

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**February 11, 2015  
reconvened from February 4, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Vice-Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill;  
Members George Melchior, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig;  
Council Representative Esther Kennedy; City Alternates Vincent  
Lombardi and Richard Shea

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Chairman Joseph Almeida, John Wyckoff

**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. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Request for Re-hearing – 500 Market Street application – submitted by Nobles Island  
Condominium Association

*Mr. Melchior made a motion to grant a **rehearing of the application**. Mr. Lombardi seconded.*

Mr. Rawling felt that the applicant was given a lot of liberty with the decision and that the only point of discussion was whether the motion was changed to exclude the vinyl shingles and to approve wood shingles in its place. To do otherwise would have been the choice, for him, of turning down the entire application, so he thought the applicant was given the leeway to do a great deal of the work they were proposing as well as a lot of consideration to use the synthetic material for the trim and the replacement windows they requested. He did not support the change in detailing that the replacement windows involved and felt they were working with them to balance their needs for improving the project and for the Board to retain the wood shingles. He did not feel that there was a case for review.

Mr. Lombardi said he needed to understand the criteria better for granting a rehearing, so Vice-Chair Gladhill read the criteria. Mr. Cracknell said it wasn't just rehearing the issue of the vinyl siding, but it was the entire application that would need to be reheard so that other issues could be dealt with. A rehearing typically looked at procedural defects, or a mistake made from a technical standpoint, or new evidence that was not available at the time that would have a material impact on the decision of the HDC. It wasn't because someone did not like the outcome

and wanted to come back to do a redo of the entire package. They would be able to proceed with the entire project, with the exception of the vinyl siding, and they could submit a subsequent application to revisit that issue. Mr. Melchior said that the applicant didn't have an opportunity to provide input and if the Commission voted in favor of rehearing -- it was just for a rehearing and not to provide input on the modification of the application. The burden to convince the Commission to go otherwise was still on the applicant. The applicant had highlighted in their letter a procedural failure on the Commission's part. Consequently, the Commission wouldn't have the opportunity to modify an application without input from the applicant.

Mr. Lombardi recalled when Councilor Kennedy made the motion to require that the applicant not use the vinyl siding, so he felt the applicant had the opportunity to speak to it. Mr. Melchior stated that the applicant did not have an opportunity, and they had two other Boards that they had to present the other change to, after the fact. He felt that the Commission should have waited until they went back to their constituents before making a decision. For the sake of time, it would be faster for the Commission to rehear the application and get it done, and if not, the application would be drawn out like others in the past. If the Commission did not change their decision, the burden would remain on the applicant as to why they would entertain something other than vinyl siding. Vice-Chair Gladhill saw it as a procedural thing, saying that Councilor Kennedy amended the motion after a public hearing and added a stipulation. He said he would vote in favor of it.

*The motion to grant a re-hearing **passed** with 4 in favor and 2 opposed, Mr. Rawling and Mr. Lombardi.*

## II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

1. (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. *(This item was continued to the February 11, 2015 meeting.)*

### WORK SESSION

The architect Ms. Jennifer Ramsey on behalf of the applicants stated that she received letters in favor from the neighbors and passed out diagrams that showed the two options for the garage. The preferred option was the one with the single dormer on the front and a single dormer on the back, with smaller windows and a lower ridge.

Mr. Shea thought the new small shed option was far superior to the previous two gables and had less of an impact on the garage. He asked what the material surrounding the windows would be. Ms. Ramsey said it would be trimmed-out with flat PVC stock. The awning windows would match the height of the existing. Ms. Ruedig asked what the current material of the trim for the garage was, and Ms. Ramsey replied that it was painted wood material. Mr. Rawling verified

that the sash size was the same and said he considered it a much improved version and suggested using a wider dormer. Ms. Ruedig suggested making it smaller and simpler to make it less overwhelming. Mr. Melchior said he would lean toward the larger dormer.

Ms. Ramsey brought up the addition to the left-hand side and said they were willing to replace the window in kind at the lower height. They would maintain the eave line along the front or break it to amplify the addition. The foundations were different from the main house and in good shape, so they would not change the foundation but would rebuild that portion of the home for safety reasons. They wanted to improve the roof pitches and connect the entire wall. Mr. Lombardi wanted to see more relief between the two ridges. Mr. Rawling noted that there was nothing in the photos indicating that there should be a demolition. Ms. Ramsey said they would not demolish to existing foundation wall but would rework the floor framing from the kitchen up.

*Councilor Kennedy arrived at this point in the meeting.*

Mr. Jenkins was concerned about the windows and rotted headers and said they would have to be replaced. Mr. Rawling said he still wasn't convinced about the demolition and that the applicant needed to repair the damage. Mr. Lombardi was concerned about the outside wall going away from the original structure. Vice-Chair Gladhill brought up the site walk and discussed the windows. Ms. Ruedig asked if it could be seen from Rogers Street, and Vice-Chair Gladhill agreed. Councilor Kennedy said she was concerned about the demolition because the house was unique and prominent. Ms. Ramsey said the parking lot was sizable and 150' away from the applicant's fence, so it wasn't a friendly environment. She felt they were preserving the largest portion of the home, and the areas they were changing were later additions that were failing.

Ms. Ruedig felt it was still the back of the house, and the building's expansion toward the back wasn't unreasonable because it fit well visually and massing-wise with the rest of the house. She preferred to see less of the back porch area because it was busy and out of character with the house. Mr. Shea felt that, from the preservation aspect, it was a bit aggressive. He didn't like the roof because it affected the front of the house, and he thought the addition on the side was too wide. Covering up two walls of a 1760s home was a major change to the inside of the first floor by opening those walls up. He said he'd like to see more thought given to the roof line as well as the windows in the sunroom because the size didn't feel right, and also more thought to the size of the addition and make it respect the old house as much as possible. Ms. Ramsey suggested casement windows to make it the porch less busy. Mr. Lombardi thought the porch would still be too much, and he was also concerned about the two walls being opened up into the rest of the house and removing a lot of original fabric from the house.

Ms. Jenkins stated that she and her husband were very committed to the front façade, but it was a challenge because they needed the space to live in. They discussed the fact that it was a process because there were considerable changes. Mr. Melchior thought the design was appropriate as presented and that he would vote for it. He also offered his services by going to look at the existing structure to provide his opinion. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he was uneasy about the porch and felt it was a shame to cover up the original façade. He suggested a Farmer's porch instead. Mr. Rawling noted that his previous comments were about preservation issues, and that he had focused on the ridgeline coming down. Ms. Ruedig felt that the building was not an old

building in the Historic District, although it was a great contributing building. The porch was fine, even if a bit busy, and wouldn't change the character of the house.

*Mr. Lombardi made the motion to go into a **public hearing**, and Ms. Ruedig seconded it. The motion **passed** with all in favor, 7-0.*

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Vice-Chair Gladhill read the application into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Ramsey presented on behalf of the applicant and started with the garage portion, saying they were adding a single dormer to the front and back of the garage. She wanted to amend the drawing to reflect the work session so that the length of the back dormer would match. The height of the windows would match the existing windows on the second half of the garage. As discussed during the work session, the eave line of the addition section of the build-out would be dropped to match the back, with the corner board maintained and the window lowered.

Ms. Ruedig verified that there would be a break in the eave line and that the front façade wall would not be rebuilt. Ms. Ramsey stated that the eave would become the header trim of the window on the play yard elevation. As part of rebuilding the whole structure, the wall would be rebuilt and the window replaced in kind, and the front bump-out would stay. Ms. Ruedig said she preferred that the front façade not change at all and would like to see the eave line continuous like it presently was because the façade was the most important. Ms. Ramsey stated that they would drop the eave, and the front elevation would match the proposed back elevation. On the backyard elevation, the main roof and addition roof would both step down equally and would amplify that it was a separate addition. They would replace the windows with ones to match the main house and would have a one-story infill Farmer's porch addition, with no change to the side yard. She summarized that there would be new windows, a new porch addition, new clapboards, new corner boards and eaves, matching to existing. Columns would match existing columns, and there would be no changes to the Mark Street elevation. The only change on the eave line would be on the play yard elevation by dropping it down.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked what the addition's foundation would be, and Ms. Ramsey said it would be fieldstone. Vice-Chair asked whether there was a historic window from the back of the house that could be reused on the front. Ms. Ramsey said they could take the upstairs window and reuse it. Mr. Shea asked if they could restore the window instead of removing it. Ms. Ramsey agreed that restoring it was the best approach.

Councilor Kennedy asked Ms. Ramsey to explain the roof on the front portion of the play yard. Ms. Ramsey stated that the main eave carried across and dropped down where the addition began so that it became the window header and created the look of a separate addition. Ms. Ramsey noted that Mr. Rawling and Mr. Shea thought it was a solution to create the look of a main home and a later addition. Ms. Ruedig reiterated that she didn't have a problem with the front façade as it was. She felt that someone didn't go in for the purpose of redesigning and fixing to make it

go with what the Commission felt was appropriate unless it structurally necessary. Mr. Rawling said that he previously thought the addition was being preserved with just a new roof structure built over the top of it, but it seemed that the addition was proposed to be reconstructed, so he felt that the proposed change to step down the gable toward Rogers Street worked better to make it more subordinate to the main structure.

Councilor Kennedy asked what the siding would be if they were going with reconstruction, and Ms. Ramsey said it was wooden clapboards. Mr. Cracknell asked Ms. Ramsey if there were any details she intended to do that were not annotated on the plan, and Ms. Ramsey stated that they were listed on the plan. Mr. Shea asked whether the window sills on the larger windows would be similar to the existing house, and Ms. Ramsey said they would be exact. Councilor Kennedy asked what the apron's material was, and Ms. Ramsey said it was painted AZEK. Mr. Lombardi asked if the boards were vertical, and Ms. Ramsey agreed.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Melchior made a motion to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as submitted, with the following stipulations:*

- 1. The dormers on the garage will be designed as shown on Sheets 9B and 9C except that the dormer on the front of the garage shall be extended to match the dimensions shown on 9C (the rear elevation).*
- 2. The eave line of the proposed addition shall be lowered on the north elevation to match the slope (pitch) proposed for the south elevation as shown on Sheet 7.*
- 3. A stone foundation will be installed to match the existing foundation.*
- 4. The easterly window on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Playyard Elevation shall be restored or replaced with a true-divided light window to match the existing window.*
- 5. The window assembly on the porch shall have panels infilled below the windows with painted ¾ inch flat stock casing and the proposed sill shall match the existing sill dimensions.*
- 6. The apron on the proposed porch shall be a vertical painted board made of Azek with ¾ inch spacing.*
- 7. A photographic inventory of the demolished addition shall be provided to the Historic District Commission via the Planning Department.*

*Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that the applicant had a hard time finding photographic evidence of the house, so he asked that photos of the house be taken with an explanation for the quirky bump-out and then submitted to the City and the Athenaeum. Mr. Melchior said he would modify his motion to accept Vice-Chair's proposal.

Councilor Kennedy stated that she would not vote for the application because she was concerned with the front and found the porch busy, so she felt it was a substantial change. She also thought things were missing on the plan, and there were no examples of materials. She wasn't sure about the vertical board and the skirt. She was in favor of postponing until those items were clarified. Ms. Ruedig said that, in general, she felt it was an appropriate addition for the building but was disappointed by the changes in the façade, which she felt were important. She would vote for it but wanted to express her disappointment because it was against her preservationist principles to change a design for any number of reasons. Mr. Lombardi said that, from a preservation point of view, he struggled with the covering up of so much of the original house, but if it was well-documented, he would vote for it. Mr. Shea felt that it was right to drop the soffit line on the front because it emphasized a subordinate addition to the main house.

Mr. Melchior stated that the key words were compatibility and complementary. The area was being rebuilt, so it was about how the Commission measured the addition to the contributing structure, and since they measured the design, which was compatible and complementary to the existing structure, he would support it as presented and stipulated. Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that he would not support it because he felt the porch was too ornate for the house.

*The motion to grant a Certificate of Approval **passed** with 5 in favor and 2 opposed, Councilor Kennedy and Vice-Chair Gladhill.*

### III. WORK SESSIONS (CONTINUED)

F. Work Session requested by **44-46 Market Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **44-46 Market Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (change exterior cladding, replace doors, windows) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct one story rear addition, construct small additions on second floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 31 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

*Mr. Melchior made the motion to **postpone** the application to the March meeting. Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

G. Work Session requested by **HarborCorp LLC, owner**, for property located **Deer Street, Russell Street, and Maplewood Avenue** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use building containing hotel, conference center, condominiums, supermarket, and parking) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 115 as Lot 25, Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued from the January meeting.)*

H. Work Session requested by **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue (46-64 Maplewood Avenue)** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct mixed use, 3 ½ to 5 story structure) as per plans on file in

the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the December meeting. The applicant has asked to postpone to the February 2015 meeting.)*

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

*At 8:15 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.