

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**February 4, 2015  
to be reconvened on February 11, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig; Alternates Vincent Lombardi and Richard Shea

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** John Wyckoff, 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. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. December 10, 2014
2. January 7, 2015
3. January 14, 2015

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **approve** the three sets of minutes as presented. Mr. Rawling seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

- A. 346 Pleasant Street
- B. Off Washington Street

Mr. Cracknell first addressed the Off Washington Street petition, stating that it pertained to the shed that was constructed for the skating rink. He said it was a minor change of two small plexiglass windows put into the shed. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked if the wood would be cut out. Mr. Cracknell said the wall would be opened and the plexiglass trimmed, and it would be consistent with the existing architecture.

Mr. Cracknell then addressed the 346 Pleasant Street petition and said it was a revision to the door on the side of the Wentworth Home. The door had slightly different dimensions and a

different manufacturer, but it was a minor change. Mr. Lombardi noted that the door's surround was much larger as a result of the smaller door that would be installed. Mr. Cracknell said Mr. Lombardi could ask for a change, but Mr. Lombardi said it was just a point of notice.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **approve** both Administrative Approvals. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded.*

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

### III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

*Chairman Almeida recused himself from Consent Agenda Item #2. He read Consent Agenda Items #1, #3, and #4 into the record. After they were addressed, Vice-Chair Gladhill read Consent Agenda Item #2 into the record.*

1. Petition of **143 Daniel Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **143 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (remove rear decks from the Chapel Street and Daniel Street buildings) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 19 and lies within the CD 4, CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

2. Petition of **Ten State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **10 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (modification to the size of one window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 4 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

#### SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Lombardi stated with regard to Petition #2 that he thought the change was a good one. Ms. Ruedig noted that the petition addressed changing one kind of smaller window to meet the sizes of the other windows.

#### SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one from the public rose to speak, so Vice-Chair Gladhill closed the public hearing.

#### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Item #2. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 5-0.*

3. Petition of **K & C Realty Trust, owner**, and **James Woodhouse, applicant**, for property located at **84/86 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace existing fan hood system with one new fan, install

vent) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 77 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

4. Petition of **29-41 Congress Street, LLC, owner**, and **Dana Joy, applicant**, for property located at **39 Congress Street, Unit F**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 10 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITIONS**

Chairman Almeida asked for comments on Consent Agenda Items #1, #3 and #4. Ms. Ruedig addressed Consent Agenda Item #1 and said she didn't think that the removal of the rear decks was necessarily a minor change, but because it was simple and in line with the building's design, she thought it was fine.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITIONS**

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Items #1, #3 and #4. Mr. Shea seconded the motion.*

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

## **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)**

5. Petition of **William T. and Annelise Ellison, owners**, for property located at **687 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (reconfigure doors and window on rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 34 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Doug Leduc on behalf of the applicant stated that they wanted to remove the slider and small window and replace them with two windows. The existing door would be left alone. The materials would not change. The clapboards would stay, and he would put the 2" brick mold back on. The addition was built in 1995 and 6/6 windows were installed but the grills were removed and thrown out, so they were double hung. He preferred to stick with the double hung windows, and if not, he was not opposed to 6/6 windows as stated in the proposal. He preferred to match what was there now.

Mr. Shea said that he had gone to the site and agreed that matching the back windows to the side ones was appropriate, so he agreed to no 6/6 additions in those windows. He wondered if the two windows on the back elevation with the 1"x5" casing would look better if they were trimmed out rather than using brick mold. Chairman Almeida asked whether the windows had sills. Mr. Leduc said they had 1" thick sills that stuck out 3/4". Chairman Almeida felt that there should not be brick mold on either the windows or doors and that flat casing would work. Mr. Rawling asked why the Board would exempt the door from the trim casing because he thought the motion was to apply trim to the windows but not the door. Mr. Shea replied that Mr. Leduc was not changing the door. Mr. Shea thought it was preferable to have flat casing on all the windows and doors, and Mr. Rawling agreed. Vice-Chair Gladhill verified that the windows on the sunroom did not have a grill pattern, so Mr. Leduc was requesting that the two new windows not have grill patterns. He asked if they were on the original structure. Mr. Leduc said they were only on the addition, like everything else in the proposal.

Chairman Almeida pointed out that there was a full screen specified that the Board did not typically approve of, but it was on the back of the house. Ms. Ruedig agreed and asked Mr. Leduc to explain what elevation it was and also the visibility. Mr. Leduc replied that it was the back of the house. Mr. Cracknell brought up the house on Google and stated that the Board's concerns were addressed and there was no problem. Chairman Almeida said that the house was a high-quality one and the window specification was not something the Board would follow around the house. He could support the location because it was a unique spot that couldn't be seen without trespassing, but otherwise, he would never support it.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulations:*

- 1. That no brick mold shall be used on the windows but instead, a flat casing to match the existing windows to remain shall be used.*
- 2. A flat casing may also be used on the existing door.*

*Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

Ms. Ruedig stated that the windows were ones that would generally not be approved in the Historic District because they were 1/1 windows. However, because they would be on a 1995 addition in that particular location, and the new windows would match the existing windows, she felt that was more important than pushing for a historically accurate window.

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

6. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Katie C. and Jason R. Jenkins, owners**, for property located at **35 Mark Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct one story addition to main house, add dormers to garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 50 and lies within the CD 4-L and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself. Vice Chair Gladhill conducted the Work Session/Public Hearing.

## **WORK SESSION**

The architect Ms. Jennifer Ramsey presented on behalf of the applicant. She stated that the garage was previously presented separate from the home, but since then, she brought the entire project into one application to include the doors on the garage and the scope on the main house. The project backed up to the middle school and was wrapped by larger buildings. She also said the building backed up to a larger Colonial, which would be used as a point-of-reference because they wanted to raise the ridgeline. Dormers would be added on the street side to provide more space. Ms. Ruedig asked how old the garage was. Ms. Ramsey said it was built in 2002.

Ms. Ramsey showed the building in context because the dormers on the garage were a separate portion of the application. They would rebuild the roof and raise the ridge. The main ridge to the lower ridge had a 2'10" transition, which they would improve upon so that it was only a 6" transition. She noted a similar house on Salter Street that was a Colonial with a 6" stepped-down addition with skylights. Mr. Shea noted that the roof on the Salter Street house dropped down 6" and he could see the rake boards separating the addition from the main house, and he asked Ms. Ramsey if she would do that as well. Ms. Ramsey said that to achieve the slight step-down, they would have a difference in the two roof lines on the back of the house and would raise the ridge on the front to a 6" difference. The roof would be kept flushed, but they would slightly lower the eave so that it would read as an addition. She also said she would add a porch-like addition. Mr. Shea asked whether Ms. Ramsey had determined what was original to the house and what the additions were. Ms. Ramsey replied that the main house was original, as well as the piece where they were raising the ridge, but the water closet and back porch were probably added later on. Ms. Ruedig said she'd be surprised if the side addition was original, although it looked original. Ms. Ramsey showed the backyard and how the addition could be seen, along with the porch, water closet and small window. She proposed adding two windows where there was currently one and said the water closet would be replaced with a window equal in size to the two in the room. The windows were further discussed.

Ms. Ruedig said she didn't have a problem with raising the roof and almost wished it were a slightly bigger drop to emphasize the transition. She thought it matched up well from the side view. She thought the back was fine, even though it was a bit busy. She said she was hesitant about the ganged windows, but it was the back of the house. Mr. Rawling stated that he had a big problem with raising the ridge because the Board had previously discussed it and he was surprised to still see it. Ms. Ramsey explained that they tried to find the best compromise. Mr. Rawling said that he would not vote for the raised ridge, and generally he would not support the

paired windows, but it was a difficult location, so it was a unique situation. Mr. Lombardi also preferred that the ridgeline be more defined and was concerned with the ganged windows.

Mr. Shea noted that three windows appeared to be original windows, and he didn't think it was okay to change the original window or the look of the house too much. He also had a problem with the ridge line being so close to the existing ridge line. He asked Ms. Ramsey if they would remove everything from the second floor except for the front elevation, and Ms. Ramsey agreed. He thought the window on the front elevation in the addition was lower than the main body of the house. Ms. Ramsey said they would raise it to match the main windows on the home. Mr. Shea suggested that they lower both eaves equally to emphasize the 6" rake board in the addition. Ms. Ruedig thought it should match what was on the rear.

Mr. Rawling felt that the front elevation should not be changed and that the windows should not be raised or the roof line changed. Ms. Ramsey asked if they should emphasize the addition or change the existing elevation. Mr. Rawling said that preservation wasn't about buildings being redesigned but preserving the existing characteristics. He also didn't see how changing the ridgeline had anything to do with maintenance. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he had a hard time with the back of the house because the extended porch would be visible from Rogers Street. He also felt that the side windows were not symmetrical. Ms. Ramsey said that the addition didn't have windows, and the current window was off-center. They would match the opening and do a pairing of four windows. The foundation was also discussed.

Ms. Ruedig said she agreed with Mr. Rawling about the preservation principles of not changing the façade too much. She understood the argument of keeping it looking like an addition but preferred not to see the eave line change. She suggested dropping the ridgeline a bit. She didn't mind the side windows being a bit off center because over time, Colonial houses and additions had quirky symmetry. She thought the two pairs of windows were aligned and were appropriate but felt that the back porch area was a bit busy for the house and suggested that it be simplified.

At this point, the two owners Mr. and Mrs. Jenkins arrived and joined the discussion. Mr. Jenkins asked if they could discuss the ridgeline issue further as well as the foundation. Mr. Cracknell noted that it was a historic resource, and what was done around the original structure would have a profound impact on its value. He echoed Vice-Chair Gladhill's suggestion of meeting for a site walk before the next week's meeting. Mr. Jenkins said he would take a photo of the addition's windows and rotting headers. Mr. Lombardi asked if the windows were original. Mr. Jenkins said they were old but didn't match any of the other 9/6 windows. The porch and the windows were further discussed. Mr. Jenkins emphasized that the water damage and rotting headers compromised the historic structure, and they discussed remedial factors.

Mr. Cracknell asked the Jenkins to get a report from the contractors documenting the condition before the meeting the following week.

Ms. Ramsey then discussed the garage, saying they proposed two gable structure dormers to center over the existing garage doors. Mr. Rawling noted that it still looked like what the Board voted down the previous time and that he didn't think the applicant could present the same issue.

Mr. Cracknell stated that anyone had the right to submit something, but the question was whether the Board wanted to review it. He said Mr. Rawling was clear that his position had not changed, and he suggested focusing on the main structure if the other Commissioners felt the same way. Ms. Ramsey said a shed dormer was challenging, so the two dormers seemed more appropriate. Mr. Cracknell suggested a dormer that was not so overpowering on both sides of the roof and respected the main structure. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he wanted to see it done as one project, so Mr. Cracknell suggested moving on to the garage again.

Ms. Ruedig stated that her first reaction to the proposal was that the house was built in 2002 and that they weren't working with a historic structure, so she afforded it some leniency. However, she felt that it still had to fit in with its context. She felt that the dormers were a bit big for the garage and she suggested making them smaller. Ms. Ramsey said the pitch could come down a bit, but they would become chunkier, and she felt a lot of it was perception and context. Mr. Jenkins said they only appeared to be chunky in the drawings. They wanted head roof because it was a small structure. Mr. Shea felt that the dormers on the front would be a bit big and asked the applicant to think of some options to present at the next meeting.

Ms. Ramsey gave four letters of support to Mr. Cracknell.

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded and unanimously passed to conduct a site walk before next week's meeting. The site walk would be held on Wednesday, February 11 at 5:30 p.m. with the continuation of the Work Session/Public Hearing.*

## V. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install solar panels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business A and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the January 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 item was continued from the January meeting).*

C. Work Session requested by **Hayscales Real Estate Trust, owner**, for property located at **236 Union Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct two family residential home) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on

Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 22 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the January meeting.)*

D. Work Session requested by **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish building) and allow a new free-standing structure (construct three story mixed use building with below grade parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued from the January meeting.)*

E. Work Session requested by **Ronald C.J. Cogswell, owner**, for property located at **180 Islington Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow a discussion concerning the existing 2 story structure and options for site (including demolition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 19 and lies within CBB and the Historic Districts. *(This item was continued from the January meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida read two additional Work Sessions, Work Sessions G and H, into the record that would be on the following week's agenda and would be addressed in March.

*Mr. Lombardi made a motion to **postpone** Work Sessions A through E, and including G and H, to the March meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Cracknell to address the Design Guidelines effort. Mr. Cracknell stated that Dominique and her associate were preparing the first two sections of the guidelines on maintenance and chimneys/roofs and would submit the first draft to the subcommittee on Monday, February 9. They would then meet on Wednesdays to give Dominique detailed feedback. It would then be submitted to a March meeting, and both the public and the HDC would have 2-3 weeks for comment. There would be an opportunity to skim through all of it after all the sections were reviewed and adopt a final version.

## VI. ADJOURNMENT

*At 8:00 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 March 4, 2015.