tall as the neighbors.
- Ms. Maltese commented that she thought Ms. Blaisdell would have some hurdles to overcome. She was not quite sold on a garage of that size. Vice Chairman Katz observed that he would consider it a barn instead of a garage.
- Mr. Wyckoff thought a site walk would be helpful but he felt that was a bit premature until Ms. Blaisdell went before the Board of Adjustment.
- Mr. Almeida commented that he was not hearing any resistance to the solar panels. He also said that height could be an issue. Ms. Maltese said a site walk would help with dealing with the height issue.

- Ms. Blaisdell pointed out that the fireplace with a chimney would be a new feature. Ms. Kozak commented that it was unusual and was not of that time period. She felt it was not in keeping with the house.
- Ms. Maltese said that she was comfortable with the removal of the existing barn. Mr. Wyckoff said that he would be more comfortable after a site walk.
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that some applicants go around the City and take pictures of design element that they would like to use.
- Chairman Dika pointed out that there seemed to be a division between the Commission as to whether the massing was okay.
- Vice Chairman Katz commented that he felt the fireplace and chimney was too much. Chairman Dika agreed.
- Mr. Almeida also pointed out that windows were not allowed on a property line unless they have fire rated glass. He said that if she wanted windows, she would have to pull the structure back three feet.

E. Work Session requested by **Craig W. Welch and Stefany A. Shaheen, owners**, for property located at **77 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (additions) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 48 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 7, 2010 meeting to the July 14, 2010 meeting.)*

- Mr. Robert Rodier, architect for the project, and Mr. Craig Welch and Ms. Stefany Shaheen, owners, were present to speak to the application. He stated that they have made a change to the roof line since the last work session. He explained that they have reduced some square footage which resulted in a change to the exterior look.
- Mr. Rodier stated that they would like to propose the Andersen 400 series window. Ms. Maltese said that it was a window that has been approved in the past. Mr. Rodier asked if they were open to the vinyl version. Ms. Kozak stated that it should be vinyl clad. Mr. Rodier added that they would like to use ½ screens with the windows. He also showed the Commission cut sheets for the French doors.
- Mr. Rodier told the Commission that the wall inside the carport would not be stone but would be smooth exterior stucco. Mr. Almeida asked if the stone pilasters would be proud of the stucco. Mr. Rodier replied yes and would probably be proud by about eight inches. Chairman Dika thought the stucco idea was a good solution.
- There was considerable discussion about where the existing vinyl siding would leave off and the new clapboards would begin.
- Councilor Coviello asked about an awkward area on one part of the roof. Mr. Rodier explained that there would be a cricket to remedy it.
- Ms. Kozak asked about the stone work, its thickness and cut and how they anticipated wrapping the corners. Mr. Rodier commented that it would not be easy finding suppliers. He said that this was becoming more of a spring project and that they would be looking for suppliers all fall and winter. Mr. Rodier showed the Commission a photo of what they would be trying to replicate with the stone. He added that if they could not find that type of stone, they would come back to the Commission with a change.

- Mr. Almeida told Mr. Rodier that his public hearing submissions should include elevation drawings highlighting what was new and what was existing.
- Councilor Coviello asked what the railings would look like. Mr. Rodier said it would be simple wood design with square posts.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:20 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 September 8, 2010.