

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**November 12, 2014
reconvened from November 5, 2014
to be reconvened on November 19, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak;
Members John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling; Planning Board
Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Reagan Ruedig and
Vincent Lombardi

MEMBERS EXCUSED: George Melchior, City Council Representative Esther Kennedy

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. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Bruce A. Erickson and Elizabeth A. Levey-Pruyn, owners**, for property located at **35 Salter Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (add window on first floor of south elevation, remove window on west elevation, replace misc. slate roofs with zinc standing seam roofs) 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. *(This item was postponed at the November 5, 2014 meeting to the November 12, 2014 meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida stated that there was a request to postpone the petition indefinitely. Mr. Gladhill questioned the postponement, saying that the chimney that they had not approved to be taken down had been removed and replaced by a green box. He felt that the applicant could be in violation if the petition was postponed indefinitely. Mr. Cracknell replied that he had been unaware of the chimney removal and asked if it could be continued to a future meeting so that the applicant could clarify their intent with the chimney.

*Mr. Gladhill moved to **continue** the application to the December 3, 2014 meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

B. Petition of **Kenneth Charles Sullivan, owner**, for property located at **40 Howard Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (modify roof pitch, raise curb height, construct roof top deck with railings, add additional

scupper, increase size of scuppers) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 61 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. (*This item was postponed at the November 5, 2014 meeting to the November 12, 2014 meeting.*)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. Sullivan requested a work session first. *Vice-Chair Kozak moved to have a work session, and Mr. Gladhill seconded. The motion passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

Mr. Sullivan gave a brief history of the renovation, saying he began renovations the previous year in three phases. During Phase 2, he had problems with the sub-framing contractor, so he made himself the overseer. He discussed other issues such as difficulties stemming from the replacement of the old Building Inspector and windows.

Mr. Wyckoff noted a problem with the additional scupper and the fact that the scuppers were larger but had been planned too small. His biggest concern was with the wide downspout because it looked like something that would be used in a demolition. Mr. Sullivan showed a wooden mockup of it and explained how the metal would go up without hugging the house. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a large downspout and a liner, saying that normally the edge on both sides would be beaded, and he explained how it worked. He also suggested that Mr. Sullivan look at the variety of downspouts on Gates Street. Mr. Rawling had a problem with the width, so Mr. Sullivan said it could be cut back to a dimension that the Committee liked. Mr. Wyckoff told him that there was a larger commercial grade 3"x5" downspout available that would cut it down about 2 inches. Mr. Rawling thought it was a good suggestion. They further discussed the box and the downspout. Chairman Almeida thought they could make it as small as possible, and if the Commissioners wanted it boxed in, they'd have to have dimensions.

Mr. Lombardi asked what the ground plastic piping was, and Mr. Sullivan told him it was temporary. Chairman Almeida said they could have a stipulation that the piping be removed. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the covers were white, and Mr. Sullivan said they were copper. He thought the scuppers looked big because they were flashed with copper. Chairman Almeida said that the scupper was shrouded with roofing material, and he suggested covering the existing facing as much as possible. He also liked the metal version.

Mr. Sullivan then discussed two lights for the door. He had found an old second light in the basement and thought he would put both of them up. Mr. Cracknell stated that it would have to be authorized because it had not been submitted. Mr. Sullivan then discussed the rear light in the small back yard and said his electrician had recommended a dedicated light with infrared for safety and security. He spoke of a Home Depot-type of dual spotlight. Mr. Cracknell noted that there was no photo of it, but Chairman Almeida thought they could give administrative approval for the third light if there was no concern about it. Chairman Almeida asked if the white windows and doors would be painted to match the rest, and Mr. Sullivan stated that they would. They discussed the reduced size of the rake line. Mr. Rawling felt that it would be difficult to accept as a flat elevation drawing because it wasn't perceptual. The top plates looked like they

were a foot higher. They then discussed the metal ridge gap. Mr. Sullivan showed a photo where the roof curve stopped and said his roofer recommended gold lead.

The windows were then discussed. Mr. Sullivan went through the specifications, highlighting the double hung Marvin windows. He also discussed the mistake made with windows that were reversed. Ms. Ruedig asked if the driveway side windows were the same, and Mr. Sullivan said they were. They further discussed why the windows were installed the way they were. Chairman Almeida referred to the HDC's window guidelines and noted that the windows were smaller. He also suggested using simple 6/6 windows instead of 9/6. Mr. Rawling thought there should be a taller window in one area rather than a smaller one, to match what was originally presented. Ms. Ruedig said she couldn't tell that the windows were not the same as before and did not think it was a big difference, and Mr. Lombardi agreed. The roof deck rail system was discussed, along with the dimensions, the visibility, the maintenance, and the hatch. The Committee thought that the deck wouldn't be visible enough to the public to cause concern.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the chimney at the back of the house was taller than the previous chimney and said the chimney as shown on the plan was taller but had not been called out. He suggested a stipulation disclosing that the taller chimney as shown was approved on the original application.

Chairman Almeida opened up the public speaking session, but no one rose to speak.

*It was **moved**, seconded and **approved** to go into the Public Hearing.*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Chairman Almeida read the petition into the record. Mr. Sullivan went through his petition and highlighted changes that included the modified roof pitch and increased height of the approved roof curve, the additional scupper, the rake line reduction, the additional scone light, the wide metal downspout, the metal ridge cap over the parapet wall, and the window location swap.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, 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 the downspout will be wood sided with an open back and be reduced*
- 2) That the drain pipes on the northeast side of the structure will be removed.*
- 3) That the scupper will be shrouded by roof material.*
- 4) That the second front door light may be installed as presented if preferred by the applicant.*
- 5) That the third light over the French door is permitted as presented provided the fixture is dark sky compliant.*
- 6) That the rear chimney alterations were approved as part of the original approval.*

7) *That the window relocations were approved as presented in the November 12, 2014 letter.*

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the changes were to a previously-approved project in the Historic District and would improve the property but not affect property values. Vice-Chair Kozak stated that all the modifications were minor to the overall intent and design of the project. She appreciated the thoroughness of the application and the mockup and was confident that none of the changes would affect surrounding properties. Chairman Almeida thought the changes were compatible in design with surrounding properties and with technologies and felt that it was an overall innovative solution.

The motion to grant the Certificate of Approval with seven stipulations passed unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.

C. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of Solano Group, LLC, owner, and Stephen Meade, applicant, for property located at **456 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace vinyl siding with wood clapboards, replace windows and doors, replace lighting) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 43 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 5, 2014 meeting to the November 12, 2014 meeting.)*

WORK SESSION

Mr. Rawling recused himself. Mr. Brian Donnelly of Solano Group and the applicant Mr. Stephen Meade were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Donnelly discussed the windows on the main house and said they could do 6/6 double hung Andersen windows. Various window sizes were discussed, such as 2/2 for certain windows. Mr. Donnelly noted that the back wall of the addition would have two windows removed and replaced with a door, and two windows centered. Mr. Donnelly said the existing side doors didn't make sense, so he wanted to remove them. Mr. Wyckoff verified that he would put a landing and steps on each side, with no decks, and Mr. Donnelly agreed and said that they would install patios. They also discussed the front and back doors. Ms. Ruedig showed a historic photo of the home that she had found. The pitch and the gable were discussed. Mr. Meade said that he wanted to remove the sagging gable. They discussed the siding and what could be beneath it. Mr. Wyckoff thought that the 1"x4" trim around the window was narrow and would be a problem to nail in. Mr. Donnelly told him they would get trim with backing on it. Mr. Wyckoff said the Commission required an actual window sill to be replicated, even if it was a fake window sill.

Mr. Lombardi asked what would be done with the bulkhead. Mr. Donnelly said they would make custom 36" deep doors. Ms. Ruedig was concerned about the style of the front door not being appropriate and the fan light being a bit much. Mr. Donnelly said they would do them similar to the one in the picture. They also verified that the door would be wood.

Chairman Almeida opened up the public comment session. No one rose to speak, so he closed it.

Mr. Wyckoff *moved* to go into the Public Hearing. Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion *passed* unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Donnelly went through his petition and stated that the vinyl windows would be replaced with wood clapboards, the windows would be replaced with new construction Andersen 400 Series 6/6 windows and the upper windows would be 2/2 windows. They would replace the front and back doors as specified. They would remove the shutters and rebuild the bulkhead. They would not touch the chimneys, and the skylight would be removed. They would also work with Mr. Cracknell to replicate the entrance. Mr. Wyckoff confirmed that the windows would be single divided light and there would be half screens.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Lombardi moved to *grant* the Certificate of Approval as presented, with the following stipulations:

- 1) *That the second floor windows on the rear elevation will be 2/2 (Andersen 400 Series Woodwright double-hung windows as presented)*
- 2) *That the proposed roof mantle will be reconstructed as shown in the historic structure and the final design shall be submitted for review to the Planning Department prior to installation.*
- 3) *That a historic sill shall be installed at all window openings.*
- 4) *That the front doors shall be solid wood and have two square windows where the fan light was previously proposed.*
- 5) *That half screens shall be used for all windows.*

Vice-Chair Kozak seconded.

Mr. Lombardi stated that the applicant agreed to do everything the Commission asked them to do, and he was very impressed.

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

D. Petition of **Haven School Condominium Association, owner**, and **Jamie A. Baquero, applicant**, for property located at **50 South School Street, Unit 5**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct roof deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 60-5 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the November 5, 2014 meeting to the November 12, 2014 meeting.)*

The architect Mr. Brendan McNamara representing the applicant requested a work session. Chairman Almeida stated that it had not been advertised as a work session and asked for a motion.

*Vice-Chair Kozak made a motion to **move** into a Work Session. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

WORK SESSION

Mr. McNamara discussed the deck and stated that code provisions limited the deck to a third of the existing roof. The deck would be almost invisible to the public, but the handrail would be visible because the parapet wall was stepped. He showed photos of various views of the proposed deck from neighboring houses and discussed different rail systems.

Mr. Wyckoff felt that the cable rail system was inappropriate because the cables took the place of the balustrade and the rail would be seen. He also recommended a black metal rail around the whole perimeter. Mr. McNamara didn't think the black metal rail would look good. Mr. Rawling said the site was surrounded by houses that were several stories tall, so the surrounding neighbors could see it and there was still a visibility issue. He stated that the deck needed a stronger sense of enclosure to it, something opaque. It didn't have to be a brick or solid wall but it should be more solid and enclose the space, which would be more appropriate than letting the space simply run off the whole roof.

Ms. Ruedig thought the metal railing was more appropriate but asked if it could be away from the existing curving wall. Mr. McNamara noted the issue of the one-third use of the roof and said they were trying to make it look as sensible as possible. It was fully engaged into the dormer, and the only way was to have a one-third engagement of that dormer. Mr. Gladhill said that one reason for moving the railing away from the parapet wall was that the railing looked flat and continuous. Mr. Lombardi said he struggled with the railing design and its appropriateness and felt that the deck didn't add anything to the historic value of the building. He preferred seeing a solar array on a flat roof rather than a deck. He felt that the deck would create activity that was never there. The owner Ms. Baquero spoke up and said that she and her husband often went out on the roof through a window and used it as a deck. Vice-Chair Kozak noted that, although Downtown didn't have a lot of flat-roof brick buildings with railings on them, there were decks of all kinds regionally and it wasn't unusual to have a railing on a flat roof. When they were evident, they were usually more formalized, but the addition to the schoolhouse was not formal at all. Given the informality of the addition and the institutional nature of the building, she didn't find that it was out of keeping. Ms. Ruedig said she was swayed by the fact that what was being proposed was something easily reversible, even though the building was rated as a historic building. Chairman Almeida said he often walked by the building and thought the deck was appropriate. He appreciated that people were living in an old school and making a new use out of it. He thought it was an amazing location to add a roof deck and if they made it look good, there was no reason to hide it. He also thought the railing was well designed.

Chairman Almeida opened the public speaking session, but no one rose to speak.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **move** the work session into the Public Hearing. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. McNamara went over his petition. Mr. Wyckoff asked if he would replace the windows with doors, and Mr. McNamara said he would.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That the metal railing system shown on the submitted plans dated 10-9-14 shall be used.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Kozak stated that there was a precedent of decks and balustrades on rooftops throughout Portsmouth, citing widow walks on flat roof buildings from the Georgian period, so she felt that the deck was not out of character. The detailing of the railing was in keeping with the language of the iron fire escapes used in buildings of that age. The doors were of great quality and would enhance the property.

*The motion to grant the Certificate of Approval **passed** with 5 in favor and 2 opposed. (Mr. Lombardi and Mr. Gladhill)*

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS, CONTINUED)

1. Petition of **Richard M. and Susan H. Shea, owners**, for property located at **19 Howard Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 82 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owners Mr. Richard Shea and Ms. Susan Shea were present to speak to the application. They stated that the Zoning Board had given them setback relief. Ms. Shea showed a diagram of the overall neighborhood and pointed out where their home was, a 1790 house that had been condemned by Portsmouth when she and her husband bought it. She showed various views of the house as well as the back corner where the shed would be located. She also showed photos of several outbuildings on the side of the structure, establishing that there was always an outbuilding on the property line. Mr. Shea showed examples of neighborhood sheds as well as a

survey plan and design drawings, and he described what the shed would look like. He showed the Commission a sample of the hinge they would use as well as an actual window with an old sash. All windows would have cedar trim and wood sills. The west elevation would have a 7' sliding door with a roller system covered with cedar board. A lean-to would be in the back on two 2"x4" posts, with a wood shingle roof. Two skylights would be on the roof made out of old wood SDL windows. Mrs. Shea added that they had several letters of approval from abutters.

Ms. Ruedig stated that it was a very nice presentation with beautiful drawings, and she thought the shed looked wonderful and was appropriate. She was concerned that the muntins on the antique skylight windows would not be able to shed water off. Mr. Shea said they could place a piece of Plexiglass on top of it to let the water shed. Mr. Wyckoff said that he had a similar skylight and suggested that they get two vertical muntins with glass set in between them so that each layer of glass overlapped like shingles. He agreed that it was a very complete application and had no problem with it. Mr. Gladhill said he appreciated that the Sheas did the research and got photos. Chairman Almeida thought it was an amazingly thorough application and that the Sheas were clearly proud of their home and should be. He said he could go either way on the skylight and thought a sash would be wonderful if they could figure out a way to make it weatherproof. He was in full support of the application.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, so Chairman Almeida closed the Public Hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was a secondary building but one of the better ones that the Commission had seen in terms of a shed and reflected the historic character of the neighborhood. Vice-Chair Kozak said that the Commission had seen a lot of sheds, but most of them were prefabricated. The Sheas' shed took it to a whole new level, and she thought it was a piece of art and authentic to the period of the house and the neighborhood. She told the Sheas that they had set the bar very high for the rest for the rest of the City.

*The motion to grant the Certificate of Approval **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

2. **(Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of Mark A. and Deborah Chag, owners**, for property located at **404 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow (new construction to an existing structure (convert existing carriage house to single family home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 21 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Mr. Rawling recused himself because he was the project architect.

The architect Mr. Dan Rawling and the owner Ms. Chag presented. Mr. Rawling stated that he had some modifications and passed out diagrams to the Commission. He said that he modified the ground floor level and added some glazing to the garage doors, and he also added a transom window type of detail across the top. He discussed the entrance door. He said the glazing along the enclosed porch area was reduced and wood dividers were used to keep the rhythm. Clapboards were spaced 2-1/2" apart to change the texture a bit, which he thought picked up some detail from the house with its different panels. Some of the glazing detail on the back of the building was modified as well.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the garage doors were conventional overhead doors. Mr. Rawling said they were rollup doors and that there was a big difference between a wood door and an insulated door. On the updated building, they would pursue the garage door with a higher value. The door was steel with an embossed texture like mahogany. He also discussed matching the scheme of the house with dark sashes, dark doors, and light trim. The upper windows would be awning windows that tilted out. He discussed the cottage double hung windows and enhancing the design by adding divided lights to the sash, which they brought around to the rest of the windows. It had a nice effect and added a horizontal line to the building that diminished the vertical lines. He also considered adding a trellis feature along the front. The larger scale windows were slightly different from the previous work section because, due to the awkward proportions of the glazing, they were divided into six lights on the upper sash to keep the same proportion of the other windows on the building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the top and bottom windows on the front unit were awnings. Mr. Rawling said they repeated the front window so that the center part would swing in and there would be one large opening to recreate the feeling of big doors opening up. Awnings would be used for the top and bottom sash, and the windows on the side would be awnings as well. He wanted to retain all the existing historic windows but had some issues with glass requirements for upper windows. He discussed changing the upper window to an in-swinging casement and dividing it to resemble the double hung with the six lights above and below it. New double hungs would be put on one side to match the others. The center portion in the back would be French doors with awnings overhead and awnings on the bottom windows, and cottage double hungs would be on the side units. Mr. Wyckoff thought that the awnings on the bottom seemed impractical. Mr. Rawling said they could be fixed. Mr. Wyckoff also thought that putting the awnings over the windows was effective and liked that the small hoods over the double hungs were replicated. The other modifications were straightforward, such as the solid door going into the garage space and the French doors with sidelights on one side. Minor adjustments were done of the barn sashes on the upper floors to work with the balloon framing of the structure.

Chairman Almeida asked if the roof edge was integrally driven. Mr. Rawling said he would submit the detail. Mr. Wyckoff thought it was a wonderful project as a stand-alone but wondered how the Commission would see what it looked like on site. He asked if the project had reached the dollar or square footage amount that it required to be placed in the District's 3D model. Mr. Cracknell said it would not fit in the 3D model. An applicant had a choice between submitting an actual 3D model or an electronic model, and the applicant had already submitted a

3D model. Mr. Wyckoff felt that the Commission didn't need all the neighborhood drawings but did need to have the barn drawn with the house to show how it would look conceptually.

Mr. Rawling passed out study sketches of what was visible on Middle Street. He also showed context photos and discussed how the barn elevation would work with the house. He said the flat elevations were misleading because they were way up on the driveway. Vice-Chair Kozak noted that there seemed to be a slight rise in grade. They had discussed setting the garage floor down a few feet, but it looked like it was still cresting up to the ground floor level. Mr. Rawling said it was possible to push the level of the new garage 4" down from the existing garage floor level, but going further than that would create a problem because the site was already high. Vice-Chair Kozak was concerned about bringing the structure down more. Mr. Rawling said the driveway was 80 feet long and the carriage house was in the back. Ms. Chag mentioned that they put a foundation on it and moved it over two feet because of the water run off problem.

Mr. Rawling stated that they had a number of letters of support from the neighbors.

Public Comment Session

Ms. Spiller of 33 Cabot Street stated that she was a direct abutter. She mentioned the water and the rise and said she was 6 feet below the Runnymede grounds and all the homes around her were tall but not massive. She felt that raising the barn would not affect the neighbors. She thought it made sense to have the cars underneath rather than on the green space. She didn't think the size of the house would be a problem and that it would fit in beautifully and be a large improvement to the neighborhood.

Ms. Vicki Fox of 39 Cabot Street said she had always felt that the Chags were good steward of their home and worked in the best interest of the neighborhood. She and her husband were supportive of the barn being lifted and parking being under it because it would preserve green space and avoiding parking in the street. She supported the design and appreciated the time and the details put into it.

Mr. Wyckoff mentioned the viability of the cable rail system with a traditional barn. Ms. Chag said they did not intend to use one. Mr. Rawling said there was a 3' high wooden railing to meet the height code requirement and they would use a cable along the top line. Mr. Wyckoff verified that it was a wood rail system. Vice-Chair Kozak verified that all the brick would be painted. Ms. Ruedig asked who manufactured the windows. Mr. Rawling replied that he was uncertain at that point but that the windows would all be wood, low eave, SDL with spacer bars and would match existing window configurations.

No one else spoke, so Chairman Almeida closed the public speaking session.

*It was **moved**, seconded and **approved** to go into the Public Hearing.*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Rawling introduced himself as the project architect representing the Chags and said the building was a late 1800s carriage house that they wanted to convert to a residence. They had received the approvals from the Zoning Board to create a residential use to the property with the stipulation that the barn be moved over 2 inches from the back property line. They had also been granted permission to raise the barn up to 10 feet but anticipated raising it only 8 feet. The scope of work was to raise the barn and place a new foundation under it, add the enclosed glass porch on one side, reconstruct the chicken coop on the back side, add new glazing to the existing openings, add a few barn sash windows to the exterior as shown on the submitted drawings, and add glazing, new openings, and a raised covered deck on another side.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, 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. Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant had gone to great lengths to maintain the special character of the District and to preserve its integrity. They did a good assessment of the historical significance of the structure and how it fit in with the neighboring homes. The project complemented and enhanced the architectural and historical character, and he felt that it was a very good application and an improvement to the District.

Mr. Gladhill stated that he would oppose the petition because no one built carriage houses anymore, due to the very few pieces of land available. There was a clause in the Ordinance about the Historical District being educational. Very few barns and carriage houses remained, so from an educational point of view, he opposed the project and preferred to see the barn the way it originally was.

Ms. Ruedig stated that the proposed design was very different from what it originally was. It was a well-preserved carriage house, and she would have liked that it be preserved and used in its original form, but realistically no one used a carriage house like it was historically used anymore. As an adaptive re-use project and in order to continue the use of the carriage house, she supported it.

Vice-Chair Kozak said she had gone back and forth and still thought the structure was too tall. From a purist's preservation standpoint, she had to support any effort to save barns in Portsmouth, especially given the support of the abutters and the museum next door.

Mr. Lombardi stated that he was initially concerned about the height but thought the applicants did a remarkable job in redeveloping and re-using the barn. If they had not done it, the barn would be useless other than a place to park vehicles. However, he still preferred that it be not quite so high.

*The motion to grant the Certificate of Approval **passed** with 6 in favor and Mr. Gladhill opposed.*

3. Petition of **Kevin M. Semprini, owner**, for property located at **300 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new structure on same footprint with two additions) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 36 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. David Witham representing the applicant told the Commission that he made some revisions to the mockup based on their feedback. He gave a brief history of the house, saying that Mr. Semprini had grown up in the 1958 house. His mother passed away, so he was moving back in. The house was a basic ranch and was not historically significant, so they were proposing to raise it. Mr. Witham showed photos of the abutting homes and stated that there was no set pattern of styles along the street. They wanted to design something historically significant and would re-use the existing footprint. Slight modifications to the foundation were made in creating their design. It would be an ell-shaped New Englander style with a smaller garage to the side and would represent a house that evolved over time. At the work session, they had discussed whether or not there would be a formal front entry on the street and how many other homes in the District had formal side entrances, and he showed photos of those homes. He stated that major revisions were made to the right side elevation. They had removed the awning windows and simplified the double hung pattern, making a more traditional look to the side, and they also formalized the roof by using traditional elements of roof lines from the road. In a desire to take advantage of the water views, they tried different variations on the middle section of the house and window patterns and came up with what worked best for the layout and texture. He pointed out the crown molding, corner boards, clapboards, clad windows with muntins, granite steps for the side entry doors, simple window pattern, and the traditional cedar shakes.

Mr. Gladhill asked Mr. Witham if he would be amenable to a stipulation that the four sides of the house be photographed before demolishing it so that the photos could be included with a brief history of the house and given to the City and the Portsmouth Athenaeum. Mr. Witham agreed. Vice-Chair Kozak noted that the clapboards were fiber cement but the shakes were cedar and the vertical boards were wood pine, and she asked the reason for the mix. Mr. Witham told her that they had not luck with wood claps holding paint in a harsh environment, so they wanted to make it maintenance-free and also stay with the real cedar shakes so they could weather naturally. Mr. Rawling asked if they would use the smooth side of the Hardiplank, and Mr. Witham stated that they would. Chairman Almeida verified that it would all be painted on site.

Ms. Ruedig stated that she could not support a new building that was trying so hard to be an old building and felt that the applicant had an opportunity to build a modern home that contributed to the Historic District. She thought it was a false building and that it was insincere to try to create a house that looked like it has always been there. Mr. Witham asked her whether she had an example of something in Portsmouth that kept that goal. Mr. Ruedig replied that there were not a lot of great examples of new construction in the area because people were too nervous to build something more contemporary. She felt that the applicant could have used more modern details

or kept the same forms of the house. Mr. Witham felt that the Modern Yankee style was great but it was still the Historic District.

Mr. Wyckoff thought Mr. Witham had done a good job of renovating the house and could not think of what currently constituted a contemporary style for single family homes because everyone was building the semi-craftsman style. He thought Mr. Witham had done a particularly good job with the garage. He asked if the window trim was prefab fiberglass or plastic. Mr. Witham said it was aluminum clad that snapped into the frames and was almost seamless. He also said they would do the drip edge. Mr. Wyckoff said it was probably the only problem he had. Mr. Witham said he had used it on South Street and it was successful.

Mr. Gladhill stated that he liked the basic design very much and felt that the replication fit in better than the original home. He mentioned modern architecture on Spinney Road as an example of what would be built in the Historic District in the way of modern homes.

Mr. Rawling thought the project did a nice job of responding to the context of the neighborhood and the scaling of the buildings. The volumes related were and were not oversized. He thought Mr. Witham was working with vernacular construction elements and that the use of materials was honest. He also felt that the building would still be a contemporary building, even though it had roots in traditional forms, just by the use of new materials.

Mr. Lombardi asked whether there were actual windows in the breezeway portion of the house. Mr. Witham verified that there were and added that he had borrowed its form from a nearby house that had an enclosed porch. Mr. Lombardi felt that it jumped out because it was so different from the rest of the house and he wasn't sure if it was a good thing.

Chairman Almeida said he agreed with Ms. Ruedig that it was a mistake to counterfeit history and recreate a fall history, but he also agreed with Mr. Rawling that the house was charming. He saw a new house that had a cohesive design that worked great. It had traditional features representing a contemporary home, and he did not see an exaggerated attempt to create an antique home. It was clear that it was a new house and when done, it would be a house that reflected traditional language, which he thought would be a wonderful change.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the one obvious attempt to bring in the vernacular on that type of house was on the right-hand side of the gambrel roof over the side door, which was put on after the Commission's comments. He appreciated the extra effort to define that side and did not think the fact that the side was made to look like it was the front was a deal-breaker.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, 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 historic record will be submitted to the Planning Department prior to construction.
- 2) That the hardiplank will have the smooth side exposed.

Mr. Gladhill seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the project matched the defining character of the surrounding properties and had a relationship to the historic and architectural value of existing structures. The compatibility of the design, scale, and mass was good, and the window trims and clapboards made use of innovative technology.

The motion to grant the Certificate of Approval **passed** with 6 in favor and Ms. Ruedig opposed.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **303 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **303 Islington Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct third floor dormers, construct rear addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 11 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has requested to postpone the application to the December 3, 2014 meeting.)*

It was **moved, seconded and passed** by the Commission that the Work Session be **postponed** to the December 3, 2014 meeting.

B. Work Session requested by **Timothy and Alexandra Lieto, owners**, for property located at **454 Marcy Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct second story addition, window relocations on first floor of north, south, and west facades) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 77 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has requested to postpone the application to the November 19, 2014 meeting.)*

It was **moved, seconded and passed** by the Commission that the Work Session be **postponed** to the November 19, 2014 meeting.

C. Work Session requested by **Ten State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **10 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (change window manufacturer, changes to coordinate MEP/FP systems design, vent screening) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 4 and lies within the CD4 and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself and Vice-Chair Kozak took his place. Ms. Reagan also left.

Mr. Rob Harbeson representing the owner was present to speak to the petition. He said the Commission had been concerned that the color of the parapet caps would fade, so he proposed

that the color be gray and that the larger decks on the left be painted to match that color. They wanted to eliminate the shale shakes on the west elevation's roof and also wanted to add an elevator vent. They also wanted to raise the roof portion to store mechanical equipment. On the conservatory element on the end of the building that was originally designed for a staircase, they wanted to make it more of a Juliet box. The windows on either side of the doors of the balconies had shifted in a bit. Mr. Harbeson talked about the roof deck and the doors and pointed out that there was an adjusted brick band on the left-hand side of the building that made it more consistent. They also adjusted the windows. He talked about the railings, noting the previous debate on whether they should be cable or glass, and glass had been approved. However, since glass got dirtied, they wanted cable rails instead like the ones on the dock below. He discussed the shale shakes on the east elevation and also proposed that the clock be removed. At the bottom of the building, they would extend the deck and add vertical mullions and transoms to the doors. He discussed similar items on the north elevation and said they wanted to change the windows on the last bay. Because there was too much blank brick, they wanted to add brick banding to break up the scale. They also wanted to add a Juliet balcony to the right-hand side. The deck would have wood posts and framing and an added trim band. All would be painted. The windows were the same as originally approved, but since the LePage manufacturer would do clad windows on the water, they wanted to go with Pella. The entry door proportion would change to 8'5" tall instead of the originally approved 9' wide, 7' tall one because it felt too squashed in. The new door would be glass and have a different panel. On the primary entry door and canopy, the canopy would be moved up to the brick band.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what the canopy material was, and Mr. Harbeson told him it was metal. Vice-Chair Kozak asked if the garage doors were changed, and Mr. Harbeson said they were not. Mr. Lombardi asked if the doors on the Juliet balcony had separate lights, and Mr. Harbeson said they were the same as all the other doors, having one full single divided light. Mr. Wyckoff verified that the roof was green. Vice-Chair Kozak asked how much higher the parapet would be raised and was told 4 feet. She asked what the overall figure was, and Mr. Harbeson said he'd have to go back and look. Vice-Chair Kozak asked about the rail post detail. Mr. Harbeson said it was a metal post with a round pipe. Mr. Wyckoff noted that they were previously stainless. Mr. Harbeson said they started with stainless but went with metal. Vice-Chair Kozak was concerned about the shiny stainless steel posts because they were out of keeping with the stark industrial nature of the neighborhood. Mr. Harbeson asked if she would prefer that they be painted like the deck, and she agreed. She said she disliked Juliet decks because they were everywhere, and they further discussed the decks. It was concluded that vertical balusters were preferred on the decks. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that the interim posts should be dark and that stainless cable rails with stainless posts were too contemporary. Vice-Chair Kozak thought they were going with a horizontal look to keep the language with the rails.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how many balconies there would be. Mr. Harbeson stated that there would be four on the water side and three full decks on the side. Two decks would face State Street and one would be added above the garage door. Vice-Chair Kozak noted that the dock pier had the cable rail. Mr. Wyckoff thought the balusters made more sense on the Juliet balconies. Mr. Harbeson said they wanted to be consistent with the cable rails on the other side. Mr. Harbeson asked the Commission which sides of the structure they preferred having the horizontal cable

rails on. Mr. Wyckoff replied that the balconies on State Street should have the regular vertical balusters. Mr. Rawling thought the connection would be lost.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the Commission agreed about the darker posts on the cable. Mr. Lombardi said he liked them, and Mr. Rawling thought they shouldn't be dark enough to look black. Mr. Harbeson stated that they would paint the trim gray, so the posts would be gray. Mr. Rawling mentioned sailcloth shades and thought it looked barren. Mr. Harbeson told him there would be activity on the deck as well as furniture and so on, and they would look at it again.

Chair Almeida opened up the public comment session, but no one rose to speak, so he closed it.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to **continue the Work Session to a Public Hearing** in the future.*

IV. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11:45 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 Dec. 10, 2014.