

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**August 14, 2013
reconvened from August 7, 2013
to be reconvened again on August 21, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Members Richard Katz, John Wyckoff, George Melchior; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak

ALSO PRESENT:

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING)

1. **(Work Session/Public Hearing)** Petition of **508 Islington Street Condominium Association, owner, and Robert Maynard, applicant**, for property located at **508 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace storefront windows with double hung windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 156 as Lot 2 and lies with the Mixed Residential Business and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 7, 2013 meeting to a work session/public hearing at the August 14, 2013 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Mr. Gladhill recused himself.

The owner Mr. Maynard told the Commission that he was submitting revised drawings that showed the proposed windows that would replace the large commercial storefront windows that currently existed on the structure. Chairman Almeida as if the window were the same specifications as the upper windows and also asked the brand of the windows. Mr. Maynard said the new windows would match; he was not sure of the brand, but the brand of the upper windows was American Craftsman. Chairman Almeida said it was fine as long as Mr. Maynard identified the brand of the replacement windows.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the trim around the windows would match the existing trim. Mr. Maynard said they would. Mr. Wyckoff said Mr. Maynard had matched the existing upper windows and

trim so he had no further comments. Mr. Katz thought it was an appropriate application, given the house and the surroundings.

Chairman Almeida thanked Mr. Maynard and said it was crystal clear as to the quantity and placement of the windows, and the Commission appreciated the new drawings.

Mr. Rawling asked if the windows were 6/6 windows. Mr. Maynard said they would match the existing pattern. Chairman Almeida verified that Mr. Maynard was matching the windows in every way.

Chairman Almeida closed the work session and opened up the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Maynard introduced himself as the owner of the 1st floor condominium and mentioned that the building was once a multi-family building but was split into two condominiums. It was a storefront at one time, so that was the reason there were large storefront windows. He wanted to replace those windows with ones that would match the rest of the house to make it look better from the street. He would match the existing windows on the 2nd floor as shown in the photographs.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

There was no one to speak to, for, or against the application so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Katz made the motion that the request be **approved** as presented in accordance with the six objectives and four criteria noted in the ordinance and with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the proposed windows shall match in detail and appearance to the existing window located on the right side façade.*

Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested **126 State Street Condominium Association, owner, and Brian Johnson and Robert Keefe, applicants**, for property located at **126 State Street, Units 5 and 8**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct decks off of Units 5 and 8). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 57 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 17, 2013 meeting to the August 14, 2013 meeting.)*

Brian Johnson, owner of Unit 8, presented to the Commission with his father, Brad Johnson, who was the carpenter on the project. Brian Johnson said they tried to incorporate more of a farmer's porch detail on the 1st floor on the front façade. Chairman Almeida verified that he was choosing not to go around the corner as previously discussed. Mr. Johnson said he wasn't because the owner of the unit below him would not be able to have a porch overhang the driveway.

Mr. Wyckoff said there were interesting roof cheeks on the side of the porch and asked if the railing went up and sat on them. Mr. Johnson said they could either sit on them or go inside of it. Mr. Gladhill asked if there was somewhere in Portsmouth where they could see the design, and Mr. Johnson said he saw it in New Castle. Chairman Almeida said they would need to know whether the cheeks were sitting on the surface and if the bottom was angled, or whether they were going all the way to the cheek. Mr. Katz asked how the inside of the cheek would be finished if they were going on top, especially if he were on the porch looking out. Mr. Brad Johnson said a bead board detail could be put on it. Mr. Katz liked the idea but said it should be stipulated. Mr. Johnson said they added the wood shingles at the top to give it a little something extra. Mr. Katz asked if the two roofs were wood shingles, and Mr. Johnson said it was just around the perimeter. Councilor Kennedy said part of the problem was that the original pictures showed it as flat and coming out into the street. The ornate decoration was too much. Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Johnson if he had referenced the yellow building on Court Street and Mr. Johnson said he had, and he noted they were on the side. His problem was the driveway with the little unit. Councilor Kennedy asked how they would access it and was told that the double windows would be replaced with a sliding door. She said it should be stated in the application. Mr. Johnson said it was in the original application.

Mr. Rawling asked about using a single window instead of a door. Mr. Johnson said it should work but not with the owner underneath him. From the exterior, it would look the same as the windows. Ms. Ruedig asked where the sidewalk was located because she wanted to make sure there was enough room. Mr. Johnson said it went out 7' from the building.

Chairman Almeida told Mr. Johnson he needed a site plan and more photos and details along with all the other requirements they would request for the final packet.

Mr. Wyckoff said the relationship with the sidewalk sounded more like Planning Board information. Mr. Johnson said he was told that he could go right up to the sidewalk. Councilor Kennedy remembered it from the previous meeting but her concern was how it would look. Mr. Johnson said the drawing brought down the height of the building from before, when it looked tall and thin. He thought the porches brought the height of the building down.

Mr. Rawling said he needed to do something different with the railings. In the detailing, the easiest way was to have them come down on a bottom rail and tie into the baluster bottoms. He asked about the types of doors Mr. Johnson had considered for replacements. Mr. Johnson told him he considered a slider door with the SDL.

Chairman Almeida asked if it was a double or single door, and Mr. Johnson said double. Mr. Wyckoff said that was a problem. The porch made sense and had historical elements, but the

sliding door looked awkward on a historic-looking porch. He preferred leaving the windows and using a single window as a true divided light door. Chairman Almeida agreed and said it was a double unit but only one side operated as a door. He would have to see the specifications. He asked the Commissioners to give some clear direction because Mr. Johnson would be coming back the following month. He himself felt that sliders were inappropriate on Court Street. Mr. Melchior agreed with Mr. Wyckoff. He also agreed with Mr. Rawling about the railing. He didn't care for the balcony architecture but felt it was probably appropriate. There should be more rail differentiation, and that might affect the door, but there should be separate and unique elements in each architecture piece, not a blend.

Mr. Rawling felt the shingles on the sides of the canopy would look better as clapboards to match the house instead of wood shingles. Chairman Almeida agreed and said he had forgotten there was clapboard next to it and thought it should continue the clapboard. Mr. Rawling said it should show more detail of the posts and caps to make it clearer so they could approve it. Ms. Ruedig thought they were going to copy the existing rail on the side of the porch. Mr. Johnson said he did not think the Commission would be happy with the existing railings because they were not attractive. Mr. Rawling asked if he was going to use AZEK rails and was told they would be cedar rails. Chairman Almeida said they would need more details if they were custom made. Councilor Kennedy said what was on the side was very contemporary and reminded them it was Court Street with the look of old tenements, and that's what she wanted it to look like.

Mr. Rawling noticed a 10' column called out and said the column he saw looked like 7'. Chairman Almeida asked if it was a custom box column. Mr. Johnson said it was a 6'x6'. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether or not there was a roof they could open or close if it rained. Mr. Johnson said they wanted to keep it open. Mr. Wyckoff said, in that case, the underside of the deck above would be seen. Chairman Almeida said the framing should never be seen from street level and they liked to see it covered. Mr. Rawling said there was a material that could be applied to the deck's underside that would allow water to go through. Mr. Johnson said he was concerned about moisture being trapped. Mr. Rawling said AZEK 1x4s would cover up the frame. Councilor Kennedy was glad they were considering cedar. Chairman Almeida asked if the cedar would be painted. Mr. Johnson said it would but they'd have to put something on it to tone it down.

Mr. Katz asked about an atrium door. Chairman Almeida said they would disapprove the slider door but would like to see what it looked like adjacent to the window. Mr. Johnson said they could do a French door because the stationary side would not swing into the rail and would look equal with the other side. Mr. Wyckoff said they could not tell the difference between an atrium door, a sliding door, or a French door from the street because they would all look the same, like a double door. That was a problem because it would have to be a large double door and would be too big on a small porch. Mr. Katz agreed and said unless installing a single door was a hardship, he would not approve it. He asked if there were interior considerations or if it were just a preference. Mr. Johnson said the top unit was a preference and the unit below was the layout. Mr. Katz advised him to look further into it.

Ms. Ruedig noted that there was already a double window that was awkward because it was big. The bottom part was covered by the rail and would not be different from what was already there.

She had no problem with a double door but was concerned that a sliding door would show a track. The atrium and French doors would not. Chairman Almeida thought the double window becoming a door might be an improvement.

Mr. Wyckoff thought it all boiled down to the level of trim, and they'd have to have details on the caps of the porch, moldings, wraparound, and so on, with the railing and balusters, trim levels, and single and double windows. A drip cap of some sort would be required with a band molding or something to lift up the window a little, especially if the door had a flat trim. Mr. Rawling said it would be different to have doors instead of windows, so Mr. Johnson might consider a single operable door and two sidelights.

Mr. Melchior said he would not support the application because the artificial roof was not honest architecture. His main concern about the door itself was the height because the height of the window would not be able to receive a 6'8" door and maintain its horizontal alignment across the other windows. The misaligned trim at the top would be noticed. Mr. Wyckoff said by adding a drip cap to the top of the door, a drip cap would have to be added to a single window as well to maintain the horizontal line across the top, and hopefully a 6'8" door would fit.

Councilor Kennedy agreed with Mr. Melchior. She said she would rather see a porch with a true railing and nothing fake. A porch had to have a railing. Mr. Gladhill noted that the building faced Strawberry Banke and if they introduced a new design element, they would need to have a reason to do it if there were no historical precedence. He thought the fake roof didn't work and that some sort of tenement style balcony was needed to face such a prominent area of Portsmouth.

Chairman Almeida was convinced that it was better without the roof. Mr. Melchior said if there were a drainage concern, there would be more dimensions to treat architecturally, and if not, it would be better accomplished with a thoughtful fascia and trim condition. Mr. Wyckoff said no matter how it was built and whether the water drained through or not, there was still going to be pooling water inside the roof structure and it could rot.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Johnson how he felt about removing the roof. He said he was fine with it but it would look more like a tenement house without it. Chairman Almeida told him his plan was upgraded a lot more than originally presented and detailed more. Mr. Johnson asked if they could go out to the edge and keep the inset a little bit if the roof were taken off. Chairman Almeida said if he was aligning the column from below, he would put the railing out closer to the edge. If he removed the roof skirting, the decking would be seen, so he'd have to finish the edges off. Mr. Rawling said they would still want to see a break in the horizontal between the floor and did not want 2-1/2 story columns. Chairman Almeida said the previous drawing looked like all the framework would be exposed, so the new detail would be much better. Mr. Johnson said they could block the framing underneath. Mr. Rawling suggested getting standard porch framing and putting bed molding around the perimeter. Councilor Kennedy suggested that they put in a window, a molding, a window, and then a door. Mr. Melchior said beyond being aesthetic, it would be a challenge.

Mr. Johnson asked for a consensus about the door. Both Chairman Almeida and Mr. Wyckoff thought a single door would be better. Mr. Melchior said a double door must be trimmed out aesthetically and the window trimmed out as well. Mr. Katz suggested eliminating the double doors. Mr. Johnson asked if it would be more acceptable if they went for a French door. He didn't know the lower level layout, but if there were a stairway, it might be impossible. It made more sense to him to do both doors the same, not a single door on top and a double door on the bottom. Mr. Katz asked, since the owner below had a problem with putting a door where the single window was, if Mr. Johnson would consider putting a single door in line with the window beneath on the two stories above.

Mr. Katz further explained that there was a single window on the 1st floor and all of a sudden there would be a double window. If he had a door that would mirror the location of the single window below on the 2nd and 3rd floors, that would solve the neighbor's interior layout problem and add some symmetry. Mr. Johnson understood that he meant to eliminate the double windows with a single door. Mr. Rawling said the construction would affect the person downstairs and they would have to go down and take a look at it. Councilor Kennedy liked the idea because it got rid of the double window problem.

Chairman Almeida said the loss of the roof would improve the project. Photos were needed for the final submission, along with lots of details, larger scale drawings and dimensions, manufacturer's cuts on materials, railing details, and actual door specifications. He said that Mr. Johnson also had to consider all the door comments from the Commission.

Councilor Kennedy asked if they should do a straw poll about lining up to the 1st floor window to get an idea of how many Commissioners were willing to go with the door. Ms. Ruedig said she would favor replacing the double windows with a single door, and everyone else supported it. Mr. Rawling said it could go to a 7' door or be sized a little differently from a 6'8" door. Chairman Almeida said the single window could become the single door and then there would be three aligning doors. The Commission finally decided on the single door and the double window.

*The Commission **recommended** a public hearing.*

B. Petition of **Peter Cass and Mara Witzling, owners**, for property located at **33 Hunking Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of existing structure (remove existing porch) and allow new construction to existing structure (construct new porch and new rear addition). Said property is Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 38 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

*This item was **postponed** at the July 17, 2013 meeting to the September 4, 2013 meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **Bo Patrik and Eva Frisk, owners**, for property located at **44 Pickering Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage and one story addition, and deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct one and two story additions, porch addition, and detached garage)

and 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 102 as Lot 19 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the July 17, 2013 meeting.)*

Councilor Kennedy recused herself.

Ms. Anne Whitney told the Commission that she wanted to stay with the same configuration and roof line. She had gotten rid of the solar panels on the east elevation after going to Peirce Island to see the roofline views and discovering that the building was quite prominent from the boat launch site. She showed the photo of what she was currently working on, the blue building with the red roof, and she said the solar panels were staying. She showed the right side elevations and said she was keeping the 14 panels on the addition and adding 12 panels on the existing roof. The photos showed two views of them. She wanted to put the panels on the south end and top them before they got to the edge of Pickering Street to compensate for a good part of the array that she had lost on the east side.

Mr. Rawling asked if the roof would remain red. Mr. Whitney told him no and showed a sample of black on black that was actually two colors of black. She said the tile pattern on them could be seen but was subtle. The solar panel reflectivity issue would be solved by the monochromatic surface.

Mr. Melchior asked if she had investigated the solar shingles. Ms. Whitney said they could not get the type of performance from those that they were looking for. The garage array that faced south was the best performing one. Mr. Melchior said it had an awkward dimension associated with it and wondered if it could be improved graphically or not.

Ms. Whitney showed a photo of a gap between two buildings on Pickering Avenue that was the only place from which the panels could be seen. In her walks around the neighborhood, she said the panels could not be seen from the old mill bridge or New Castle Avenue because the buildings obscured them. Chairman Almeida asked Ms. Whitney if she could include more photos addressing the views before the hearing.

Chairman Almeida asked the Commission to discuss the appropriateness of the solar panels to see if they were comfortable with them. Mr. Gladhill was hesitant to have solar panels in the Historic District because they were glaringly modern and did not represent history. He said the things that currently blocked the view of solar panels might not be there forever because fires or natural disasters could suddenly unblock the view. Ms. Whitney replied that the neighborhood was not a historic museum but just a neighborhood with lots of vinyl siding, and as energy matters progressed, the panels would appear more often and be so commonplace that they may not be a concern then. Mr. Katz said when they were first confronted with solar panels a few years before, the Planning Department had told them they should view it as something that should be encouraged if they could make it work in the Historic District reasonably. He felt they had done so, and he did not want to get into the 'what-ifs'. Solar panels would probably be invisible in the future. Ms. Whitney added that she was doing a monolithic application to make it a dark surface. Ms. Ruedig agreed and said the panels were reversible and could be taken off.

Ms. Whitney said they were almost like storm windows. Chairman Almeida thought they were almost like a piece of mechanical equipment and would be obsolete at some point and replaced with something new due to technology changes. Ms. Whitney said the longevity of the PC panels could be 40-50 years, and they probably would not get replaced even with newer projects.

Mr. Gladhill considered the fairness factor and said it had nothing to do with aesthetics but more to do with environmental and economic issues. He thought people would question why the HDC would allow it on Ms. Whitney's project but not on their house due to their prominent location. Mr. Katz said it was fair because they made those judgments on every project they looked at. Mr. Gladhill disagreed and said it had nothing to do with the house design or its cost and was unfair. Mr. Rawling said that, when regarding changes with historic buildings, they looked differently at the front of the house than the back of it for conspicuous changes that would change the historical character of the house. He felt that the HDC had a moral obligation to support energy efforts. Mr. Melchior felt that solar panels or skylights had dimensions that he was aesthetically against. He liked clear roofs. Mr. Rawling said shingles were complex because every single one got a hole through the roof and was wired from the attic and interconnected, so there were thousands of connections within the interior space. Mr. Melchior said someone could still do them regardless of the complexity. The craftsmanship quality mattered. Ms. Whitney said it depended on the roof system. When the roof was redone, panels could come off then be put back. If shingles failed, they would be replaced.

Chairman Almeida mentioned a previous application Ms. Whitney had done where the panels were used at ground level and asked if it would work in the present situation. Ms. Whitney said it had been different on the previous project because they had done a water-based system and could only place the panels low because of the reflection from the water and the view.

Chairman Almeida told Ms. Whitney the Commission's consensus was favorable regarding the appropriateness of the panels, but she would have to prove that the panels had minimal impact to sightlines when she came back for the hearing. Ms. Whitney said she would take more photos but emphasized that there would be no impact if they could not see the panels from anywhere.

Mr. Rawling asked if the house's exterior had been redone in the past 20 years. Ms. Whitney said parts of it had and the house wasn't in great shape. Most of the windows had been replaced with cheap vinyl inserts that downsized the window openings with flat casings. The last photo of the south view showed what was left of the existing trim. She said the rakes and the original moldings were in good shape, but the eave and return side had been ripped off. She wanted to insulate the roof and walls from the inside with extra insulation on the whole building, including the roof surface. Chairman Almeida verified that she was covering the entire building. Mr. Whitney said yes, that they would remove the existing trim and recreate it. She talked about the sheathing, insulation, flash, foundation dimensions, and so on, and said she would put clapboards to create a main screen. Chairman Almeida concluded that the added thickness would be simply the insulation and strips. Mr. Rawling was concerned about the strapping being loose or pulled in tighter than others, causing a wave system. Mr. Melchior said they had done it several times before and had never caused a wave system.

Chairman Almeida asked if there was a skirt on the house and was told no. Mr. Rawling asked if there was breathable foam that would allow moisture to penetrate. Ms. Whitney said no, it was vapor barrier foam, and there was insulation in other places. She said the moisture would be dealt with due to the insulation with ventilation that would control humidity. Mr. Rawling asked if other insulation was going in the wall cavities. Ms. Whitney said they were gutting the 1st floor and the attic, and there would be a thermal barrier between the studs. Moist air moving through the wall system would not get to the sheathing.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if she was going to use the existing crown molding and Ms. Whitney said yes. He asked about gutters, and she said she was considering wood because it was difficult to find a substitute. She did not like fiberglass. Chairman Almeida said he advocated AZEK in that particular area. Ms. Whitney said they had pulled it off because it had come apart. Mr. Melchior asked if everything would move outward due to the insulation and if it would box out the windows. Ms. Whitney said everything would move out to get bigger windowsills, and the addition would have a similar system with 2" spray foam that would downscale the rake and the overhang. She wanted the dormer to have an overhanging flat rake covering the gutters. She did not want a lot of heavy detail on the dormers, just flat trim on the sides, which was a common New Englander detail. A shadow board would cover the gutters and would not be seen because the building was set back on the site, so just the downspouts would be seen.

Ms. Ruedig was concerned that it would look more of an Arts and Crafts style than a New Englander, and the problem might be the 2/1 windows. She asked if 2/2 windows would be better. Ms. Whitney said she had started with 2/2 windows but it looked too busy. On the 1-story addition, she had eliminated the windows to a group of four on the front and one on the end. The 2/2 windows had too many vertical SDLs, so she spread it out a little. Ms. Ruedig said that 2/2 windows on the main house might be more appropriate on the main house. Ms. Whitney said if she did it on the old windows on the main house but the additions had 2/1 windows, it would show a distinction and would be too vertical and repetitious.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there were storm windows. Ms. Whitney said no, they were Marvin clad windows. Chairman Almeida agreed with Ms. Ruedig about the 2/2 windows and thought it added to the building. Ms. Whitney asked how he felt about the tiny ones. He said he never knew 1/1 windows to be successful. Mr. Rawling said he supported 2/2 windows in the buildings to be open to the porch's change of pattern. Mr. Katz felt the same way. Ms. Whitney said the four windows and the one on the Pickering Street side would be 2/1 windows.

Chairman Almeida asked for a consensus from the Commission and said he favored 2/2 windows. Mr. Gladhill agreed. Chairman Almeida asked about the bay. Mr. Rawling said he preferred 1/1 for the small windows and 2/2 for the other windows. He said if the smaller windows in the bay had 2/2 windows, they would pop with the simulated light and either a half screen or no screen. Ms. Whitney said she felt the little windows could stay unless they got bigger windows because the little ones were narrow at 2"x4". Chairman Almeida said they were getting into philosophies. He had never felt that the addition should represent a different moment in time but that it should be more traditional and match.

Chairman Almeida brought up the topic of doors and said there was a door on the porch and a balcony with an operative panel and fixed panel and a clear light. There were no SDLs. The pattern was repeated at the same elevation on the back of the addition. He asked if the same manufacturer could match the muntin widths. Ms. Whitney said if they put SDLs in the doors, they could match them with the windows, and she asked if the Commission preferred four lights or two upper lights. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the balcony. Ms. Whitney said it had a cedar bracket that may disappear. Mr. Wyckoff said it would be cleaner without the balcony. Ms. Whitney said the porch would have a square column with a molded cap and a molded base.

Chairman Almeida thought she should continue the language from the old house to the addition and with the fascia trim and roofing and siding materials, but he also thought the window should not reflect the original structure. Ms. Whitney said the Pickering Street side would be 2/2 windows. The current 2/4 window would be 1/1. Chairman Almeida was glad she clarified that it would be just that one window and not the new ones.

Mr. Rawling said the back elevation was very prominent, so the window treatment was important and he thought some sort of divided light would be good. Perhaps Ms. Whitney could add a transom over it to give it a barn-like appearance and make it more interesting. He felt something was missing. Ms. Whitney said he could do a trim and bump it out a little.

Mr. Wyckoff said he hadn't noticed how prominent the back of it was until Mr. Rawling brought it up, and he felt strongly that there was no place on that type of building for a 2nd floor balcony and patio doors. Mr. Melchior said he could support the balcony and door. Chairman Almeida said he also could, but he was not sold on the bracket detail to support it and thought it needed a pair of columns. Mr. Rawling thought the bracket had an Arts and Crafts style to it.

Chairman Almeida said he was bringing up the topic of windows because he wanted to soften the impact of the solar panels. He accepted the panels and knew Ms. Whitney had minimized their visibility, but he was looking for ways to mitigate their existence by improving the things happening below them. Mr. Wyckoff said he would prefer if Ms. Whitney got rid of the balcony, but he felt it would be better than a bracket system if it were supported by square columns. Chairman Almeida said he would do the same thing. In the past, there had been requests for single glass doors for historic homes, and they did away with grids in the door, but in this particular case, Ms. Whitney could match it exactly.

Ms. Whitney asked for a consensus on moving forward with the solar panels. The Commission said the panels were fine but had the following recommendations: that she lower the profile and make the panels less visible, do trim details, get 2/2 windows versus 1/1, use columns instead of brackets for the balcony, look into patio door details, take more photos, and get more window patterns. Ms. Whitney said she would try to file for the September meeting.

The Commission recommended a public hearing.

D. Work Session requested by **Douglas F. Fabbriatore, owner**, for property located at **536 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing

structure (construct second floor addition, lift main roof and add shed dormers) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 56 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

The owner Doug Fabbriatore told the Commission he would speak to the context of the two-fold project and then Rick Jones, architect for the project would explain how they were incorporating architectural features from the South End. The project had two enhancements, one of which was the bedroom addition on the 2nd story above the kitchen to allow them to make a large modern bathroom as well. The second enhancement was the dormers, which would make the attic level more usable. The attic was finished but sloped down and was not as usable as it would be with the dormers and would give more head space. Another full bath would also be added.

Mr. Jones mentioned that when he started a project in a historic district, he did a six-block walk around the property to identify the precedents in the area. He showed photos of a series of houses with gables facing Marcy Street and said he had looked for gables with dormers as examples. He also showed how the window on the top floor would be created. Another sheet showed a detailed level of extrapolating shingles and dimensions and a setback from the rake at the front and back of the dormer ranging from 3-5'. He showed 10/12, 2/12 and 12/12 and 4/12 roof pitches and the existing conditions and facades on the house.

The new Site Plan illustrated the dormers that would be added on either sides of the main roof and the hip roof that would be raised to the 2nd floor of the kitchen rear addition. The existing 6'5" ceiling was not high enough for usable space, and he pointed out the existing 1/1 windows, insulated Broadway Smith-type windows. He did not intend to replace all the existing windows or install new siding. The roof would be redone, and he showed the ridge coming up 2' at the peak to give a new 7' clearance at the edge of the dormer, which would create more head room on the upper floor and allow for a new bathroom and den. He showed a bedroom added at the back near the kitchen that carried the wall back. He said he had received BOA approval but there was still a historic concern. The elevations continued the window pattern up, and more windows would be added in the dormer as well as a small dormer in the bedroom over the kitchen. He showed existing windows at the lower level.

Chairman Almeida asked if the existing 1-story addition in the back already had an angle-back condition that Mr. Jones would straighten out. Mr. Jones said yes, and it would give it more elevation. Mr. Melchior thought the roof was a nightmare. Shed dormers on New Englanders were common architectural features and the most important feature was the prominent roof, so he could not support the shed dormers. Mr. Katz agreed. However, he said shed dormers had become part of the vernacular on New Englanders, and people's needs differed. This was an improvement with more living space and he found it relatively subdued and not pumped out to the edge like others he had seen. He thought the addition struck a nice balance between honoring the main house yet were different enough to show it as an addition. It had a preservation aspect to it. Mr. Jones said he tried to avoid conditions like having the apron underneath the main roof and was cognizant of the need to hold back the dormers on the edge and continue the apron across.

Ms. Ruedig agreed with Mr. Melchior but thought shed dormers were very common. She thought they were awkward to the roof lines of the buildings. She had more of a more problem with the half round window on the façade with the double window underneath it because it looked out of context and inappropriate. In order to retain the character, it needed to be the front façade, and the top windows had to stay the same as a single window. Mr. Wyckoff agreed about the window and thought the examples Mr. Jones was showing were new, and the half round window had no business there. Mr. Jones said it was not the original window and was about 50 years old. Mr. Wyckoff did not have a problem with the shed dormers on the main house, but he did with the dormer on the kitchen addition. He said the dormers had to back at least 4' from the rake. Ms. Ruedig said she didn't like the dormers in general, especially the full shed, but it might be okay if they were broken up a bit. Mr. Gladhill said they looked awkward on both sides. One side could be functional but not both, and he agreed with Ms. Ruedig about the windows.

Chairman Almeida said he had voted in favor of shed dormers in the past but did not like to see shed dormers go all the way to the ridge unless it was necessary. In this case it was not. He thought Mr. Jones was achieving some impressive ceiling heights inside, over 9'5", but the dormers were too big. He also did not like that they jutted out and asked if they could be held back a bit. He agreed with the window comments. Mr. Jones said he could reduce the dormers.

Councilor Kennedy said she had a similar house and would love to put dormers on. She asked if the Commission was going to allow every New Englander to be changed. Americans wanted more space these days, and the South End had a lot of New Englanders, so they would have to decide eventually. She was uncomfortable seeing the number of times the Commission conflicted in allowing one person to do dormers but not another. She said she would not support dormers until the Commission decided to do it for all New Englanders. They were making major decisions about the South End, and what was right for one should be right for others. She liked the historical look, so she was against the dormers, and if they went one way, everyone would want shed dormers for the extra space.

Mr. Fabbriatore asked whether it already set a precedent, since the dormers did exist and had recently been installed in the house right next door. It was an individual case and he did not want it tied to a grand statement about dormers in the South End. Chairman Almeida said they considered every application on its own merit and would never make a blanket decision to allow dormers on all New Englanders.

Mr. Rawling said they were often shown pictures of examples of existing buildings that represented things they would not approve. The building location was very prominent and exposed and he did not think that shed dormers were appropriate on the building. The juxtaposition of all the different gabled roofs working together in the South End created a unique character, and the dormers on the building would disrupt it. He felt the same way about the 3rd floor added window because it was not the scale, proportion or style of the rest of the house. He also did not think the double windows were appropriate with the house's fenestration pattern. Councilor Kennedy said she was okay with the back addition where it was not as prevalent.

Mr. Wyckoff said maybe it was the way it was drawn, but the right wall was not that prominent and looked like a castle turret. He was used to seeing dormers on New Englanders and felt they

were necessary because people wanted to use the attic, but the problem was on the side entrances and 2-3 bays that did not make the stairs work, so a dormer would be added to make the stairs work. He approved the shed dormers but said the front elevation with the triple bay window made no sense. Mr. Jones said the single existing window was the desired solution, and moving it vertically would raise the roof ridge. Chairman Almeida asked if he was raising the existing ridge, and Mr. Jones said yes, the roof was going from a 9/9 pitch to a 12/12 pitch. They would reconstruct the entire roof structure because presently it was 6'5, but it would not meet the code with the ridge, so they could not make the modification without raising the ridge.

Chairman Almeida said the Commission saw a lot of shed dormers that were poorly done, and he was afraid the shed dormer might waste the gable. Mr. Jones said they were clear on the window and the bay and they would address the dimensions with the eave and the ends of the gable roof and the spring point. Mr. Jones said if the ridge was going up, he did not want awkward solid space above it.

Mr. Rawling said a vent could be placed above it. Mr. Jones would have to replicate the frieze and cornice details, and the rake would have to match the existing building. A big overhang on the dormers would make them look awkward because of their transition. Mr. Jones said they did not want a big overhang. Mr. Rawling said it looked like a 1' tall flat face on top of the roof. Mr. Jones said it would be non-existing. Chairman Almeida asked if he meant the existing was wrong and they would replicate something they should not. Mr. Jones asked for clarification on whether they would restore parts of the house not previously in the scope of work to make them more historic, or whether the existing windows and rake would be matched. Chairman Almeida said if he was planning to tear it out, he might want to just restore it appropriately and it might mitigate the impact on the dormers if certain details were carried through.

Mr. Rawling said it was all new construction anyway but the Commission would not force him to put all new windows or paint the house. Mr. Melchior said he did not like a hip roof nor half a hip roof on the addition and preferred a gable. Mr. Jones said he had no problem with the gable and could change it. Chairman Almeida said it would be an improvement but would be an awkward shape because it was not a square. Mr. Melchior said it would be a challenge with the dormer on the addition intercepting the roof line. Ms. Ruedig suggested separating the double windows on the 2nd floor of the addition because they looked awkward and she could not tell if they were centered above the door beneath it. She agreed that the shed dormer had an awkward roof plane and that maybe a different roof would help.

Mr. Gladhill said that in a previous presentation, Mr. Jones had shown an example of a shed dormer going up the side of the house but didn't replicate it in the addition. Mr. Jones said it was a 1-story structure with a dormer that may have been added in the past, but the house next door was two stories, and if the main volume of the roof was changed it would interfere with the other house. They wanted to maximize the kitchen floor area for space but it felt like an accessory structure to the main house and looked added on, so they felt they could bring it out to the edge. Chairman Almeida asked if Mr. Jones had gotten BOA approval for it, and Mr. Jones said it had been 5-1 in favor.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Jones if he wanted to come back for another work session or a public hearing and recommended that he do a combination work session/public hearing. It would allow the Commission to hear his responses to their comments and address any concerns before the public hearing. Councilor Kennedy recommended that Mr. Jones have a 2-prong approach in his presentation for the plans for the back addition so if one section was not approved, he could go to the other section. Chairman Almeida also told him they had letters from abutters that supported and opposed his proposal.

The Commission recommended a work session/public hearing.

E. Work Session requested by **Jo Ann Lamoreaux and Thomas Lowcock, owners**, for property located at **77 Wentworth Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovate porch on west side of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 11 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Thomas Lowcock, owner, came before the Commission to continue discussions about his project. He showed the Commission photographs of the structure and said he was going to use cedar siding. The structure was on two levels and completely unfinished. The bottom half was 4' below the rest. He wanted to remove two existing windows and replace them with four windows to let more light into the room. He had recessed the door to meet code and would make the window at the end slightly bigger. Windows on one elevation were the same as the ones on the upper floor, and the window at the end was the same height but 8" wider. He would also remove the stairs. Chairman Almeida asked him to include the dimensions in the final packet.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Lowcock how much he was recessing the door by, and Mr. Lowcock said 3'2". Mr. Wyckoff asked how the walls would be finished. Mr. Lowcock said it would be cedar siding.

Chairman Almeida mentioned the 'back of the house' rule where it could only be seen by being in the same lot but noted that it was obstructed by the garage. He asked if the front of the house had originally faced the water, and Mr. Lowcock said yes.

Mr. Rawling asked about the skirting. Mr. Lowcock said the rest of the house, meaning the front and side, had cedar lattice work and he wanted to match it. Chairman Almeida said he would need to show photos of what existed and what he wanted to match. He also asked if the little shed would be reconstructed. Mr. Lowcock said the outside would remain the same but he would gut the inside and reposition the windows. Mr. Ruedig thought it was a good idea to re-clad the outside and asked if he would be reusing the shutters. Mr. Lowcock said he would not because they were imitation shutters and he didn't like them.

Chairman Almeida asked if the elevation with the four windows would be visible from the cemetery. Mr. Lowcock said it would. Chairman Almeida said he had concerns about the window placement and skylights and asked Mr. Lowcock to provide the manufacturer's data and cut sheets for them for the next meeting, and Mr. Lowcock said he would. Chairman Almeida aid

the view from across the pond was important but he was not seeing it in the plans. If the back side facing the pond was an issue, he assumed that it would have major alterations.

The Commission recommended a public hearing.

F. Work Session requested by **63 Humphreys Court Realty Trust, owner, and Lynn Fedorowich, applicant**, for property located at **63 Humphreys Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish mud room, attached garage, and deck landing) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 38 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

The owner Lynn Fedorowich and the architect Paul Fowler presented their plans to the Commission. Ms. Fedorowich said she had just purchased the house and it had three bedrooms, a full bath upstairs and a half bath downstairs. She wanted to add a master bedroom over the garage and mudroom and make the house more aesthetically pleasing. The house was built in 1958 and was not historic by definition.

Mr. Fowler guided the Commission through the plans. He wanted to improve the mudroom and the garage by making them more uniform and reflecting the vernacular of the neighborhood more. He said he was meeting with the BOA the following week because it was a non-conforming site. He planned to do improvements beyond the visual by taking the garage that was up against the rear property line and pulling it forward toward the front property line. The addition would be the same footprint and would move forward up the driveway.

Mr. Fowler showed the existing conditions and street elevation and what would be removed. He would keep the house as it was but would replace the double-hung windows with divided light 2/1 windows. Ms. Fedorowich said she wanted upper lights in the front door and maybe a window in the door to let more light in rather than a solid door. Mr. Rawling said they would need details of the lights and manufacturer cut sheets. Ms. Fedorowich wanted to use Andersen 400 Series windows. Mr. Rawling asked about the 1st floor windows. Ms. Fedorowich said she would have a standard middle window, but all the windows would be 2/1 windows.

Chairman Almeida said it would be an improvement to meld them together as one unit with the existing opening. Mr. Ruedig thought the picture windows were strange and said she had never seen anything like them, with the central fixed but with muntins. Mr. Fowler said they were double-hung on each side but stationary in the middle. Mr. Wyckoff said the windows were not represented on the drawings and he could not imagine their proportions. He thought the windows would need casings around the floor and sills. Chairman Almeida told Ms. Fedorowich to bring the cut sheets with her at the next meeting.

Mr. Rawling said the variety of the window styles needed more compatibility. There was a multitude of different styles, and the 2/1 windows did not go with the house. He suggested a 6/1 window. He saw a problem with the combination of the casements and double-hung windows because were they proportionally different, and he thought that larger windows should be used.

Ms. Fedorowich said she wanted privacy and wall space in the bedroom. Mr. Rawling said she could realign them proportionally. Mr. Fowler said he could do that and they may become smaller. He wanted to meet the egress requirement. Mr. Rawling said he should get casements and windows that related to one another. Chairman Almeida agreed.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the fenestration of the window at the top and whether it lined up with the entrance and garage doors. Mr. Fowler said it did. Mr. Wyckoff said it didn't seem to relate to the two doors at all. Mr. Wyckoff thought the four windows were awkward and asked the reason for the two entrance doors on the front façade of the house. Ms. Fedorowich said one door went into the mudroom and the other was the front entry and led into the dining room. Mr. Katz said the garage door was prevalent in 1950s architecture, so they were speaking the same language of awkward building in an awkward era. Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Fowler to explain the small 4-pane window by the side door. Mr. Fowler said it was open for discussion, but the original idea was to bring light into the mudroom and leave room for a bench.

Mr. Katz asked if there was granite in front of the garage door. Ms. Fedorowich said it was brick and wood and was falling apart. Mr. Katz asked if they were removing it. Ms. Fedorowich said it was granite on the front but not on the garage. Chairman Almeida asked if she was talking about the main door and the addition. Mr. Fowler said the main door had granite steps and the addition would have wood steps to give it a little formality.

Mr. Rawling said it looked like a variety of trims. The side door had wide trim, and some windows had wide and thin trim and were inconsistent. Mr. Fowler said it was only a graphic rendering, but they would redraw the windows with casing to make them consistent in size. Mr. Rawling noted that the door and the garage had different heights and trims, and he suggested that they bring the trim up on the garage and maybe put in a transom to unify the lines. Mr. Wyckoff said they could have another roof to take away from the garage door. Mr. Fowler talked about aligning the trims, maybe getting a transom and adding more light.

Chairman Almeida said Mr. Fowler seemed to be creating a roof situation where the double dormer was. He thought it looked very heavy with a sliver of roof and that perhaps it should read as a 2-story addition instead of the overbearing dormer. Mr. Fowler said he wanted something to divide it, whether the roof would come down or the trim. Mr. Wyckoff reminded Chairman Almeida that Mr. Fowler was duplicating the 12/12 roof pitch with the cheeks on the roof. Chairman Almeida said it was the same wall plane, but Mr. Fowler said it was more of an implied trim.

Chairman Almeida said it looked like the condition that was on the previous application, and he asked what the view was coming up Humphrey Court from Marcy Street. Ms. Fedorowich said the addition would not be seen because it was set back. The Commissioners went through the photos and were told that only the neighbor would see the addition. Mr. Fowler asked about a 6/1 window and suggested a cottage style might be a nice thing to do to bring language into the casement. Councilor Kennedy said she preferred the three windows instead of four and thought it would look cleaner. Ms. Ruedig said they were changing the original appearance of the house and reminded the Commission that it was a 1950s house and that they always try to go back to the original.

Councilor Kennedy supported Ms. Ruedig but noted that the mudroom and the garage were not original. She said she was fine with the addition. Mr. Fowler said that one of his proposed changes was to go from clapboards to clapboards and wood shingles on one side, but it was not 1950s language and more 19th century that was consistent with a 6/1 window, like a New Castle Cape. Mr. Katz said 6/1 windows were not automatically put on houses in the 19th century. His own house was built in 1935 and had 6/1 windows that were more inviting than 1/1 windows.

Chairman Almeida said the house may have been built in the 1950s but did not represent 1950s architecture. If the owner wanted to do clapboards with 6/1 windows, he thought it would be appropriate. Mr. Fowler said it would break up some of the massing as well. Chairman Almeida thought it would be a big mistake to do 6" exposed clapboards and that he should do a more traditional clapboard to fit in with the neighborhood, maybe 4". Mr. Fowler agreed.

Mr. Fowler said if they went smaller with the windows on the front, the casement would mimic a double-hung window because they would need the egress. The garage and the office in the back in the lower level would keep the alley and court views on the backyard.

Mr. Fowler talked about the rear elevation and the mudroom lowering the massing in the back so that the office would keep the previous language. Chairman Almeida was confused about the new addition elevation and tried to relate it to the dormers and roof lines. He thought it looked like there was no return coming across the back. Mr. Fowler said the return was flush and different from the front. Chairman Almeida said they were two different planes, and one was pushed further back. He thought it should just be a 2-story addition. Mr. Fowler said he would have to include more to bring the language from the front to the rear. Chairman Almeida said something was not quite right. Mr. Rawling said Mr. Fowler had to bring the language from the front to the rear, and he said the rear windows were disconcerting because they were different types.

The Commissioners discussed the awning over the rear door and a double window and thought a shed roof would protect the rear door and pick up on the pitched roof. Councilor Kennedy asked why it was over the window. Mr. Fowler said if the awning was over the door, the plane would be different from the other plane, so it protected the door and the window, and there was a separation between the two. He said if they brought the language from the front to the back, there would be an applied overhang coming the whole way which would protect the door. However, he did not think it made sense to cover the window, as the Commission had pointed out, so he would remove it from over the window.

Ms. Fedorowich asked if the Commission had any house color requirements and was told she could use any color she liked. Mr. Fowler said he would update his plans by incorporating the Commission's suggestions and would file for the next public hearing on September 4.

*The Commission **recommended** a work session/public hearing.*

G. Work Session requested by **Ryan P. and Crystal L. Cronin, owners**, for property located at **180 Gates Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct rear addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 18 and lies within General Residence B and Historic District.

Ryan Cronin, owner, and Dennis Maccarone of Somma Studios were present to speak to the application. Mr. Cronin said he had a new package for the Commission that included corrected dimensions for the height of the house. He told the Commission that he had a very small 5'x7" 2nd floor bathroom that had a shower but no tub. They had two small children and another on the way, so he wanted to extend the bathroom off of the 2nd floor on the rear of the house and add a sunroom/playroom on the 1st floor. Mr. Maccarone showed photos of the house and the site plan. The first sheet shows the location of the addition on the lot. The second page showed the existing and proposed back elevations. The 1st floor showed the sunroom and how the windows would fill up the whole façade.

Chairman Almeida noted that the rear of the house was very visible to the neighborhood. Mr. Maccarone said the windows were Andersen windows that had been approved the previous month and said the windows in the addition would match those with the same style, manufacturer, etc. Sheet 3 showed the side view from the driveway. Mr. Maccarone said the eaves and trim would match, and he would use AZEK for a material. Sheet 4 showed the interior side elevation, the entry door into the sunroom and two skylights on the roof. The last sheet showed the windows and door and the detailed blow-up of trim around the 1st floor.

Mr. Gladhill said the addition was too modern and that he would like to see an ell that was more historically accurate. He also did not want to see the electric meter on the house. Mr. Maccarone said that Sheet 2 showed the current location of the meter, and they were going to turn it to a right angle but not move it.

Mr. Wyckoff said they could get a little box with a raised panel so that the meter would poke out from the middle. He agreed with Mr. Gladhill and said he had a big problem with the width of the windows in the sunroom because their proportion was immense. Giving them a 9/6 language was almost insulting. Mr. Maccarone said he had just tried to match the existing windows. Mr. Wyckoff understood but thought it was inappropriate and did not like their size, spacing, or the paneling underneath. He would rather see a different design. Mr. Maccarone asked if he would like clapboards all the way and Mr. Wyckoff said yes, with smaller windows.

Mr. Rawling said Mr. Maccarone could enlarge the window by following the proportions of the individual panes rather than doing a 9/6. He could keep the same light patterns and add another row of lights to get a proportionate relationship. He thought the width of the addition looked a bit narrow. Mr. Maccarone said they cut it short because they did not want the existing window tied into it.

Mr. Rawling said they could do 12" on the side to improve the appearance. The horizontal windows in the driveway were inappropriate seeing that all vertical windows were in the rest of the house. He thought the overall design pattern was important. Ms. Ruedig said she did not care

for the paneling because it seemed more Victorian. Mr. Katz asked what the reasoning was for the awning windows. Mr. Maccarone told him it was for the light. Mr. Katz asked why they were high. Mr. Cronin said a washer and dryer were under one and a shower under the other, and he was keeping in kind with the current windows on the 2nd floor. Mr. Katz said they were not as truncated as the other windows and were on the driveway side, which was a problem. He thought it should be clapboards instead of panel and that they could work a significant amount of light with the same sized windows as the 1st floor that would be more appropriate.

Chairman Almeida said they had some fine examples of 18th century homes in the South End and the windows could not be limited by what was happening inside the house. The windows had to come first. Mr. Maccarone said they were not opposed to the style at all.

Mr. Rawling said it was important to have separation between the two windows and a good starting point would be to follow what was on the front elevation. Councilor Kennedy said she would be more comfortable if it were looking from the back on the left side; otherwise, the whole addition would be seen to someone coming up Gates Street. The street was so pristine, and all people might see would be the addition. Mr. Maccarone said it would be tough because of the kitchen and a child's bedroom upstairs. Mr. Katz thought he could get some space for the 2nd floor windows in the driveway side area because they were significantly smaller than the 1st floor windows, and he thought it would work.

Chairman Almeida said he wanted to see the application in an exclusive work session again and not a combination work session/public hearing, with all the Commission's comments addressed.

Mr. Cronin said it seemed like they needed one and did not oppose any of their comments, especially since he had been leaning toward a clapboards design from the beginning. He said their third child was due at the end of November and he had hoped to have most of the exterior framing done by then. He asked whether they could do the combination work session/public hearing if they came back with all the suggestions addressed. Mr. Katz said he would have to be prepared with all the specifications, window sizes, cut sheets, etc. but that it could be done. Chairman Almeida agreed.

Mr. Maccarone asked if they could take out the transom and have a solid wall. Chairman Almeida said a solid wall would be troubling to some people. Mr. Gladhill said the standards were very high on Gates Street. Chairman Almeida said if they did the single window on each side, it would go a long way toward approval. Mr. Wyckoff said that a problem with the addition was having to start the sill plate and the floor joints lower than existing to have a level floor. Chairman Almeida said the back of the house in the photos showed some exposed foundation.

Councilor Kennedy asked if neighbors were in support and Mr. Cronin said he had variable support but no letters yet.

*The Commission **recommended** a work session/public hearing.*

H. Work Session requested by **Middle Street Baptist Church, owner**, for property located at **18 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (remove vinyl siding, replace with wood siding, replace/restore windows and misc. trim) as per plans on file with Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 2 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

*The Commission voted to **postpone** the application to the August 21, 2013 meeting.*

III. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:05 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Acting Historic District Commission Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on March 5, 2014.