

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**September 3, 2014
to be reconvened on September 10 & 17, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak;
Members John Wyckoff, George Melchior, City Council
Representative Esther Kennedy; Dan Rawling; Planning Board
Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Regan Ruedig and
Vincent Lombardi

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

*The Board's action in these matters 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

- A. August 6, 2014
- B. August 13, 2014

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the minutes of August 6, 2014, and August 13, 2014 as presented. Vice-Chair Kozak seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- 1. 1 Junkins Avenue
- 2. 319 Vaughan Street
- 3. 121 Mechanic Street
- 4. 1 Harbor Place

Chairman Almeida recused himself from the Administrative Approvals.

Mr. Cracknell referenced the letter from the Inspection Department outlining the inspection that was done by the Building Inspector at 121 Mechanic Street. In review of the letter and past concerns about demolitions occurring without notice to the HDC, Mr. Cracknell had asked the Building Inspector to submit the letter. Due to the infestation of carpenter ants in the wall structure, the Building Inspector required the addition to be removed and the foundation put in place. The applicant would replace the windows with the same previously-approved windows on

the upper portion of the building, and the submitted letter denoted the proper protocol for similar situations.

Mr. Gladhill noted that, in regard to the 319 Vaughan Street application, the memorandum mentioned changes regarding windows but their email referenced new plans. Mr. Cracknell replied that the applicant's intention was to build the covered entryway, and if it took longer than the occupancy permit stated, it would have to be brought back. A real threshold had not yet been established for the entryway. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether it was a one-year time limit, and Mr. Cracknell agreed, saying if the entryway was not installed within a year of occupancy, the applicant would either get an extension or remove the request. Mr. Wyckoff concurred.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** Administrative Approvals for Items #1 through #4 as submitted. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said they preserved the integrity of the District and were all minor in nature.

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

III. OLD BUSINESS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEM)

A. Petition of **Frank and Irja Cilluffo, owners**, for property located at **179 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove widows walk) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 15 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 6, 2014 meeting to the September 3, 2014 meeting.)*

Mr. Paul Spurling representing the owners stated that the reason for the demolition request was to remove the widow's walk to obtain all the details, reconstruct it and then put it back up. He passed out documentation and photos to the Commissioners and stated that the widow's walk was in deplorable condition and ready to collapse, so it had to be examined and reconstructed. He wanted to preserve as many historic details as possible, and he thought that enough material still existed to duplicate the details. The widow's walk had been repaired 30 years before, and the materials used then were not conducive to the historical aspect of the building. He wanted to build them to the proper historical specifications and needed the Board's permission to have it removed so that it could be documented and then put back up.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not think the application was clear because he could not imagine why it didn't include a rebuild. He did not feel that it was complicated, like rebuilding the interior of a colonial home. The half balusters looked new, even though they were 30 years old. He asked for clarification. Mr. Spurling replied that the widow's walk was unsafe, and by walking on the remaining widow's walk 2/8 boards, they would collapse. Some artifacts in the rail system were new, but the process by which the balusters were done would cause them to collapse. Everything needed to come down to be documented because it was too dangerous to document it on the roof, and a rebuild would be expensive.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that, in terms of procedure, replacement in kind was exempt, and the application appeared to be a replacement in kind, so she questioned why it was before the Board. Chairman Almeida stated that he did not think it was a replacement in kind because several pieces were chopped-up boards and not appropriate, and the applicant wanted permission to remove it to see what might be historical species. Mr. Sperling mentioned 1784 beams and said the original material was critical because putting in modern materials would be a waste of money. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the profile would be the same, and Mr. Sperling replied that he needed to get that profile. Chairman Almeida agreed.

Mr. Gladhill asked what the timeframe was from demolition to a new widow's walk and was told six months. Councilor Kennedy stated that a stipulation could be added about the widow's walk being installed within a year. Mr. Rawling asked for shop details. Mr. Sperling replied that he could supply the official end result of shop materials. Ms. Ruedig clarified that it was a demolition and that the applicant would have to come back and show the Board the drawings before putting it back. Mr. Lombardi was surprised that there was no original documentation and asked Mr. Sperling if he had looked for it. Mr. Sperling stated that he would find out.

Mr. Cracknell said if the applicant was going to remove the balustrade, it made sense to figure out what the new one would look like and prepare drawings to reconstruct the balustrade. He suggested that the HDC continue the meeting until the drawings were submitted. He asked if 60 days would be enough time to get a clear picture of the materials. Mr. Sperling said it may not be enough time. Chairman Almeida told Mr. Sperling he could request a continuance.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **approve** the removal of the widow's walk for further inspection and with the stipulation that it be replaced by September 3, 2015. Additionally, the applicant was requested to appear before the Commission at its December 3, 2014 meeting to present proposed drawings of the widow's walk for their review and final approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gladhill. The motion passed unanimously (7-0) with all in favor.*

IV. OLD BUSINESS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEM)

B. 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 was requested to allow exterior renovations 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 103 as Lots 98 and 99 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 6, 2014 meeting to the September 3, 2014 meeting.)*

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Worth Development Condominium Association, owner**, and **Scott Pulver, applicant**, for property located at 113 Congress Street, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install mechanical equipment on the roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

2. Petition of **Mark Wentworth Home, owner**, for property located at **346 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace service door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

3. Petition of **Peirce Block Condominium Association, owner**, and **DeStefano Architects, applicant**, for property located at **23 High Street, #C**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocation of existing mechanical unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 17 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Vice-Chair Kozak recused herself.

Chairman asked the Commissioners and the public whether any items should be removed for discussion. No one spoke, so he declared the items closed.

*Councilor Kennedy moved to **grant** Certificates of Approval for the four Consent Agenda Items as presented. Mr. Melchior seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

4. (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 (Option A: mock-up for proposed modifications and design changes to the pre-cast banding on the hotel portion of the building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1-2 and lies within CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

WORK SESSION

Mr. Jeff Johnston representing Portwalk and Mr. Matt Worth of Pro Con, Inc. were present to speak to the application. Mr. Johnston stated that Mr. Worth would review parts of the mock-up.

Mr. Worth showed photos that were taken during the site walk. The main elements of the mock-up reviewed were the fiberglass banding at the second-floor level that now closely matched the precast vertical concrete pilasters and had a coat of paint and were completed. They also added the precast capitals on two pilasters as an option to break up the long band versus having the band be continuous. A rosette had been discussed for the middle of the precast band but there was no final design as yet. Decorative aluminum panels were shown on two of the bays to give a feel of what they would look like. They brought up whether or not it would be the aluminum color to stand out or if it would be painted black so it wouldn't be as prominent. It was an option that was not a part of the original approval of whether it would be aluminum or painted black. Two awnings were installed on an adjacent bay to show how they sat in relation to the pedestrian scale of the sidewalk. Also, the panel trim at the street level was discussed as well as two existing bays that kept the panel with the smaller trim at the edges, while the center bay had the

finished pilaster, which was part of the original submission. There had been comments that the black panels did not look like they were fully finished, and they could stipulate that all the black be painted to its final coat.

Mr. Wyckoff clarified that Mr. Worth meant that the black interim columns were not finished and the quality was poor because the fasteners and so on could be seen, which was inappropriate on a building of that quality. Mr. Johnston agreed and said that the pier detail was not finalized, so they had thought there could be a stipulation that everything that was black would be painted black. Chairman Almeida stated that the Commission had asked for the mock-up so that they and the public could view it, and they needed to see whether the mock-up was approved or rejected so that they could discuss whether it needed to be embellished. However, he rejected the mock-up because he did not think it was ready. The capitals were 'funky' and not right. He was glad that they went through the mock-up process because it was a good tool that convinced him that it was not the solution. Mr. Lombardi said his first impression was that the aluminum decorative panels did not relate to anything on the building or in the area, and they seemed to be simply placed there as an element to cover something else that didn't look good.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why the capitals were placed where they were. He thought they should be at the top of the precast concrete columns underneath the horizontal panel so they would block the difference in material. However, the fibercast was painted with sand paint, so they were not so plain anymore, and he felt it was effective. He asked Mr. Worth why the capitals were not placed underneath the horizontal band. Mr. Worth stated that they had discussed how the horizontal band and pilaster came together and how they would make that piece read better, and it was a solution to introduce shadow lines in that area to highlight. Mr. Wyckoff noted that the mitered joint between the precast concrete and the band was still visible, so he had thought that the heads were going to cover it up and make it look like a column so that it had a base, shaft and capital. He felt it was a bad idea to put them up on the horizontal band but said he might agree to accept the spandrel panel if it was painted black, even though it was right 'in your face'.

Mr. Rawling asked whether the amount of projection in the capitals was a function of them being precast. Mr. Johnston stated that their task was to build a mock-up based on the drawing, which they had received final approval on, so they took the detail, reveal and profile that were on the plan. Mr. Rawling clarified that the projections were not the functional component of the precast, and Mr. Worth agreed. Mr. Johnston stated that they could be changed. Mr. Rawling asked what kind of sand paint was used. Mr. Worth replied that it was epoxy-based paint that went over the fiberglass, with a durability of 5-8 years. Mr. Rawling asked what would happen when half of it came off. Mr. Worth said the entire band would be repainted.

Mr. Rawling felt that the capitals were not resting comfortably and the overheads seemed to have too much dimension. He suggested placing something under them that stepped them back because they were overhanging too much. He also felt that the panels would be better in another color. He preferred the original design but said, with some adjustments, there could be improvements. Mr. Melchior stated that the capitals looked awkward and the materials would need diligent maintenance. Mr. Johnston stated that it was a different product from the fiber cement and they could use a coat of paint at the base, but they should not compare the same products. Mr. Melchior stated that fiber cement looked like an artificial product.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the aluminum panels were an original design. Mr. Johnston said the theme was taken from the Beauty School Building and applied to the panel to create some of the design so that it connected to another place in the City.

Ms. Ruedig stated that she agreed with Mr. Melchior regarding the texture between the two separate materials, the plastic and the cast stone. They were the same color but had different textures and properties, and she didn't understand how it was approved to begin with. It didn't look right to have two different materials as one piece of the building. She thought the aluminum panels were fine and would be more appropriate in black.

Vice-Chair Kozak thought that adding more detail lower would be successful because there was less of a tendency for pedestrians to look up at the upper band, so she thought the direction was right but that it needed fine tuning. She liked the idea of a darker color in the panels but would not want to see flat black because it needed contrast. She thought it was nice to tie into materials that were already on the building and mentioned something more subtle, maybe with a copper tone. She felt that the shiny aluminum was jarring but that the design of the motifs was fine. The awnings were successful, and she liked the pilasters, but she shared the concerns about the capitals and thought the extending part should be more subtle. She suggested either changing the fiberglass band or making the capital deeper so that it went down to the bottom of the band.

Councilor Kennedy had a problem with the band and agreed that the aluminum was 'in your face'. Nothing matched it. She had a problem with the overhangs because there was a lot there. She also thought the mock-up would show everything in final, but she could not get past the spots in-between. She was concerned about the non-natural material. She asked Mr. Johnston if he considered everything finished and was told that he did, so she stated that she was uncomfortable with it.

Mr. Rawling mentioned a similar capital detail on a bank that seemed softer and recommended that the applicant look at it. He thought the color and shading of the material should relate to Infill Detail A, the double pilaster and column. A subtle color difference would be an improvement, and the space behind it could be darker to accentuate it more.

Vice-Chair Kozak reiterated that the difference between a fiberglass band and a concrete band or a façade with an embellishment versus one without an embellishment was greater. The more they could do to place it over someone's head would be much better than the difference in concrete and fiberglass band, which would be lost to the pedestrian because it was too high to notice. Chairman Almeida agreed, stating that he had said several times that what happened at the first 14 feet was far more important than the band. He felt that the comments about the capital were very good, and the public had agreed. The placement of the capitals was wrong, and the band was now something completely different from the columns supporting it. His reaction to the final details on the column was that the aluminum panels were too bright and should be more subtle. He thought they were misplaced. He wanted to see the decorative panels on a particular bay to dress up the spandrel. The grills downgraded the building but perhaps could be custom-made. The awnings were not very successful because they came out 30" but not enough to cover the pedestrian. He felt they were more decorative than useful and recommended a 6-

foot extension. He thought the pilasters were very successful, and any panels that remained visible or unchanged would have to be refinished and cleaned up.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that the pedestrian would not see the band. He agreed that the band would have maintenance issues but should have a better detail or better placing. He thought if they were smaller and didn't have such a square overhang, they would be better. The problem was that they were oversimplified into just a block that cut into the horizontal band. He also liked the idea of canopies on the whole sidewalk.

Ms. Ruedig stated that the building sat at a major entrance into the City, and most people would not notice the difference in materials because they were the same color, but as the materials aged differently, that difference would be greater. She preferred that the band be a different color. Mr. Lombardi thought the aluminum would be a maintenance problem due to maintaining the painted surfaces underneath it. Mr. Rawling thought the pattern on the top of the tower was prominent and had nice detailing. He felt that the color comments related to the design, something less stark than the aluminum.

Mr. Johnston knew there was concern about the metal panel, and he asked if awnings would be more favorable. They could propose that the awnings have no sides, which would open up the building more. They could put the metal on the tower itself and have softer awnings on the street level. Councilor Kennedy stated that she was looking for continuity, and popping a tower did not work for her unless there was consistency somewhere else. She agreed with Ms. Ruedig that people would see the difference in materials.

Chairman Almeida opened up the Public Comment.

Mr. Rick Becksted of 1395 Islington Street stated that the aluminum design panels needed more contrast and thought they looked thrown on. He wanted something more in continuity with the rest of the storefronts, either raised or recessed. He wondered why they kept adding dressing on the building because it presented more work for the Board as well as the developer. He felt that the costly aluminum panels should be thrown out. The awnings, even though they were a subtle touch, needed to have their location adjusted because they protruded outside of the two vertical columns and had nothing to fasten them onto. He thought a recessed panel would look much better. He asked how the capitals were put on and whether there was a ledge. If a metal band could go all the way across, he asked why that couldn't carry the precast. He also questioned the granting of the Conditional User Permit because it was based on quality material, and he felt that fiberglass was not quality material.

Mr. Joe Caldarola of 170 Dennett Street presented a power point presentation. He mentioned a stipulation for a final painting of the panels and said the painted concrete material was substituted without HDC approval. He took several photos of the building in close-up detail and noted that there were issues on Maplewood Avenue with nails that were overdriven and puttied over. There was extremely poor joinery, and instead of molding, something uneven was put on that had a cardboard texture. There was flashing behind the paint that didn't match the prefinished work as well as putty that didn't fill in the dents. Deer Street had the same pattern of bad textural issues and overdriven nails. The drip cap was not custom-made to fit the building.

He compared it to the Residence Inn that had no textural, joint or drip cap issues and also showed a few new UNH buildings with similar panels, consistent color and texture, and no visible flashing. He agreed with everything said about the capitals, saying they looked fake and did not relate to anything people were accustomed to. He made a formal request that the Board require the substitution of the concrete panels taken off and replaced with aluminum panels. The mid band already had an FRP going around the top of the building, so it was almost too late for paint concerns. He talked about the history of it being substituted for the precast but using the same design. Mr. Caldarola felt that the biggest problem with the building was the human scale on Maplewood Avenue, and he requested that the Board lower the wall by three feet because it was too high. He also recommended an automatic sprinkler system for plant irrigation.

Ms. Barbara DeStefano of 99 Hanover Street stated that she was one of those short people who walk along the building, and she thought it was a great idea to have canopies over all the door entrances to the building because it was mostly glass, so the canopies would help differentiate where the doors were and give it a human scale. She felt that the precast banding issue should not hold back approval. She liked the art deco metal work and thought it gave a great look to the building and didn't have to match everything in the area. She said she did not even notice the capitals but suggested that they could be moved down and have the art deco put on them so that people would see them more. She felt that people did not look up at the building and think it was poor workmanship -- they just walked by to go eat or shop. She thought there was no reason for the wall to be reduced because it would look out of place if it were shorter. She asked the Commission to approve the project so that they could move on.

Mr. Bob Cataldo of 133 Islington Street stated that he was always impressed with Mr. Caldarola's photos. His wife thought the mock-up looked cheap. He said that changes had been going on since the HDC originally approved changes and thought the work sessions were confusing from the point of the developer. He felt that it was time to have accountability to the City and the public for transparency and suggested that a list and description of each deviation be provided, as well as Mr. McNeely's comments, so that the public would know what the HDC actually approved, what the developer agreed to do, and what the construction contractor really did. He challenged the Planning Department and the HDC to come up with the information and publish it so that the public could decide whether it was proper and if the developer had done everything he said he would do.

Ms. Clare Kittredge of 3 Franklin Street stated that she agreed with people who preferred the horizontal band and also agreed that the brick wall was too tall. She objected to the process of hiring a Boston architect to police a Boston developer and asking him to catalog design changes instead of finding out when and why the changes occurred. She asked why the City staff did not monitor the information and make it public, like other cities did, and why the HDC alone had to decide the consequences for all the unauthorized changes. She wondered how other developers and homeowners who couldn't afford lawyers and public relations personnel could feel confident that the rules uniformly applied to all.

Mr. Caldarola rose again and said he agreed with Chairman Almeida that the awnings were a wonderful addition to the building.

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

Chairman Almeida asked if they would have the public hearing or continue the work session. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the developer wanted to respond to any public comments. Mr. Johnston stated that the irrigation system would be installed that week. He also stated that the FRP band with sand paint was among other improvements that the HDC could like. The vertical bands seemed to be acceptable, and he agreed with Mr. Becksted that they put some of that detail into the band and awnings on top of it. The precast capitals could be removed. There would be no metal panels, but they would do the awnings. He emphasized that the hotel was open, guests were shopping, and the building was ready to move forward.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the HDC had received a lot of comments about the band and the aluminum. They were not finished well and needed more work. Placing the aluminum filigree over might not be the way to go, but the awnings might. Mr. Rawling questioned the air flow requirements and the louvers and asked whether the awning line would be raised or continued. Mr. Worth said they would study it. Vice-Chair Kozak thought if the awnings were moved up, it would break up the harmony and make the building entrance difficult to find.

Councilor Kennedy thought there were some main themes, such as the connection to the fiberglass, what it looked like at the top, and the kind of decoration. Then there was the theme of breaking the line. She could not vote on it yet because the HDC had given many suggestions and themes, and she felt it was up to the contractor to decide which theme they wanted to present. She suggested that the developer come back with their ideas. Vice-Chair Kozak wanted to address the fact that there were a lot of comments to process and all the changes were confusing, but it had all been documented and posted on the Planning Department website. The HDC approved documents early in the design phase, and the final construction documents were submitted to the City, which the architect approved.

Mr. Rawling stated that he wanted to get the application approved as much as anyone else, but it had been hard for the HDC to make a motion because they needed something that addressed the changes that they could look at and confirm what was approved. Mr. Wyckoff mentioned the change of material underneath the spandrel, the aluminum piece. He said the developer changed the material and it might not be fastened properly. If the vote was postponed, he felt that some mitigation had to take place on how the developer would repair the panels before the spandrel was put on, and those panels would have to be repaired all the way around the building and done right before additional material was placed over them. He stated that it should be Point No. 6, in addition to the five points presented for approval, and that the vote should be postponed until the following month.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **continue review of the application** to the following month. Mr. Melchior seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

At this point in the meeting, Chairman Almeida recognized Mr. Lombardi with regard to his new appointment to the Commission. He asked him to say a few words about his appointment. Mr.

Lombardi stated that he was excited to be on the Commission and hoped he could make a good contribution. He had a long history with preservation; he was a park ranger with the Boston National Historic Park for several years and then worked at Strawberry Banke. His background was more preservation than restoration. His current avocation was computer technology, but he had a deep interest in the preservation and historic integrity of Portsmouth. He looked forward to getting to know everyone and doing what he could to help.

5. Petition of **Kristina Logan, owner**, for property located at **220 South Street**, wherein permission was to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing shed) and allow a new free standing structure (construct 15' x 30' artist studio) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 1 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Ms. Logan stated that she was an artist and had always wanted to make the detached garage a usable space. She had a photo of the new elevation that showed the shingles on the outside of the building. The intent was to keep the spirit of it being a small outbuilding with the fine roofline, the beadboard under the exposed rafters, and keeping the barn doors and the side entrance. It would increase in size, from 12 x 3' x 18' to 15 'x 30'.

Chairman Almeida stated that the HDC was aware of the changes due to the previous work session, and he verified that Ms. Logan proposed shakes instead of clapboard and that everything else was the same. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there was a door or window behind the north exterior elevation. Ms. Logan replied that it was a sliding panel that opened in. The interior space would have 6' x 8' for a lawnmower, shovels, etc. and would be separate from the studio. Mr. Rawling asked if the side would have white cedar prefinished shingle and was told that it would. Ms. Logan showed a sample of it. Vice-Chair Kozak asked what the materials for the sliding door would be. Ms. Logan replied that they would be cedar.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak to the application, 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 stipulations:*

- 1) That white cedar sawn shingles shall be used as shown on Sheet A01.*
- 2) That the sliding door shall be cedar and designed as shown on Sheet A01.*
- 3) That the side door shall be a wood material and designed as shown on Sheet A01.*

Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that a very good effort was made to design the building so that it contextually matched the rest, and it would help everyone in the District. Councilor Kennedy thanked Ms. Logan for leaving the barn doors on the front and keeping the wood. Mr. Rawling said that she made the design from the work session a little nicer.

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

6. Petition of **Strawbery Banke, Inc., owner**, and **Stephen P. Bedard, applicant**, for property located at **61 Washington Street (Conant House)**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (reconstruct scullery) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Stephen Bedard representing Strawbery Banke was present to speak to the application. The addendum to the previous approval was to do the rest of the preservation work at the Conant House. They found the original scullery foundation and would like to reconstruct it. He stated that the house was part of the Carriage House Program and would be two apartments. It was all wood.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Larry Yerdon of 372 Court Street, President of the Strawbery Banke Museum, stated that the change fit in with the long-term preservation policies of Strawbery Banke.

No one else rose to speak to the application, 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. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that it was a historical recreation of something that evidence showed previously existed. It appeared that all the details were in keeping with the time period of the original structure, and the quality of the proposed details and materials were authentic. Mr. Rawling stated that he supported it completely.

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

7. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Work Stiff Properties, owner**, for property located at **92-94 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels on main building and rear addition) as per plans on file

in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 76 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

WORK SESSION

Ms. Barbara Jennings, owner, and Mr. Condon of Revision Energy were present to speak to the application. Mr. Condon showed a sample of the solar panel to the Commission and stated that he changed the layout and removed the panels running down to the drip edge as suggested. The active panel was 10 watts instead of 300 watts and had a black frame and mostly black cells. The panels were made to absorb light and not produce glare. They would be pitched at a 40 degree latitude on the east and west roofs, and the frame would only be seen close up.

Councilor Kennedy asked if Mr. Condon had looked into having the panels all on the back side of the property. He replied that those sides of the roof were limited by building ownership. Councilor Kennedy noted the panels on the front side and thought if the dormers that they owned were incorporated, the panels on the back side could use the dormers. Mr. Condon said using the dormers did not help much because they could barely squeeze one panel in and there were issues with snow and shadows. Ms. Jennings said that the square footage didn't equal up, and if they lost the edges, it would look like a ridge cap. She thought the front was subtle and noted that the back was just an ugly cinderblock wall.

Mr. Rawling asked what kind of frame would be used on the collectors and how far off the roof the top of the collectors would project. Mr. Condon replied that the frame was aluminum, and they had a testament to its longevity. The racking system was made by their solar hot water manufacturer. The biggest concern was leaking, so everything was mounted to rafters. Mr. Rawling asked for the framework dimensions of the modules and was told that the frame itself was 3" and about 1-1/2" wide, and each module had an aluminum railing on the top and bottom. The hardware was 1" x 1" stainless steel with black anodized coating.

Mr. Rawling presumed that the surface of the collector would be 5" off the roof and asked if there would be 2 or 3" visible hardware around the edge of the frame. Mr. Condon told him that it would be just barely and showed him another project as an example.

Mr. Gladhill noted that Historic New England had submitted a letter to the HDC about their concern with the visibility of the solar panels facing Pleasant Street having a bad effect on the John Langdon House. Ms. Jennings emphasized that their environmental effort would preserve the building and would be efficient. Putting the panels up at the ridge was the most minimal they could do on both sides. Mr. Gladhill stressed that it was the core of the tourist area and asked her how she thought solar panels belonged in the core of the Historic District. Ms. Jennings replied that she had researched it and it was about compromise, and some historic districts were working out those compromises. Mr. Gladhill asked for examples. Mr. Condon mentioned a project in downtown Exeter that was built with the same panels.

Councilor Kennedy stated that she was looking for alternatives for the back of the building and suggested expanding the height and putting another side on it. Mr. Condon said it would be challenging engineering-wise.

Mr. Rawling stated that he had walked down the street and around the blocks, and the roof line visibility above the dormers was so minimal that someone would have to search for it. Dormers dominated the rhythm and blocked the views from the sides and angles of it. He felt it would be clean, simple lines, and the color harmonized with the roof and would not draw attention. Chairman Almeida agreed but said he would request that they be held back from the eave line on Court Street at least two feet so they didn't interrupt the gable eave on the street. Mr. Condon didn't see a problem with that.

Mr. Lombardi noted that the Photoshop image of the collectors was very flat on the roof, whereas a small rise might create a shadow on the roof. He felt they had a significant presence on the street. Ms. Jennings thought they were better than the cinderblock wall and also more productive. With a cutaway, it wouldn't be that detrimental.

Mr. Gladhill asked if they could put a solar panel on the roof and have a site walk on the Pleasant Street. Vice-Chair Kozak said she had trouble supporting solar panels on Pleasant Street. The HDC tried to keep solar panels off primary streets. She suggested insulating the building instead of using solar panels. Ms. Jennings said the boiler had to be replaced, so it was a timing issue, and solar panels would be cleaner.

Chairman Almeida thought it would be possible that they might not get all the solar capacity they wanted and there was still work to do on the front of the building. He asked the Commissioners if they should consider it further. Mr. Wyckoff suggested simply voting and thought the site walk was just a way of putting the vote off. Chairman Almeida said he was not quite convinced about the Pleasant Street side but could be. Councilor Kennedy stated that she preferred doing a site walk to see if the panels had shine, glare, or visibility. Mr. Rawling mentioned that it was a new design in the HDC that didn't detract from the original design but was just a clean new element on the building itself.

Mr. Condon stated that he could offer other sites with full roof arrays for the Commission to view. He had two concerns with a site walk on Pleasant Street, one of which was that one panel would not do it justice and the other was that he could not legally go up on that roof by himself.

Ms. Ruedig said she did not feel strongly one way or the other. She asked the reason for the black frames, and Mr. Condon said it was mostly aesthetic. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the Commission could look at the Exeter site. Mr. Melchior said he would support the application as presented, and Mr. Wyckoff agreed.

Ms. Jennings asked for a two-week continuance so that a site walk could be done on one, two or three sites.

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **continue** the work session/public hearing to the September 17, 2014 meeting. Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

8. Petition of **Flintatta, LLC, owner**, and **Futuro, Inc., applicant**, for property located at **73 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels on southwest roof, replace front doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 19 and lies within CD4-L and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Jesse Ware representing the owner and Mr. George Sparks were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Ware stated that all the panels were black with no silver lines in the grid. They would cover the west-facing street of the building and would provide 75% of the building's power. They also wanted to replace the front doors of the building with glass framed doors.

Mr. Wyckoff told the applicant that the Commission needed specifications and more detail on the door and suggested that they come back at a different time for the door request.

Mr. Gladhill noted that the solar panels were in a prominent location and not hidden. Vice-Chair Kozak stated that very few buildings in the District relied on solar power because the roofscapes were so important, especially on focal buildings like churches. Chairman Almeida mentioned other projects with flat roof arrays that were not visible.

Mr. Sparks said the building was from the early 1800s with a 1940s asphalt roof, and they wanted to maintain the aesthetic of solid black on an asphalt roof. There would be no reflectance and it was designed to blend in with the roof as much as possible. Chairman Almeida said it was a good point, but their Ordinance made it clear that there was a sensitive way to encourage innovative technology and materials. Councilor Kennedy stated that she was not in favor of the panels but wanted to see examples of other sites in order to see the reflectivity.

Mr. Rawling asked what prevented a similar strategy as the previous application by putting the panels on the other side. Mr. Sparks replied that there was less power on the northeast side, and they had to harvest a minimum of 80% power to install the panels. The northeast side would probably be 45-55% and would not be acceptable to the State standard.

Councilor Kennedy recommended that the Commission view other sites so the applicant could come back, seeing they had to come back for the door. Chairman Almeida asked the applicant to give some examples to Mr. Cracknell so the Commission could look at them.

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 **continue** the application to the September 17, 2014 meeting. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

9. Petition of **Mary C.S. Maurer, owner**, for property located at **65 Rogers Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows, add storm door, install fence and gate) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 115 as Lot 2 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Mary Maurer, owner of the property showed photos of the porch to the Commission and stated that she wanted to change the lattice to a new lattice because the bottom piece of wood was rotting faster than the upper pieces. She wanted to put AZEK on the porches. The side farmer's porch had no side door, so she wanted to install a wooden door. The existing fence would be brought up to six feet with decorative sides and would be all cedar wood. She would keep the single gate door but do an arbor. Eight of the original windows were 2/2 and were replaced with 6/6, so she wanted to replace a few 6/6 windows each year.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that there was no cross-section of the window and asked if it was a sash package or a prehung replacement window and whether the storm windows would be removed. Ms. Maurer said she would keep the storm windows and the replacements would not have storms. Mr. Wyckoff asked how the window would interface with the old window sill because he was concerned that the window's framework on certain brands could sit up from the sill quite a distance and be filled in. Chairman Almeida told him that the quote showed a framed window sitting on top of the sill. Mr. Wyckoff discussed the 14-degree angle and how some windows were not compatible. Ms. Maurer stated that she had researched the windows.

Mr. Rawling applauded Ms. Maurer's efforts to go back to the 2/2, but he noticed a significant wide frame around the replacement window and also noted that it was a metal-clad window, which was a big issue. The Commission looked it up and noted that the sill was sloped.

Chairman Almeida and Mr. Wyckoff discussed the dimensions of the frame of the sash. Ms. Ruedig asked how the style of the storm door was chosen. Ms. Maurer said she just chose the one she liked best. Ms. Ruedig said it was a style more suited to the South End but not appropriate for the Victorian house. Mr. Wyckoff mentioned wooden storm doors with panes of glass, but Ms. Maurer said the front door would never be opened.

Chairman Almeida stated that an exemption was created for storm doors, which he read. In essence, it stated that storm windows and doors and screen windows and doors were exempt providing that they were wood frames with metal or vinyl racks concealed by wood frames. Therefore, storm doors constructed with wood frames were exempt.

Vice-Chair Kozak asked about the fence facing Rogers Street. Ms. Maurer said it was four feet and she wanted it to go to six feet. Vice-Chair Kozak said the HDC typically asked for lower fences on the street but allowed higher fences on the sides and rears of properties. They discussed how the fence aligned and stepped back. There were no questions on the lattice work.

Chairman Almeida asked if the gate door and the arbor were the exact replication of the example given and was told that it was. Councilor Kennedy recommended that all the windows be done in wood.

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** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That a sloped sill for the proposed window shall be used.*
- 2) That the windows shall be wood.*

Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff said it would preserve the integrity of the District, and everything chosen was appropriate for a Victorian style house. It would maintain the special characteristics and would complement and enhance the architectural and historic character. Councilor Kennedy appreciated everything done to preserve the house that was in shambles, and said that using wood would complement the Historic District. Mr. Rawling stated that he didn't think the windows held to the standards of the HDC.

*The motion **passed** with all in favor and Mr. Rawling opposed, 6-0.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:30 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 October 1, 2014.