

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

AUGUST 4, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members Tracy Kozak; Alternates Joseph Almeida, George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: John Wyckoff, Elena Maltese; City Council Representative Anthony Coviello

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – June 9, 2010

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (5-0) to approve the minutes as presented.

B. Petition of **Rockingham House Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **401 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace gutter and roof) in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 3 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The application was withdrawn at the applicant's request.

C. 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.
(This item was postponed at the July 14, 2010 meeting to the August 4, 2010 meeting for a work session/public hearing.)

WORK SESSION

- Mr. Richard Johnson of Pine Brook Corporation was present to speak to the application. He stated that he had come before the Commission last month to propose a generator and

possible screening. He passed out a rendering showing the extension of a brick wall to provide screening of the generator. He explained that it would not be seen from the rear parking lot. They have been working with the Planning, Fire, and Inspection Departments to address all code issues.

- Mr. Almeida commented that it was a clever idea. He asked if it was possible to take the cap all the way up so that there would not be two caps. Mr. Johnson said that they liked the look; it gave it more character and structural integrity.
- Mr. Almeida asked what the height of the wall would be. Mr. Johnson answered the new brick would be somewhere around five to six feet. Mr. Almeida pointed out that the Commission would need an exact height. Mr. Johnson said it would not be any higher than six feet.
- Mr. Almeida asked how they planned to match the brick. Mr. Johnson said it would be as close of a match as they can buy.
- Ms. Kozak asked what the capped material would be. Mr. Johnson said it would be cast concrete and would be painted.

Hearing no other questions, the application moved into a public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Johnson proposed to extend the existing masonry wall using brick to match, the new wall to sit on top of the existing coping stone with new cast concrete coping stone painted to match the brick. The height would be six feet above the existing coping.

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 amended with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the existing brick masonry wall will be extended six (6) feet above the existing coping using bricks to match the current condition.
- 2) That the new brick masonry wall will sit on top of the existing coping stone.
- 3) That the new cast concrete coping stone will be painted to match the existing brick color.

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

Mr. Almeida felt it was a clever solution to hiding mechanical units in and around Market Square.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as amended with the following stipulations passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote:

- 1) That the existing brick masonry wall will be extended six (6) feet above the existing coping using bricks to match the current condition.
- 2) That the new brick masonry wall will sit on top of the existing coping stone.
- 3) That the new cast concrete coping stone will be painted to match the existing brick

D. 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. *(This item was postponed at the July 14, 2010 meeting to the August 4, 2010 meeting for a work session/public hearing.)*

Chairman Dika informed the public that a site walk was held prior to the meeting.

WORK SESSION

- Ms. Kristin Alexander, owner of the property and Mr. Tom Herman, contractor for the project were present to speak to the application.
- Mr. Herman explained that they would put lattice on the front side of the deck. He wondered what the Commission thought of the composite sleeves for the railing. Chairman Dika wondered if there was a better solution. Ms. Kozak thought the detailing on it was very nice. Mr. Herman said that from a distance it looked beautiful. It would not warp or split.
- Mr. Almeida commented how appropriate the existing entry stair was. He wondered if that design could be rebuilt in kind or as close to it as possible. He added that it was hard for him to accept such a huge deck coming off of it. Mr. Herman said that he could make it the same; however, the railing was a very traditional railing. He explained that he could mirror the railing to match the front porch railing. Mr. Almeida said that he wanted to hear what other Commissioners had to say but he felt the railing that existed now was a far more appropriate design for the area.
- Mr. Herman said that he would like to build a stronger railing system around the area with the sheer wall. There was detailed discussion on what type of railing system would be appropriate looking. Vice Chairman Katz asked if the existing railing would remain and the new railing would co-exist with it. Mr. Herman stated that his first choice would be to build all new railings. Vice Chairman Katz said that was good with him.
- The Commission then discussed the cantilevering of the deck and the size of the deck. Mr. Almeida did not think there was an example of this type of deck anywhere in the Historic District. Ms. Kozak pointed out that it was not fronting the street and it was not the formal front of the house. She felt the deck was appropriate. She was concerned; however, with closing in the bottom of the deck because at eye level, one will be looking underneath it. Mr. Herman showed the Commission where he would be willing to put lattice work. He wondered if the Commission would be open to setting the lattice in a foot or two. Mr. Almeida thought it would look awkward. He preferred that the lattice

on the front of the house was replicated. Vice Chairman Katz asked why not lessen the deck space. Mr. Herman explained that eleven feet was the minimum measurement to put a table on and if he did that, he would have a lot of unusable space.

- The Commission came to an agreement about the location and application of the lattice.

At this point, the Commission held a public hearing on the application.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Kristin Alexander, owner of the property and Mr. Tom Herman, contractor for the project spoke to the application.

Mr. Herman stated that the lattice work would be modified and would be placed on the front of the house that was exposed to the street and also in four other locations on the proposed deck. The lattice would match the existing lattice.

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 with the following stipulation:

- 1) That lattice, in the same configuration and matching the existing lattice, will be installed on the front of the deck structure (facing the street) and in four additional locations on the deck.

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

Ms. Kozak stated that she thought the new deck would enhance the use of the property without causing any detriment to the District or the surrounding properties.

Vice Chairman Katz added that this was an example where a site walk was very helpful.

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 stipulation passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote:

- 1) That lattice, in the same configuration and matching the existing lattice, will be installed on the front of the deck structure (facing the street) and in four additional locations on the deck.

E. 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. *(This item was postponed at the July 14, 2010 meeting to the August 4, 2010 meeting for a work session/public hearing.)*

WORK SESSION

- Ms. Rosemary Finn, co-owner of the property and Mr. Paul Stone, architect for the project were present to speak to the application.
- Chairman Dika stated that the Commission had a site walk prior to the meeting.
- Mr. Stone explained that the scope of work included a new railing on the front porch, a new 16'x 24'6" side deck, new windows, and French doors.
- Ms. Kozak pointed out that this house was on the fringe of the district. A little corner of the lot was in the District. She said that the house could not be seen from Middle Street so she was not giving this house as much scrutiny as she would other homes on primary streets. She added that the details should fit with the period of the house. Mr. Stone said that the house was built in 1900.
- Mr. Melchior asked how this property compared to the Richards Avenue property that also was partially in the Historic District. He pointed out that they gave that application a great amount of scrutiny. Vice Chairman Katz thought that maybe the reason for that scrutiny was that the houses on that street were essentially of the same era. He felt that this house on Park Street did not draw upon much to determine its characteristics.
- Chairman Dika felt that they should place the same amount of scrutiny on all houses that are in the Historic District.
- Chairman Dika commented that she did not see anything in the proposal that she objected to except that she would like to see a square window in place of the proposed octagonal window. Ms. Kozak said that a round window would be appropriate as well. Mr. Stone explained that they would like a window that was operable. He found a round window without a grill that would work.

At this point, the Commission held a public hearing on the application.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Paul Stone stated that he was proposing to remove existing windows and add new windows, add a new railing to the front porch, construct a new deck, and replace the octagonal window with a round functional window.

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 with the following stipulation:

- 1) That a round window without a grille will be used instead of an octagonal window.

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

Mr. Almeida stated that he felt these were appropriate changes to the structure.

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 stipulation passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote:

- 1) That a round window without a grille will be used instead of an octagonal window.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **HarborCorp, LLC, owner**, for properties located at **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a one year extension of a Certificate Appropriateness where a one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness has already been granted. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plans 118, 125, and 124, as Lots 28, 21, and 12 and lie within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney Malcolm McNeill, attorney for the applicant was present to speak to the application. He stated that this was a project of significant size and described the scope of the project. He also said that this project has been before every Commission in the City of Portsmouth and perhaps before every court in the state of New Hampshire. He stressed that the applicant was before them because they wish to do this project but the capital markets that are available for a project of this size could not provide the financing at this time. He pointed out the current conditions of the commercial and real estate markets.

Attorney McNeill explained that one year ago, he was before the Commission to request a one year extension which is almost always granted. He said that they received that extension and it was in effect through October 8, 2010. They are before the Commission again because the markets are still such that they will not be able to start the project before October 8, 2010. Attorney McNeill explained that they have also requested an extension from the Planning Board which will be heard in August and September at public hearings.

Attorney McNeill told the Commission that the reason they do not have any materials before them was because the applicant was not planning on changing a thing that was previously approved. He pointed out that two of the Commissioners in attendance this evening were part of

the approval process. He also pointed out that the project has been tied up for a year and a half in court and now they find themselves in the middle of a recession. He said that they were now asking for one an extension until October 2011.

Attorney McNeill stated that the zoning ordinance did not provide for any criteria for the Commission’s actions. He explained that the Planning Board would be determining whether there has been a material change in circumstances that affects traffic flow, pedestrian safety, drainage, water availability, sewer capacity, design standards, and landscape elements in zoning compliance.

He also pointed out that in 2009, the State Legislature, in a very unusual act, extended the time period to vest projects that were approved during the same time period as the HarborCorp project. In the past, the State legislation allowed a one year vesting of a project and now the new ruling is three years. Previously, the project had to complete permanent vesting in four years but has now been extended to six years. He felt that action taken by the State was in response to the recessionary characteristic of the current marketplace.

Chairman Dika asked Attorney McNeill to describe the project for those individuals who were not familiar with the project. Mr. McNeill stated that the project location was in the vicinity of the Sheraton Hotel. The project consisted of a 204 room Westin Hotel, with a large conference center, retail space, 21 condominium units and a 743 space parking garage. He explained that originally, the parking garage was a joint effort but now would be a private venture. He added that the project would have significant benefits to the community.

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

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a one year extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz wondered what benefit to the Historic District would there be in denying the extension. He could not think of one. He wished the project all hopes of success.

Chairman Dika agreed and added that the Commission spent a great deal of time reviewing the project. She said it was a shame that it had not been built yet but she hoped that it would.

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

2. Petition of **Zoe Moses, owner**, for property located at **53 Humphrey’s Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 39 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Zoe (Moses) Copenhaver, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. She stated that she would like to install a fence on her property. The fence would be a 3 ½ foot high space board fence with two gates. She said that the reasons for the fence were to enclose a dog and privacy. The fence would be made of cedar and the hardware would be black steel.

Chairman Dika asked the Commissioners if they had any questions for Ms. Copenhaver. 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 Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Almeida commented that the fence would have minimal impact to the streetscape and that it was an appropriate design.

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 (5-0) vote.

3. Petition of **Argeris N. and Eloise M. Karabelas, owners**, for property located at **461 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations to garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 7 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Rick Becksted, representing the property owner, was present to speak to the application. Mr. Becksted explained that they would like to renovate the existing garage by removing the clapboard, adding sheathing, residing with Hardiplank, adding corner boards using Azek, and adding new windows and doors.

Mr. Almeida asked Mr. Becksted about mitering the existing corners. He said that the existing conditions were unique in Portsmouth but very common in other Historic Districts, specifically in southern states. He felt the detail was unique enough to preserve. He also asked if it was

possible to miter the Hardiplank. Mr. Becksted pointed out that this was a 1950's garage, it was not a historic building.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that asking the applicant to preserve a non-traditional application, non-traditional in the City of Portsmouth and non-traditional in New England would be carrying preservation to an inordinate degree. Mr. Almeida dropped the inquiry.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise she declared the public hearing closed and awaited a motion.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Vice Chairman Katz stated that Mr. Becksted, given his tenure on the Historic District Commission has reviewed more applications than any two or three of the present Commissioners. He had confidence that he would present something that was up to the Commission's standards.

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 (5-0) vote.

The next two applications were taken in reverse order as requested by the applicant. The applicant explained that approval of petition #5 was dependent on the approval of petition #4.

5. Petition of **Louis F. Clarizio Revocable Trust 2000, Louis F. Clarizio, trustee and owner**, for property located at **566 Islington Street** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (replace existing generator with larger generator) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 156 as Lot 24 and lies within Mixed Residential Business and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Kevin Belanger, Vice President of Rod's Electric, was present to speak to the application. He said that the current generator was undersized and he would like to replace it with a larger and quieter generator. He pointed out the submitted plan that showed the difference in the size of the new generator. He also said that even though the unit was larger, it would be quieter than the existing unit. Chairman Dika explained that decibel level was not a concern of the HDC. Mr. Belanger added that it would be gray in color.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any 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. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Kozak stated that this was a minor request with little or no impact to the District.

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 (5-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Louis F. Clarizio, owner**, for property located at **880 Middle 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 152 as Lot 48 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Kevin Belanger, representing the property owner was present to speak to the application. He stated this generator would be the generator that was currently in use at Mr. Clarizio’s dental office. He said that the generator would be located within a fenced area and showed the Commission the area from the submitted plans. He added that some landscaping would need to be removed for air clearance.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Ms. Sheila Gregg of 76 Lawrence Street spoke against the petition. She stated that her home was directly behind the Clarizio residence. She said that she was saddened to hear that the Commission was not concerned with the noise and that it was not within their purview. She explained that the noise coming from the Clarizio pool area was greatly amplified back in her direction. It has been an ongoing problem. She said that she knew this was not the right venue so asked where she should take her concerns.

Mr. Clum explained that the generator’s installation would not be approved by the City’s mechanical inspector if it does not meet the City’s Zoning Ordinance for noise. Ms. Gregg pointed out that there was an amplification situation in the pool area. She was wondering if the generator could be placed outside that amplified arena.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. Clum if Ms. Gregg could write a letter to the inspector indicating the problems. Mr. Clum replied yes.

Ms. Meg Middleton of 78 Lawrence Street stated that she had the same concerns. She urged the Commission to have the generator moved to another location because it was incredibly loud in the pool area. She suggested maybe an enclosure for the generator would be a solution.

Mr. Peter Middleton of 78 Lawrence Street spoke next. He stated that he felt there would be some room for the generator in front, near the trellis area. He thought that location would help to reduce the noise factor for them.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone else 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 Mr. Melchior. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Almeida stated that while he heard the concerns of the abutters; unfortunately, their concerns were outside of their purview. He felt that aesthetically, the proposed location was ideal.

Mr. Melchior pointed out that it was not the Commission's place to redesign the project.

Chairman Dika added that the applicant has come to the Commission with an application that meets the HDC criteria. She urged the abutters to pursue their concerns with the Inspection Department.

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 (5-0) vote.

6. Petition of **Lewis G. Harriman III and Cynthia Harriman, owners**, for property located at **57 South Street** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace three windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 50 and lies within General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Lewis Harriman, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that he would like to replace three windows on the east side of his house. He also needed to replace some flashing. Mr. Harriman told the Commission that he was proposing Marvin windows with aluminum cladding and simulated divided lights.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any 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 with the following stipulation:

- 1) That permission is given to replace any additional windows in the structure provided they match the same specifications of this approval.

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

Mr. Almeida stated this was a very straightforward application with a window that has been approved in the past. He felt it was a minimal request.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote.

The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application with the following stipulation passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote:

- 1) That permission is given to replace any additional windows in the structure provided they match the same specifications of this approval.

7. Petition of **Richard A. Porzio, owner**, for property located at **56 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 33 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Richard Porzio, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He presented additional material to the Commission for their review. He stated that he was requesting approval for changes to the existing fence. This project had already taken place so he was seeking an after the fact approval. Mr. Porzio explained that this was a joint project with an abutter, Ms. Anne Westin. He explained that the fence was replaced in kind with the exception of a portion of the fence behind the garage that went from 6 feet in height to 4 feet in height. He said that they changed the height of the 4 foot section to a 6 foot section. He stated that he did not realize that he needed approval to do that. Mr. Porzio added that the change created a problem with another neighbor which resulted in a lawsuit. An agreement had been reached and it included the installation of a new 5 foot fence with a gate on the north side of his property. A letter of support from Ms. Westin was given to the Commission.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any 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

Ms. Anne Westin, Mr. Porzio's neighbor, spoke in favor of the application. She confirmed that they did replace the fence last summer not realizing that they needed HDC approval. She felt the new fence would be a good replacement for the dilapidated fence that was currently there.

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

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

Ms. Kozak stated that the fence mimicked what was there. She felt it was an appropriate design and material for the area and that the change in height did not have any adverse impact to the historic nature of Salter Street.

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 (5-0) vote.

8. Petition of **John A. and Sandra S. Dika, owners**, for property located at **333 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace rear window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 13 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant requested that the application be postponed to the August 11, 2010 meeting

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Melchior made a motion to postpone the application to the August 11, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. The motion passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Nancy J. Ratliff Revocable Trust 2000, Nancy J. Ratliff, trustee and owner**, for property located at **180 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct additions, construct front porch, install windows). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 23 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project and Ms. Nancy Ratliff, owner of the property were present to speak to the application. Ms. Whitney explained the project consisted of two additions which were similar to additions that were approved in 2006.
- She said that on the front elevation, the existing entry would be repaired in kind. She pointed out that this elevation was in bad condition as the clapboards and windows would need to be replaced. The elevation did show the seven foot one story addition which would have casement windows. The attic window would also be replaced.
- Mr. Almeida asked if there were plans for the basement windows on the front of the house. Ms. Whitney said that she had not considered them but she could take a look at them.
- She also was proposing a French casement that would be used to help get furniture up into the second story. It was not perfect proportionately but it would be a good solution.
- Ms. Whitney pointed out that the shed addition runs the length of the house on the rear elevation and projects out four feet. The existing chimneys have been rebuilt. She said they would like to take the eave line of the existing house and project a gable out over the existing shed. She explained in detail about this would be accomplished.
- Mr. Almeida pointed out that they would lose the saltbox profile on one side of the structure. He wondered if there was any concern about losing that profile. He felt it was a rare profile for Portsmouth. Ms. Whitney explained that it was added fairly recently and it was not historic. She said it would be easier to leave it but she would like to see it go to provide functionality and views to the internal space. Ms. Kozak pointed out that it was only a small sliver of a saltbox profile. Mr. Almeida stated that it was not a major problem. Mr. Melchior added that it was not an authentic feature.
- There was considerable discussion concerning the windows. Ms. Whitney said they were thinking of using a Marvin aluminum clad window with a surround and heavier sill.
- Mr. Almeida agreed that the window proposed to get furniture to the second floor was odd. He asked Ms. Whitney if she considered a small walkout with a removable rail. She explained that the problem with that was that there was minimal head room on the second story. It would require stepping up to get to the deck. Vice Chairman Katz felt it looked awkward. Ms. Kozak felt that if the pane size of the window were smaller it might not look so awkward. Mr. Almeida agreed.
- Ms. Kozak had concerns about the using of casement windows with the existing double hung windows.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked Ms. Whitney if she was looking to have another work session. Ms. Whitney stated that she would like to go for a public hearing next month. She felt she could resolve the issues.
- Ms. Kozak pointed out an area where a cricket would be needed.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the stainless steel chimney pipe would be removed. Ms. Whitney explained that the furnace would be reworked and so the pipe would probably be removed.

In other business, Mr. Charles Hugo, of Charles Hugo Landscape Design stated that he was doing a landscaping project at 10 Commercial Alley which involved the installation of a green wall and exterior lighting. He learned that HDC approval was needed. He said that an application was submitted but he was not sure what components of the project required review.

Ms. Good confirmed that the application had been filed and would be heard at the September meeting. She stated that she would be glad to talk with Mr. Hugo after the meeting.

Chairman Dika stated that Margaret M. Newville was requesting a postponement of her application for 104 Gates Street to the August 18, 2010 meeting. Mr. Almeida made a motion to postpone the application to the August 18, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a unanimous (5-0) vote.

Vice Chairman Katz said that Chairman Dika asked him to prepare some information on stockade fences. He passed out information to the Commission. He pointed out that almost every Historic District Commission in New England prohibits stockade fences. Mr. Melchior added that there were currently about four or five other topics that were unresolved that they should discuss as a Commission. He suggested they discuss various design details, preservation vs. appropriateness of design, sustainability, and materials. Vice Chairman Katz thought a separately scheduled work session would be necessary to address the issues. Chairman Dika asked the Commission to give a list of topics to Ms. Good for compilation.

Chairman Dika asked the Commission how they would like to proceed with the issue of stockade fences. Vice Chairman Katz asked the Commission to review his information and then they can talk with the Planning staff as to how best to incorporate it into the Zoning Ordinance.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:10 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 October 6, 2010.