

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**July 9, 2014
to be reconvened on July 16, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak; Members John Wyckoff, George Melchior, Dan Rawling; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternate Reagan Ruedig

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Esther Kennedy

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

The Board's action in New Business and all Public Hearings has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature. If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest, that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. May 21, 2014
2. June 4, 2014
3. June 11, 2014
4. June 18, 2014

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the minutes of May 21, 2014, June 4, 2014, and June 11, 2014 as presented. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the June 18, 2014 set of minutes as amended. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Request for Re-hearing of the Certificate of Approval for 195 Hanover Street – submitted by the City of Portsmouth
- B. Request for Re-hearing of the Certificate of Approval for 195 Hanover Street – submitted by Joe Caldarola, et al

(These items were postponed at the June 18, 2014 meeting to the July 9, 2014 meeting.)

Mr. Cracknell read the July 9, 2014 letter that Pro Con sent through their attorney to the Planning Director Rick Taintor addressing the confusion about the change of material for the mid band on the hotel portion and the fact that it was a conditional approval.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **deny** the Requests for Re-hearing A and B for the following technical procedural reason:*

The item upon which the rehearing request has been filed was conditionally approved and final action by the Historic District Commission is still pending. Thus, this request is premature pending such action. Note: The 30-day period to file a Request for Rehearing will commence when the Historic District Commission has taken final action on this item.

*Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion. The motion to deny the Requests for Re-hearing **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

C. Petition of **Frank and Irja Cilluffo, owners**, for property located at **179 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of existing structure (remove widows walk) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 1 and is within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 4, 2014 meeting to the July 9, 2014 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **postpone** the petition to the August meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Treadwell House, Inc., owner**, for property located at **70 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing storm windows, add storm windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 49 and lies within the CD4-L and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Ralph Woodman representing the applicant was present to speak to the petition. He stated that the building tenants could not open some of the windows. The storm windows did not work and there were missing screens. Approval of the application would help keep down heating costs and would allow the Palladian window to have a storm window, improve the building and make the tenants happy.

Mr. Rawling stated that he had no objections to the storm windows but did to the choice of color. Everything in the building was dark, but the window selection was white. Mr. Woodman stated that the applicant discussed repainting the building in a lighter color in the spring. Mr. Rawling said that the storm windows should match the sash colors and suggested that the sashes be white. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he was not comfortable approving white storm windows on a dark building. Mr. Woodman stated that if they painted the building the same dark color, the storm windows could be repainted as well. Ms. Ruedig preferred that the storms matched the sash color. If they intended to paint the building a lighter color and do the sash white, they could stay with white storms. If they did not paint the building in the near future, they could stay with the darker color. Mr. Wyckoff thought that it was more of a promise than anything else if the applicant intended to paint the sashes, and he suggested that they seriously consider dark storm windows. They further discussed the color options of brown and black. Mr. Rawling preferred the black color. Mr. Wyckoff thought the brown color was acceptable.

SPEAKING TO, FOR AND AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

1) that the color of the storm windows shall have a baked brown or black finish.

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that by not having the storms stand out as they would with white, it would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain the special character and also complement the architectural and historical character. It would help the windows blend in.

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

2. Petition of **Danny Parker, LLC, owner**, and **John Bosen, applicant**, for property located at **266 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install two condensing units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 9 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.
3. Petition of **Roxy James Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **110 Chapel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct trash enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 3 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.
4. Petition of **Charles J. Doane and Claire OBrien, owners**, for property located **283 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install

generator) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 27 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, AND AGAINST THE PETITIONS

No one rose to speak to the petitions, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved that Consent Agenda Items 2, 3, and 4 be **approved** as presented. Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

It was determined that the proposed applications met the purposes and objectives of the Historic District ordinance and Review Criteria. Mr. Wyckoff added that the changes were minor and worked well.

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

5. Petition of **Carol J. Elliott Revocable Trust of 2011, owner**, for property located at **143 Gates Street** and **Jane A. Nelson, owner**, for property located at **135 Gates Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior repairs to existing structures (repairs to the roof area where the two houses meet) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lots 98 and 99 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **postpone** the petition to the August meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

6. Petition of **Warner House Association, owner**, for property located at **150 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 58 and lies within Civic, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Kerry Vautrot, Warner House Buildings and Grounds Chair, and Mr. James Smith, marketing representative were present to speak to the application. Ms. Vautrot requested approval for a new advertising sign that was a 2' wide x 4' tall x 1/2" thick PVC laminated and illustrated sign, along with an additional sign that would display open hours. The panels would be hung from a 12' post.

Mr. Gladhill asked if it would have a matte or glossy finish. Ms. Vautrot replied that it would be matte. Mr. Rawling asked the post size, and Ms. Vautrot stated that it was 9” tall, 4” in diameter, and tubular steel. Chairman Almeida asked what would happen to the existing hand-painted sign. Ms. Vautrot said the Warner House had a collection of all their signs from various eras. Chairman Almeida said he was concerned about a PVC sign in the front of the Warner House and asked if the sign could be framed to make it more substantial. Mr. Wyckoff added that a black border would make it look more like a frame. Mr. Ruedig stated that she appreciated the design because of its simplicity. She thought a border to frame the image was not a bad idea, and she preferred the minimal volume of sign. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the actual edge detail was, and Ms. Vautrot replied that it was a plywood squared corner. They discussed weather exposure and its similarity to other Portsmouth signs. Mr. Smith stated that it would have a dark edge but didn’t know if it would be sealed. Vice-Chair Kozak suggested detailing it so that it was a bit thicker to create the edge. Mr. Wyckoff asked how the sign would be hung on the post with three metal brackets and if they would wrap around. Ms. Vautrot replied that it was a double-sided sign. Mr. Wyckoff still didn’t understand how it would be attached to the post.

Chairman Almeida agreed that there wasn’t much detail about it, but seeing that they had hired a professional to hang the sign, it wasn’t a sticking point with him. Mr. Wyckoff thought it was an incomplete application. Mr. Melchior stated that the HDC had granted exceptions in the past with proprietors who cared about their properties, like the Warner House personnel, and the HDC could afford some leeway.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, AND AGAINST THE PETITIONS

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1) that the edge band be a solid material that is visible from the face of the sign.*

Mr. Gladhill seconded.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that the simplicity and minimalism of the sign did service to the property and the location was quite good. The technical strategy of how it stood up would be up to the fabricators and she thought it would be appropriate.

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

7. Petition of **82-86 Congress Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **25 Chestnut Street**, wherein permission was requested was allow new construction to an existing structure (remove/replace windows, infill brick, add mosaic cladding to west elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 45 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture, the mural designer Ms. Katherine Jackson, and the owner Mr. Mark McNabb were present to speak to the application.

Mr. McHenry stated that the purpose of the project was to replace five existing windows and wood paneling with three new round windows with brick infill and a mosaic. He showed renderings and images of the windows and mosaic and stated that the mosaic design expressed the joyful character of the Music Hall across the street. Ms. Jackson showed a sample of a fish mosaic piece to the Commission. She stated that the design would have mirror tiles to outline it, quilted broken glass for the infill areas, and glass roping for the string parts of the guitar motif. Chairman Almeida asked if it would be fabricated offsite and then applied to the building, and Ms. Jackson agreed that it would. He asked if it would adhere to the brick. Ms. Jackson explained how the design would be prepared for installation. Vice-Chair Kozak asked what the backer board was, and Ms. Jackson said it would be put together with adhesive and mortar.

Vice-Chair Kozak was concerned about the long-term maintenance and longevity of the mosaic on a 200-year-old building that would last another 200 years. She asked how Ms. Jackson would ensure that the tiles wouldn't pop during the winters. Mr. Jackson replied that she had done another project and no tiles had popped off, but if they did, they were easy to replace. Mr. Gladhill noted that the packet stated that the property owner agreed to maintain the mosaic artwork, and he asked if the maintenance was part of the deed and how they could guarantee that the next owner would maintain it. Mr. Melchior stated that the owner showed the highest level of care in everything he did, and he did not think a 10-year maintenance plan should be a restrictive covenant in the Commission's decision making. Mr. Gladhill said he was just curious. Mr. McNabb stated that there were no legal restrictions and that downtown buildings had applied tiles on them using the same technique and lasted a long time. Occasional chips got repaired. He ensured that it would be a high-quality installation and that it would be maintained. He wanted to contribute to the Music Hall and Chestnut Street, which would soon be rebuilt with trees, curbs, and planters, and it would be a continuation of the upper-quality theme.

Ms. Ruedig thought the tiles would be fine because the 1930s building was not so old that the bricks were not as soft as they could be. She thought the mosaic design would improve the building, especially seeing what had been done to the building in recent times. She felt it was appropriate for the area and it had her full support. Mr. Wyckoff congratulated Ms. Jackson on the design but was concerned about the three windows scattered haphazardly because if the design were changed, they would have to be dealt with. However, he was in full support. Chairman Almeida stated that he was very much in support of it and would challenge the non-contributing status of the building because it was becoming a very contributing building to Chestnut and Congress Streets.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that it was consistent with the special defining characteristics of surrounding properties and also with the unique character of Chestnut Street and its performing arts nature to have visual art relating to the context. It didn't mimic anything else in the District but was very much in character, and it was an innovative technique that went well with the mission of expressing the artwork. She believed it would be an asset to the City. Mr. Gladhill said he knew the owner had put time and effort into his buildings, but he had reservations about the three random windows. He would support the petition because it was new and different.

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

8. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Robert D. and Carlotta M. Holster, owners**, for property located at **46 Livermore Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add two story rear addition, elevator, add screen porch to rear wing of building, add new windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 21 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture and the owner Mr. Robert Holster were present to speak to the application. Mr. McHenry stated that there were minor changes in the packet that were mostly refinements. The main issue was materials. He went through the design intent of the project and the changes that had been previously discussed, like the new entryway, the screen porch addition, new roofing throughout, and new windows to the wing, as well as the placement and scale. He stated that the entire structure would be re-roofed, but the porch addition and area behind it would have metal standing seam roofing that would be compatible with the new asphalt shingles. The screen porch scale and roll-up screens were acceptable. The elevator shaft evolved from a chimney-clad veneer to the panel system and was now slid in so the exposure of the main chimney on the first two floors came out by a foot. He said the exterior foundation had similar materials to the existing house and talked about the mortar and trim. He discussed the three new windows in the barn structure and the copper gutters and spouts. Design elements had evolved and they hoped to get public hearing approval.

Chairman Almeida asked about the seam metal roof and if the edges had fine details. Mr. McHenry said the function of choice of the seam detail was whether it was clipped in or had mechanical fasteners, as well as the height of it. He brought an example of it. Mr. Wyckoff asked what color it was, and Mr. McHenry said it could be slate gray, dark or medium bronze. Mr. Hoslter said it would match the asphalt as closely as possible. Vice-Chair Kozak mentioned a tin-coated historical material that was closer to lead-coated copper. They further discussed alternatives, heights and details. Chairman Almeida suggested a flat or matte gray and said it

was important as to how flat it would be. Mr. Rawling brought up the detailing on the elevator tower and thought the change to the panel treatment was successful, but the size of the panels were confusing because they didn't quite follow the plan's design. Mr. McHenry said they had talked about right angle corners as an attempt to shroud mechanical devices. Mr. Rawling asked if some easing of the top edge would help. Mr. McHenry thought the metal roof was appropriate because it was a slow-pitched roof.

Chairman Almeida asked if they considered a larger structure to encompass it or another design element to cap it off. Mr. McHenry said they wanted to minimize the impact of the mass. Chairman Almeida thought the mass and external chimney were two items causing pause. Mr. Gladhill asked if it was a hydraulic elevator and was told that it was a residential grade elevator. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the new chimney cap was masonry, and Mr. McHenry said it was intended to be brick. Mr. Rawling brought up changes in the rhythms of the elevations and mentioned pilaster. Chairman Almeida noted the transition window casing to panel. Mr. McHenry stated that the windows had brick mold casings so it was intentionally narrow, and adding flat mold would take up too much landscape and lose the idea of the paired windows.

Mr. McHenry showed a sample of the Marvin window corner to the Commission. Chairman Almeida asked about the window heads on the addition versus the historic house and whether the floor aligned with them. Mr. McHenry said it had not been an issue. Ms. Ruedig thought it was an improvement and hoped they would keep the interior as intact as possible. Chairman Almeida asked why they had not carried the roof to the elevator shaft because it didn't interfere with any windows. Mr. McHenry replied that it would interfere with the left window.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public comment session.

The Commission then moved from the work session into the public hearing session.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Almeida read the petition into the record as an official public hearing.

Mr. McHenry reintroduced himself and Mr. Holster and reiterated the purpose of the application.

Chairman Almeida asked if the Commission had comments about the elevator tower. He thought it was appropriate to carry the eave condition of the home around the top of the tower to terminate it more rather than being random. Mr. McHenry stated that instead of it looking like added-on housing, they had wanted to make it look like a dormer on the back of the house with its own hip roof, but then we thought it would impose on the existing house like a fake dormer.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it preserved the integrity of the District and respected the special historic character. The addition would not affect the main structure. It complemented the historic character and was a very high-quality addition on a high-quality building that would last.

Mr. Gladhill stated that he would not support the petition because he didn't feel the addition complemented the building as well as it should. It had a greenhouse effect, and he thought it would look better in brick. There were also prominent views of it from the bridge.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that, as the details and materials evolved, she saw that it was the only way to do the addition. She liked that it was transparent and evident that it was an addition and not a modification or ill-fated attempt to copy the original. The original building and the addition related to one another in massing, scale and proportion. She would not be in favor of the painted metal roof if the public view of it was closer, and thought it would be beneficial for the applicant to pursue a natural patina copper material. Chairman Almeida said he was convinced and very satisfied with its appropriateness. He thought it was a fine design that was worth seeing from several locations. The applicant and owner understood clearly the fine details the Commission had been asking for and were in sync with their aesthetic.

*The motion **passed** with 6 in favor and Mr. Gladhill opposed.*

9. Petition of **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (changes to the parapet and eave finish material, add exterior lights, egress, door, and vents in place of shuttered windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios was present to speak to the petition. She presented three aspects of the building, the lights, mechanical louvers on Bridge Street, and the change in material to the parapet system. She discussed where the lights would be added. She said the parapet material had been improved and provided a sample of the textural difference that would be used on the main building's parapet wall and also on the one-story addition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the parapet had molding. Ms. Ramsey said the framework achieved the final finish and the product would be seamless, like a plaster application.

Ms. Ramsey spoke about the mechanical louver added to the Bridge Street elevation. They abandoned the closed shutter detail, removed the existing header and sill, and brought in new

bricks. The louver would be painted to match the brick color. A second louver was on the side wall of the rear addition with the same material as previously-approved. They would paint it a color that resembled the wood tone after staining.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the louvers were 5'6" long. Ms. Ramsey said they had to get a certain size that was streamlined and above grade.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application with the following stipulation:*

- 1) that three light fixtures are added beside the upper doors along the Maplewood Avenue and Hanover Street facades as presented.*

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a minor change to a building that they had approved with a number of minor changes, and it didn't affect the design or integrity of the building. Mr. Gladhill said the mushroom factor and the louvers were innovative technology.

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

10. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Joan S. Davis and Charles P. Allard, II, owners**, and **Elizabeth Levey-Pruyn and Bruce Erickson, applicants**, for property located at **35 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove exterior stairs) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new side entry and porch, install dormer, construct decks, replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 29 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Alyssa Murphy of Murphy/Manypenny Architecture and the applicants Ms. Elizabeth Levey-Pruyn and Mr. Bruce Erickson were present to speak to the application.

Ms. Murphy stated that they were replacing all the windows and trim in the south and east elevations. In the north elevation, they would make more space by raising the back second floor but keep the slate roof and shutters and match the proportions of the other windows. They were considering a skylight that would not be visible to the street in the east elevation.

Mr. Gladhill stated that he took photos of the building from Peirce Island and found it visible, especially the metal roof, and thought the potential skylight would be visible as well. Ms. Murphy stated that they had not designed it to be invisible and still thought it was appropriate. They had received twelve letters of support for the design.

Mr. Gladhill asked if there was an alternative to the roofing material on the shed dormers. Ms. Murphy mentioned imitation slate but felt that it would not be used due to the low pitch, so they thought metal was the better solution. Ms. Levey-Pruyn didn't think that copper would match the slate as well as a colored metal. Chairman Almeida asked if they would consider using slate on the vertical sides of the shed dormer. Ms. Murphy said they had piles of slate, and Mr. Erickson was concerned about the cost. Mr. Wyckoff thought the vertical boards were more appropriate. Ms. Ruedig was not comfortable with the vertical boards and felt it was too busy. The bigger issue for her was the size of the dormer, which was very large and visible. She asked if they could push it back from the front of the house. Mr. Erickson said they had already so.

Mr. Rawling asked about color. Ms. Murphy said they wanted to paint the house a slate color, light on the main house with a darker color as trim. Mr. Rawling thought the dormer would relate more to the roof by making it recede as much as possible. Mr. Wyckoff thanked them for restoring the wooden steps on the front of the porch, saying that they seemed to be original.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the public comment session.

The Commission then moved from the work session into the public hearing session.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Almeida read the petition into the record.

Ms. Murphy went through the restoration that was proposed for the house. The two-family home would be changed to a single family home, and they were removing the exterior stairs and the second-floor door, and the skylight. They would replace windows with fiberglass and add a new exterior door and steps on the side, and also added a rear deck and raise the small roof piece.

Mr. Gladhill asked if zinc would be used for the metal roof. Ms. Murphy stated that they would consider it if it was a better material. Mr. Gladhill thought it was more appropriate for the District and the visibility aspect. Ms. Murphy agreed that they would do the zinc.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Kozak moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

1) that the metal roof shall be zinc.

Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that it was a careful restoration of a historic contributing building and struck her as exemplary because it restored and preserved many original features, like the slate roof, and the different shapes of trim, shingles and siding. Most of the forms were kept exactly what they were, and the metal roofing to zinc was an improvement. Chairman Almeida stated that it would be a high-quality restoration and looked forward to seeing it.

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

11. Petition of **J.H. Sanders 1986 Revocable Trust, owner**, for property located at **30 Walden Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new deck and railing with composite materials) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 18 as lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts.

Vice-Chair Kozak recused herself from the discussion and vote. Mr. Melchior left at this point in the meeting.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The contractor Mr. Vincent Bauer was present to speak to the petition. He stated that the main deck needed repair and did not hold paint due to a maple tree. The large deck had no hand rail, and they wanted to replace the deck with a composite system. The footprint would be the same. The railings on the main structure were not considered hand rails and did not meet code.

Ms. Ruedig asked if there was another deck on the site. Mr. Bauer agreed and said they wanted to match it. She asked what the railing design was. Mr. Bauer said it was a post with a basic cap, like the photo. Ms. Ruedig asked if they would match one another. Mr. Bauer said they would and said there would be a hand rail going up the stairs instead of a railing. They would replicate the existing one, and the larger one would look like the smaller existing one.

Mr. Rawling thought the 42" railing system would overwhelm the house elevation. Mr. Bauer said the code was 36". Mr. Wyckoff stated that the 36" rail height was fine for residential and the height would be the same as the back door location. He asked what kind of caps would be put on the posts. Mr. Bauer said they were flat tops and matched the detail on the existing. Mr. Rawling asked if the decking would be the new plastic wood look. Mr. Bauer agreed and said it was Fiberon that didn't need to be painted. The color chosen was to match the natural look. Mr. Rawling stated that artificial materials simulating brand new wood was a bad idea, and the photo showed it as very artificial. He suggested a darker color.

Mr. Rawling said that the Commission needed samples to look at. Chairman Almeida said there was a color issue and asked if it would match the existing wood. Mr. Bauer said the existing wood was painted and pressure treated. Mr. Wyckoff said the problem was that the photo showed a bleached-out, light-colored wood. Mr. Cracknell went to the website on line to find to color pattern. Ms Ruedig asked if the back of the house faced the water. Mr. Bauer said it faced the garage, not the water. When the colors came up on the website, Mr. Bauer said it was the Ipe color. Mr. Rawling still insisted that the simulated new wood look was too artificial, and any colors except the Ipe and the Western Cedar would be fine with him. Chairman Almeida agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Rawling moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1) that the deck pattern and color shall be any color but the IPE and Western Cedar as shown on the fiberondecking.com/gallery website.*
- 2) That the railing and post caps shall match the side door railing and post caps.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Mr. Gladhill noted that the application was not very detailed and usually they had specifications and dimensions. Ms. Ruedig stated that she would support it but preferred that they had more information. She was not very comfortable because she didn't have a clear understanding of what was being applied for.

Mr. Wyckoff thought it was innovative technology that met the Commission's back-of-the-building policy. The railing would replicate a high-style wooden railing from a distance, and it was appropriate for the site. Chairman Almeida stated that despite having a limited amount of information, he understood the materials being used. The style of railing would be replicated as well as the footprint of the decks and stairs, and it was outside of the public view.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 5-0.*

12. Petition of **402 State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **402 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear additions) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct staircase) and allow renovations to an existing structure (change vinyl siding to composite wood siding, replace windows, add French doors, decks, and skylights on rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 12 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Attorney M. L. Geffert, representing the applicant and owner, Mr. Tim Phoenix and Mr. Jason Beane of Blue Water Construction were present to speak to the application. She wanted to retain the existing main building, which was an ell-shape with granite foundation. The street-facing façade would not change, but they would retain the side steps and modest deck and entryway. The side step area was new construction but replicated the current street view.

The Planning Department had advised them to retain the steps to break up the view in the back a bit. The property owner agreed to granite, and the deck would be shorter. There would be no changes to the ell-shaped building, and all street-facing façade windows and doors would be retained. Some of the older doors would be removed to be used on the new renovation. All the doors and windows were compatible with the 1800 historic structure or the surrounding area.

There would be no change in height, or scale, and the massing would be the same and would in fact shrink. There would be no change in the width of the steps, nor to the front façade. The new treatments included adding rear wood railings, removing vinyl siding from three sides of the building and replacing it with a composite siding and adding French doors.

Ms. Ruedig asked if they would retain the chimney, and Attorney Geffert said they would. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the fiber siding was. Mr. Beane said the concrete siding would match the existing wood clapboards. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the original siding was in bad condition. Mr. Beane said that had dry rot and felt that concrete siding would reduce maintenance. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the wood trim around the window would be replaced and was told that it would. They would re-use the windows from the demolition and recreate new wood trim. The existing windows would be painted. Mr. Beane thought there were wooden clapboards beneath the siding. Mr. Gladhill suggested that they keep the original clapboard if it was usable.

Mr. Phoenix said that when they bought the property 20 years before, the vinyl siding was left because they were told the wood was in poor condition. Mr. Gladhill asked if the foundation was usable. Mr. Beane said the brick foundation was in disrepair. He asked if the columns would stay, and Mr. Beane said they would. Vice-Chair Kozak recommended a smooth fiber cement siding texture, which was required in the District.

Chairman Almeida requested that they change the long vinyl fence to wood, and Mr. Beane said that had already made that change on their site plan. Chairman Almeida said it was a well thought-out plan and was excited to see the original proportions of the building exposed again.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Tim Phoenix stated that he supported the project and thought the aesthetics were beautiful.

No one else rose, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Gladhill moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application with the following stipulations:

- 1) that the proposed fence shown along the side yard shall be wood;
- 2) the fiber cement siding shall have the smooth finish exposed;
- 3) the existing chimney in the rear ell will remain;
- 4) that the preferred antique vintage door shall be used as presented.

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.

Mr. Gladhill stated that the restoration would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character.

The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.

13. Petition of **Tess Casey and Michael J. Dipleco, owners**, for property located at **1 Jackson Hill Street, #2**, 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 141 as Lot 30-2 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Michael Dipleco, one of the owners, was present to speak to the petition. Mr. Dipleco stated that he rescued the house seven years ago from falling into the ground. He wanted to replace the rotting windows with simulated divided light and vinyl Andersen windows. The house was on North Pond and he had replaced a lot of the siding due to water damage.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the two houses shown in the photo were one property. Mr. Dipleco agreed and said they were turned into a condominium. Ms. Ruedig explained that she had seen the interior and that most of the windows were vinyl replacement windows, with a few double hungs with no storms but in good shape. They were wooden, single glazed windows and needed work but were historic. Mr. Rawling asked who decided to have 4/4 windows. Mr. Dipleco stated they were originally 2/2 and the contractor changed them. Mr. Rawling thought 6/6 windows would be more appropriate.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the 4/4 windows were in the back shed addition. Ms. Ruedig said they were on the main house. Mr. Wyckoff concluded that the house had inappropriate windows for a colonial structure and said 4/4 windows could not be changed to 6/6 and would have to be replaced. Chairman Almeida appreciated how the windows were hung because they respected the previous glass area and asked Mr. Dipleco if he wanted to replace all the windows. Mr. Dipleco agreed and said he had already replaced the windows on the second floor with 1/1 full replacement windows. Mr. Gladhill did not like the vinyl windows.

Mr. Wyckoff said that they had approved composite windows before and insisted everyone put in 6/6 with divided light. Mr. Dipleco said there were dozens of homes next to him without

proper windows. Ms. Ruedig told him that it wasn't a good reason to continue the poor windows. Mr. Dipleco offered to replace the aluminum storm windows on the house if he could keep the modified windows on the second floor. Ms. Ruedig said the 2/2 or 6/6 windows would be fine, but the main issue with vinyl windows was that they had no exterior muntin, and the Commission almost never accepted those. Mr. Dipleco said he couldn't afford wooden frame windows. Mr. Wyckoff knew that the 6/6 style in that particular size was around \$600 and thought at least the front of the house deserved the treatment. They could do the back-of-the-house rule. Chairman Almeida thought they could salvage some of the work that had already been done by painting the vinyl and applying muntins. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a site walk so they could look at the window situation as a group and consider the back-of-the-house situation.

Mr. Cracknell stated that he had suggested to Mr. Dipleco that he restore the windows on the structure and consider the Andersen series. He offered to write down the information for him. Mr. Dipleco said he would appreciate the name and details of the requested window. Chairman Almeida said the Commission would do a site walk.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **continue** the application to the July 16 meeting with a site walk to be scheduled prior to the meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

14. Petition of **Colaco, LLC, owner, and Karen Hayes, applicant**, for property located at **47 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 28 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The business owner, Ms. Karen Hayes, was present to speak to the application and stated that the structure had a heating system in the basement but no cooling system. Mr. Wyckoff verified that the structure was a cement block coming off the back of the building and the condensers would be mounted on the wall. Chairman Almeida asked if it could be placed on the roof. Ms. Hayes said she would ask her contractor. Chairman Almeida hated to see the courtyard be a dumping ground for a mechanical unit, and if it were put on the roof, it would be out of the way. Ms. Hayes asked if it could go on the wall if it wasn't possible to put it on the roof. Chairman Almeida said they could stipulate it. Mr. Wyckoff noted that the shown unit was a wall-mounted air conditioner and perhaps could not be mounted on the roof.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

1) That a roof mounted condenser is preferred.

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.

Mr. Gladhill said it was an innovative technique for getting it on the roof and out of the way.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

V. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Athenaeum, owner**, for property located at **6-8 Market Square**, 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 117 as Lot 20 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Wyckoff recused himself from the discussion.

The representative Mr. Dick Adams and window installation representative Mr. Bruce Clemens were present to speak to the application. Mr. Adams told the Commission he wanted to replace 12 windows in the FOY building. The building collapsed in 1981, and the front of it was rebuilt using the old brick. He wanted to use high-quality windows and would consider the Andersen 400 series. Mr. Clemens added that the properties on either side had vinyl windows. Ms. Ruedig asked if they would be full replacement windows. Mr. Clemens said they would.

Vice-Chair Kozak said the Commission would not approval vinyl windows on Market Square. Chairman Almeida agreed and said they would need an all-wood option. Vice-Chair Kozak suggested Marvin. They further discussed window options. Chairman Almeida thought the aluminum clad baluster treatment was painful to look at on the first floor in that prominent location. Ms. Ruedig said the owner of the Athenaeum had a responsibility to keep up the main cornerstone building of Market Square and it was important to have wood to keep it historic.

Mr. Adams disagreed with the Commission's viewpoint that the difference would be seen from ground level. Mr. Rawling said replicating the existing detail was important. Vice-Chair Kozak stated that the Commission couldn't approve anything that evening and suggested the applicant come back for a combination work session/public hearing.

The Commission recommended a Work Session/Public Hearing.

B. Work Session requested by **Christopher D. Clement, Wendy L. Courteau-Clement, Andrew R. Courteau, Jr., and Elaine M. Perry, owners**, for property located at **41-43 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (upgrade the lower front portion of the building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 29 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **postpone** the application to the July 16th meeting because the applicant was not present. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

VI. WORK SESSION/PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED)

C. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Portwalk HI, LLC, owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (changes to all facades) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1-2 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the June 11, 2014 meeting to the July 9, 2014 meeting.)*

Mr. Jeff Johnston representing the applicant and Mr. Matt Worth of Pro Con were present to speak to the application. Mr. Cracknell handed out a copy of a memorandum drafted July 9, 2014 regarding revised plan changes for the apartment section of the Portwalk building. Mr. Worth spoke about the diamond façade building and said Option A made the most sense because it lent symmetry to the retail space. He talked about the main front entrances on Facades 1 and 2 that were part of the apartment buildings and retail space.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked if there was detail trim on the fiber cement panels. Mr. Worth stated that it was a banded trim. They further discussed the trim and the flat panel. Mr. Worth stated that they lowered the awning of the door to bring it down to pedestrian level. Mr. Rawling asked if there were pilaster details. Mr. Johnston said they were as approved. Vice-Chair Kozak thought it was an improvement.

Mr. Johnston stated that they removed the spandrel from Façade 5 on Hanover Street to bring the glass down, and they also lowered the awnings near the trash room to add some variety. Chairman Almeida said the awnings made a big difference. Mr. Johnston discussed panel and glazing options. Vice-Chair Kozak thought the alteration would break things up. Mr. Worth stated that on Facades 5, 6, and 7, the spandrel had been removed from the basement storefront, the awning was brought down on the main floor on Maplewood Avenue, and the doors were changed to wood. Chairman Almeida thought the wood door was more elegant.

Mr. Worth referred to the transformer gates and talked about using a similar panel to one that was on the garden wall and also bringing the scale of it to the height of the trellis. Another

option was to use a leaf pattern. Both would have a perforated metal so that the transformer wouldn't be visible. Mr. Gladstone said that he liked the leaf pattern but preferred Option 1 where it indicated that it was just a gate. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the location of the gates could be brought forward. Mr. Johnston stated that they would have to set them back on the back side of the pier. Mr. Wyckoff thought it looked like a hole in the wall. Mr. Worth stated that Option 2 did not have the leaf pattern. Ms. Ruedig said that a maintenance gate still presented the opportunity to do something interesting with it. Chairman Almeida suggested a different colored pattern. Vice-Chair Kozak suggested a wrought-iron approach. Mr. Gladhill thought it was important to give people on Maplewood Avenue something interesting to look at. Mr. Wyckoff agreed and said the gate needed a detail and suggested handcrafted leaf design. Mr. Johnston thought the colors should be kept similar to make it subtle. Ms. Ruedig wanted the gate to be interesting but didn't want it to draw too much attention, so she preferred Option 2 with the higher quality of ornamentation. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the applicant could make the gate a bi-folded one with four panels. Chairman Almeida stated that Option 2 was the preferred option because it was more subtle.

Chairman Almeida suggested that they go into the public comment session.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover stated that the Commission should be ready to vote on the whole thing. She thought the gate with the leaf pattern would be nice and said that everything else was looking good. She thought it was a great improvement to the neighborhood.

Chairman Almeida closed the Public Comment session. They then went into the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Almeida read the petition into the record.

Mr. Johnston presented the changes as discussed and agreed upon in the prior work session. Chairman Almeida noted that a lot of doors had been changed to wood, with the exception of one, and he asked if it had been included in the change to wood doors. Mr. Johnston referred to Façade 5, where he had stated that the entry door would be all glass. It was not a wooden door.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the petition, so Chairman Almeida closed the public session.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the modifications as presented as follows:*

Façade 1 & 2 – Portwalk Place (Page 1):

Façade 1

1. Modify the storefronts including changing the pier widths, adding a pier, adding a door,

- adding a mid-rail to the doors, changing the storefront height and width, raising the granite base height, and changing the window height above the canopy.
2. Add a column of windows and shift doors and windows.

Façade 2

1. Increase the width of the band height.
2. Add pilasters centered on windows above with 12-24" pier widths and add an awning.

Façade 5 – Hanover Street (Page 4):Façade 5

1. Modify the height of the storefronts and change the double egress door to single door. The door shall be all glass.
2. Add column of windows, relocate doors and windows, and add a column of double doors with balconies.
3. Increase the height of the band.

Façade 5, 6 & 7 – Maplewood Ave. (Page 5):Façade 5

1. Modify the width of the storefronts along Maplewood Ave., modify the muntins at the door head, reduce the 2nd floor glazing heights, and increase the height of the band.

Façade 6

1. Change the paint color on the 5th floor.
2. Modify the storefront along Maplewood Ave. to include modifications to the entry glazing, awnings and the use of wooden doors.
3. Increase the height of the band and change the profile.

Façade 7

1. Add transformer gates to the wall using Option 2 with a curved rail system and a hammered or cast-aluminum finish with a decorative vine pattern (with a color similar to the gate) to be applied to the gate.

Façade 3B & 2B – Portwalk Place Rear (Page 6):Façade 3B

1. Modify the windows, relocate a door, change the granite base to concrete, and precast band to FRP.

Façade 2B

1. Increase in width of the window trim, add a green trellis, and add an additional door.

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they were modifying a previously-approved building that maintained the character of the District and enhanced the architectural and historic character of the building and defining character of the surrounding properties. He supported the modifications.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that the details and nuances of the discussed changes had involved a lot of compromises that the applicant made to mitigate some of the changes, and although they were not initially approved, there had been new improvements to the building. As a whole project, she believed it was at least as good as, if not better than, the original submission.

*The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11:07 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on August 6, 2014.