

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

August 3, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Elena Whittaker; City Council Representative Anthony Coviello; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternate George Melchior

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Tracy Kozak; Alternate Joseph Almeida

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – June 8, 2011

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (6-0) to approve the minutes as presented.

Approval of minutes – July 6, 2011

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (6-0) to approve the minutes as presented.

B. Request for one year extension of the Certificate of Approval for 180 New Castle Avenue – requested by Nancy J. Ratliff Revocable Trust 2000, Nancy J. Ratliff, trustee

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant the request for a one year extension of the Certificate of Approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Whittaker. The motion passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote. The Certificate of Approval will now expire on September 1, 2012.

Councilor Coviello arrived at this point in the meeting.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

C. Petition of **Carol J. Elliott, owner**, for property located at **143 Gates Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 99 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 6, 2011 meeting to the August 3, 2011 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Carol Elliott, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. She stated that the Commission had the submitted paperwork and she added that she brought a sample of the window with her.

Chairman Dika explained that originally Ms. Elliott presented a window that the Commission was not familiar with. In the intervening weeks, Ms. Elliott secured another opinion and was now before the Commission to present a new window proposal.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if the screen would be a full screen or a half screen. Ms. Elliott replied that it was a full screen. Vice Chairman Katz stated that they mentioned during the last hearing was that full screen windows tend to obscure the details on the face of the windows. He encouraged the use of a half screen. Ms. Elliott explained that her house sits very close to the street so for security reasons she preferred being able to open the windows from the top. Vice Chairman Katz also pointed out that because the house was so close to the street, passersby can view the obscuring full screen. He did not think a full screen was appropriate in this area. Ms. Elliott said that currently the windows have no screens and she has had to use insert screens which do not look very nice. Mr. Wyckoff said that he agreed with Vice Chairman Katz and said he would like to see the half screens. He pointed out that the half screen could slide up to the top of the window for opening. In addition, he felt the traditional look on her house in that neighborhood was important. Ms. Elliott stated that she still had a strong preference for the full screen.

Ms. Elliott showed the Commission the sample window that she brought with her.

Councilor Coviello asked the other Commissioners how pushing a half screen up to the top of a nine over six window would work. The half screen would be for the six pane part of the window so he felt there would be an awkward position. Mr. Wyckoff explained that the nine pane sash could not go down any further than the distance of six panes. Councilor Coviello felt there would be a lot of screen adjusting every time the windows were opened and closed.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that his suggestion for a full screen was just a suggestion. He said that if the homeowner had strong feelings about a full screen, she had his blessing.

Mr. Melchior observed that the window had an extruded aluminum sill that was flush with the jams instead of a sill that extended past the rest of the casing on the house. He also wanted to know where the pane of the window would fall in relation to the existing window as well as the clapboard siding. There was detailed discussion regarding this.

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

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

Ms. Whittaker stated that Mr. Melchior brought up some real concerns with the window and with the making of the motion; discussion had been pulled away from the applicant. She pointed out that this was a window that they have approved in the past but there were some real differences in the appearance and the usage in this particular house.

Councilor Coviello withdrew his motion so that discussion with the applicant could continue.

Ms. Whittaker asked Ms. Elliott if she understood Mr. Melchior's concerns. Ms. Elliott replied no. Mr. Melchior and Councilor Coviello explained to Ms. Elliott in detail the Commission's concern with the proposed window.

Ms. Whittaker asked Ms. Elliott if she wanted a window that would be more efficient but would have the same look as what was there now. Ms. Elliott replied yes. Ms. Whittaker told her that this window was not going to achieve that.

Vice Chairman Katz suggested the applicant ask for a work session/public hearing to work out the details.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that this window could work but he was still not happy with the screen. Vice Chairman Katz asked that considering the surroundings, wouldn't an insert situation be more appropriate? Mr. Wyckoff said that would work and it would be much less expensive. Councilor Coviello added that that was what Ms. Elliott thought she was doing. Ms. Elliott commented that it has been hard and frustrating to get a straight answer from people.

Ms. Whittaker made a motion to postpone the application to a work session/public hearing at the September 7, 2011 meeting. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz. The motion passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **57 Market Street Condominium Association, owner, and Jeff and Gina Abood, applicants**, for property located at **55 Market Street, Unit C**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace five windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 25-3 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Daryl Kent of K & S Contracting and representing the property owner was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was proposing to replace the windows with inserts in the original openings that currently existed. There would be no renovation to the exterior trim or jams. He said they were proposing an Andersen Woodwright 400 series. He gave the Commissioners a brochure explaining the proposed window.

Mr. Kent pointed out that the windows would be one over one with a half screen. He showed the Commission a sample of the exterior insert.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the storm windows would be removed. Mr. Kent replied yes. He added that the sills would sit on top of the other sill and would be a smooth transition.

Chairman Dika pointed out that the building was built in about 1810 and there was a variety of muntin patterns surrounding the building. She wondered if the applicant would consider a more traditional muntin like a six over six pattern. Mr. Kent said that there was no discussion about that and with it being a condominium association; the rest of the owners would need to be in agreement. He said they were just trying to replace what was there.

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. Whittaker made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Whittaker stated that the applicant had chosen a very good window to weatherproof the building which would maintain the integrity of the building and its appearance.

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

2. Petition of **Martingale Wharf Limited Partnership, owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (install lighting, install screening on roof, install gates, approve west elevation parapet, approve door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Mark McNabb, owner of the property and Mr. Brandon Holben of McHenry Architecture were present to speak to the application.

Mr. McNabb stated that he would like to address two items that were discussed at the site walk from last month. He said that the fixed door and the trim on the underside of the bay window

have been corrected and he presented pictures showing the changes. He also pointed out that the door was painted black as was suggested.

Mr. Brandon Holben guided the Commission through the submitted plans. He talked about the styles chosen for the front of the building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the wheat design on the Parkway light fixture would be coated with copper. Mr. Holben replied yes. Mr. McNabb clarified that it was solid brass and was not painted. Mr. Holben pointed that the lighting fixtures all had similar style projecting brackets.

Mr. Holben talked about the proposed screening element. He said that it was painted PVC with copper caps.

Page 4 showed the gates and the two locations where they would be located.

Mr. Holben continued by reminding the Commission that the west parapet had been left the way it was. Mr. Wyckoff commented about the material and wondered why the copper was coated with lead to begin with. Mr. McNabb explained that the nice thing about lead was that it not only tones down over time but you do not get the same bleeding that happens with copper. The lead coated copper was a better, more durable material and a more historic material as well.

Ms. Whittaker stated that she was unable to attend last month's meeting so wondered what the feedback from the Commission was on the baluster screening. Mr. McNabb said that they presented three designs that were all deemed to be appropriate so the applicant chose the one he liked best. Chairman Dika commented that she saw an almost identical screening on an historical building in Providence, Rhode Island.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Mr. Wyckoff stated that Mr. McNabb has tried very hard to bring the building into compliance. He said that while he was not a fan of one of the light fixtures and that the screen was a bit busy, he was finding that the location of the screen and its purpose made him willing to forgive that. In general, he said he was happy with the project.

Mr. Melchior said that after the work session last month, he went back and looked at the Commission's purview. Although it would not affect his vote this evening, he thought that the interpretation that the emergency lighting and the roof top units did not require HDC review was a pretty egregious misinterpretation of their purview. He said that he would like to see something in writing from the Planning Department that clarifies just that point. He did not

think this was a precedence they wanted to set going forward especially with the new development coming down the road.

Ms. Whittaker stated that she had concerns about the lights being at different heights in relation to the structure they are on. She did not see the architectural language going across all of the lights. She also said that she struggled with the amount of equipment on the roof but sometimes putting screening up ends up looking bigger. She did not see the appropriateness of decorating the roof top.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a 5-1 vote with Ms. Whittaker voting in opposition.

Chairman Dika commented that maybe the Commission needed a meeting with the Planning Department on the safety light.

3. Petition of **82-86 Congress Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **82-86 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (add rooftop enclosure, add window to east elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 45 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Brandon Holben of McHenry Architecture and Mr. Mark McNabb were present to speak to the application. Mr. Holben stated that they were presenting a couple of minor modifications to the approved design of the third floor addition. He said that they would like to add a stair enclosure to allow roof top access. They would also like to add a fire rated window at the front corner of the building. Mr. McNabb clarified that it was ceramic glass and was not considered an opening since windows were not allowed on a lot line.

Ms. Whittaker wondered if the roof top appurtenance was visible from anywhere. Mr. Holben said they could not determine any views where it would be seen.

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. Whittaker made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Whittaker thanked the applicant for the change to the blank wall. She added that she realized they needed access to the roof and she was glad that it was not in conflict with what the HDC was trying to achieve since it would not alter the view or the experience.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (6-0) vote.

4. Petition of **Shoot The Moon, LLC, owner**, for property located at **106 Penhallow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install new HVAC unit on rooftop) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 33 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Dana Joy of Joy’s HVAC and representing the owner of the property was present to speak to the application. He stated that the existing unit on the roof top was failing and they were looking to replace it with a larger unit but a more efficient and quieter unit. The new unit would be about five inches taller than the existing unit.

Ms. Whittaker asked if there had been discussion about moving the unit away from public view. Mr. Joy said that it was not feasible because of where the ductwork was located. Mr. Joy stated that he felt the owner might be open to screening the unit from view.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Mr. Wyckoff said that it was replacing an old unit with a new unit in the same location and it had to be done.

Ms. Whittaker commented that the Commission would not approve of this unit if it were being put in that location now. She pointed out that the tree blocked its view but if that tree went down, it would be very visible. She wondered if anyone had any soreness about that. Chairman Dika responded yes but at least it would be a new unit.

Councilor Coviello stated that he did not think the request was grossly extravagant. He felt they were pretty much matching what was there so he was okay with it.

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

5. Petition of **Christopher D. and Tracy Kozak, owners**, for property located at **28 Walden Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing windows, replace trim around front door, replace bulkhead, and lattice) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 19 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Tracy Kozak, owner of the property was present to speak to the application. She gave the Commission some history on the house. She said she would like to replace the windows, the lattice, replace the trim over the front door.

Ms. Kozak explained that at some time in the last century, an enclosed porch was added to the front of the house. When that was done, all of the original trim and the original door were removed. The porch was removed in the 1980's and they put back what was seen in the submitted photos. Ms. Kozak said that based on similar houses in the area, the proposed door trim detail mimicked that. She pointed out that she would like to replace the rotting lattice with vertical lattice. The ell of the house had a concrete foundation which Ms. Kozak would like to reface with a brick veneer. She also added that the bulkhead would be removed and replaced with a wood bulkhead.

Ms. Kozak said that the proposed windows would be Marvin all wood inserts with muntin grills of 5/8" and would have a six over six pattern. Mr. Wyckoff asked Ms. Kozak why she did not go with a window with a little more sill angle. Ms. Kozak offered to cut it back so that it would be flush with the nosing to eliminate an extra shadow line. Mr. Wyckoff thought that was a good solution.

Mr. Wyckoff wondered why crown molding with a dentil effect was chosen. Ms. Kozak said that since this was a raised one and half story cape style home, it was right on the cusp of the Greek revival style. She thought this was small enough to allude being on the beginning of that phase. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a simpler trim but it was not a deal breaker for him.

Mr. Melchior commented that he thought it was a very well thought out and designed proposal. Ms. Whittaker agreed.

Mr. Gladhill asked if there would be any changes to the light fixtures. Ms. Kozak replied no.

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. Whittaker made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill.

Ms. Whittaker stated that the applicant has brought forward a thorough and well thought out application.

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

6. Petition of **51 Islington Street, LLC and Arthur E. and Joan T. Jones, owners**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (install lighting, infill one window, add dormer, install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

Councilor Coviello recused himself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios and representing the applicant was present to speak to the application. She stated that she had one change to the submitted plans which involved a change to the configuration of the fence. She passed out a new plan to the Commissioners.

Ms. Ramsey explained that the fence would be a wood fence and would be eight feet tall. She said that the soundproofing material was six feet tall so they had to go a bit taller to contain the noise and meet the site plan approval.

Page two showed the lighting fixtures and locations. Mr. Wyckoff asked if any of the lighting fixtures were battery back up emergency lights. Ms. Ramsey said no, they were all exterior decorative lighting.

Page three showed the back of the building and where light fixtures would be located. It also showed the window that would be in filled. Ms. Whittaker commented that the window in fill was not a light issue. She thought it was a big issue. She recalled the discussions at the work sessions about the location of windows. Ms. Ramsey pointed out that there was a steel beam that runs through the wall at that location which would not allow the installation of a window. She added that the window was facing Tanner Court.

Mr. Gladhill asked what the inspiration was for the style of lights that were chosen. Ms. Ramsey said that the building was not hugely traditional. It had traditional details with contemporary elements and colors. She said they were trying to find something that was more transitional that did not identify a certain era or look.

Ms. Ramsey stated that page 4 showed the proposed larger dormer on the Phase B of the building. She explained that they had diminished the size of the dormer by two feet. All of the brackets and detailing would remain the same. Vice Chairman Katz asked the reason for enlarging the dormers. Ms. Ramsey said that it was motivated by the buyer of the unit. Vice Chairman Katz stated that he was more comfortable with the new size.

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

Vice Chairman Katz stated that the diminished size of the dormer was an improvement. He also felt the lights were appropriate.

Mr. Gladhill commented that the style of the lights looked almost art deco from the 1920's or 1930's. Vice Chairman Katz agreed.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a 5-1 vote with Ms. Whittaker voting in opposition.

7. Petition of **Jeffrey H. Marple, owner**, for property located at **37 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 24 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Chairman Dika read the next two petitions into the record and explained to the Commission that they would discuss and vote on both properties together.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jeffrey Marple, owner of the two properties was present to speak to the applications. He stated that he has owned the properties for at least 25 years and when he bought them, the windows had been replaced but they were never a good fit. He said that he would like to replace

them with Andersen replacement windows. He explained that they were the same windows that were approved in another one of his buildings on State Street. He wanted to replace them for two reasons: one was for energy efficiency and the other was for noise reduction. He felt it was a good window.

Ms. Whittaker asked Mr. Marple what sill angle he was proposing. Mr. Marple said the windows would be made to hit the sills that are there now.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the windows would be simulated divided light. Mr. Marple replied yes.

Ms. Whittaker noted that the specification sheet did not include a spacer bar. Chairman Dika asked Mr. Marple if he would consider the spacer between the glass.

Mr. Marple explained that he had already purchased the windows from Nick's Door and Window and was told that these windows were the ones that they have put in a number of different buildings and were approved by the HDC. Mr. Marple also added that he did not know that he needed to get approval from the HDC. Mr. Wyckoff commented that Nick's Door and Window has taken things a little too lightly; however, he did not think they needed to hold Mr. Marple's feet to the fire. He asked what type of window screens would be used. Mr. Marple said that he ordered the full screens but he would be willing to put in half screens. He added that he would be removing the storm windows.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of approval for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Whittaker.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant has intended to provide the half screens. He also said that the absence of a spacer bar was an unfortunate situation and either Mr. Marple or someone from the City should inform Nick's Door and Window so that they do not take such a cavalier attitude about it. Mr. Wyckoff thought that the building would look very good.

Ms. Whittaker cautioned the viewers that just because a window is approved for a particular building, it does not make it okay for every other building until it goes through the HDC process.

Councilor Coviello stated that he would support the motion but he would not support it with enjoyment. He did not want to set precedence. He does not want people buying their windows ahead of time and then thinking the HDC will be lenient with them.

Mr. Gladhill commented that he would not be supporting the motion. He felt that this building needed the full divided light on the façade.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a 5-2 vote with Mr. Gladhill and Mr. Melchior voting in opposition.

8. Petition of **Jeffrey H. Marple, owner**, for property located at **51 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 24-1 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented passed by a 5-2 vote with Mr. Gladhill and Mr. Melchior voting in opposition.

III. WORK SESSIONS

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

A. Work Session requested by **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct 4 and 5 story mixed use building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios and Terrence Parker of Terra Firma Landscaping were present to speak to the application.
- Ms. Ramsey presented the Commission with plans showing the further development of the elevations. She said that last month they discussed a special skylight type window but are now looking to use a more standard skylight. She pointed out that the narrow slices between the brick would be EFIS material.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if the skylights and the mansard roof would be compatible with the pitch of the roof. Ms. Ramsey said it would work. She pointed out that they would maintain the mansard pitch all the way around the building.
- Ms. Ramsey pointed out that the first floor was continuous with below grade parking. The second floor would be in a U-shaped pattern.
- Ms. Whittaker stated that she still was struggling with the size of the building. She said it was one building away from the railroad tracks. She did not see a five story building in that location. Ms. Whittaker pointed out that the building did not sit on the lot the way the large buildings across the street did. She was interested in hearing more about the landscaping plan but she reiterated that the massing was way too large.

- Mr. Wyckoff thought they should take a straw vote concerning the massing. The rest of the Commission was okay with the massing. Mr. Melchior commented that he thought the massing would disappear because of the hill on Deer Street and the other large buildings in the area.
- Mr. Parker explained that they wanted to open up the Maplewood Avenue and Deer Street corner while creating a sheltered space behind the intersection. He discussed particulars of the landscaping such as a fountain, sitting walls, trees and other plantings. He also explained that there was an opportunity to put in a storm water filtration system.
- Mr. Gladhill asked Mr. Parker what type of trees he was thinking of planting. Mr. Parker said that he liked elm trees.
- Ms. Whittaker expressed concern about skateboarders damaging the sitting walls.
- Mr. Melchior reiterated Ms. Kozak’s comments from last month. He said that this was an area that would become more pedestrian friendly. He had concerns with obstructing the front entrance. He said he would like to see more hard surface elements. Ms. Whittaker thought that would make the massing look larger. She felt the landscaping plan achieved the pedestrian friendliness along with pedestrian safety.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that he could see both points of view. He added that he would like to hear more discussion about the entrance to the building.
- Vice Chairman Katz stated that he has never seen this much energy and resources spent on landscaping and he thought it was an exciting prospect.
- Mr. Wyckoff thought the project was well thought out; however, he felt more importance should be assigned to the entry. Ms. Ramsey said that the entrance would have a different awning with more glass, more lighting and sidelights and more prominent dormers to bring attention to this plaza.
- Chairman Dika agreed with Mr. Melchior and pointed out that this was the entryway to the building and should not be blocked. Ms. Ramsey explained that one would be able to see over the sitting walls to the entrance. Ms. Whittaker suggested seeing photos of buildings that have this type of entrance to serve as examples.
- Mr. Wyckoff commented that he liked the idea of the sitting walls.
- Vice Chairman Katz pointed out that there would be other boards who would weigh in on this project.
- Ms. Ramsey said that she would like to come back in October with more details and for a possible site walk.

B. Work Session requested by **Gilman Anderson and Winifred Amaturro, owners**, for property located at **129 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to back ell and second floor) and new construction to an existing structure (construct garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 47 as lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

- Ms. Lisa DeStefano and Ms. Sarah Hourihane, both of DeStefano Architects and Gil Anderson and Winifred Amaturro, owners of the property were present to speak to the application. Ms. DeStefano stated that they were back to discuss changes made from the work session last month. She said that they have simplified the project.

- Page three of the plans showed the proposed addition setback 1'9" from the face of the existing building. She said that this would still allow for garage storage but it was the smallest they could make it.
- Page four showed the balcony over the pergola facing the garden. They have also eliminated a lot of glass and have dropped the massing down so that they could keep a third floor window.
- On the southeast elevation, the carriage house doors remained the same. The northwest elevation would stay the same except that the scale would drop down about a foot for the ridge and the eave. Ms. DeStefano pointed out that the gabled end elevation was not allowed to have windows so they were proposing one shuttered system.
- Ms. DeStefano explained that they would be adding decorative headers back onto the brick building. They would not be adding them to the State Street façade. Mr. Wyckoff asked what that material would be. Ms. DeStefano thought it would be wood.
- Pages six and seven showed perspective drawings.
- Ms. Whittaker commented that she was not present for the first work session. She appreciated the fact that the addition was speaking a lot of the same language as Sheafe Street; however, there were still some contemporary features that she was not comfortable with. She added that they were not deal breakers though.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that he could understand where they were going with project; however he was not in agreement with all of the details. He commented that the rake trim should stand out from the building. He added that he was much more in agreement with this proposal than the previous one.
- Vice Chairman Katz agreed but said that the addition still looked a little too important. He wondered what the effect might be if they did not have the gable end on Sheafe Street. Chairman Dika wondered if a simpler door would make it look less important. Ms. DeStefano pointed out that the houses along Sheafe Street had gable ends. Ms. Whittaker agreed that toning down the entrance would help. Mr. Wyckoff commented that the transom window could go away. Ms. DeStefano agreed. Mr. Melchior thought that the door was fine the way it was.
- Chairman Dika said that the design was much approved from the original design. Ms. DeStefano added that they were using all of the elevations to the best of their abilities.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked Ms. DeStefano if she would provide a photo showing evidence of the decorative headers having existed on the building at one time.
- Ms. DeStefano told the Commission that she would come back for a public hearing in September.

C. Work Session requested by **68 State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **68 State Street**, wherein permit is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add roof deck). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 165 as Lot 13 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic Districts.

In other business, Mr. Gladhill expressed concern for an article in the Portsmouth Herald showing a potential design for a building downtown if someone was to buy it. Ms. Whittaker said that if the developer or owner of the building was to bring the design before the Commission and it failed, then they were setting themselves up for their own failure. She did not think the Commission should concern themselves with the article at all. The rest of the Commission was in agreement.

III. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:55 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Historic District Commission Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on October 5, 2011.