

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**August 5, 2015
to be reconvened on August 12, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff and Dan Rawling; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Vincent Lombardi, Reagan Ruedig

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. June 10, 2015
2. July 1, 2015

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **approve** the June 10, 2015 and July 1, 2015 minutes. Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

Several Commissioners noted that the Contact Sheet needed corrections, which they supplied.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

A. 35 Portwalk Place

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition concerned issues pertaining to the rooftop mechanical equipment, condenser and frosted glass for the Green Elephant restaurant. He said there was a 12/12/2014 stipulation that there would be no frosted glass on the Deer Street door, yet it was installed because the door led to a storage/trash room. Mr. Cracknell said he asked the owner to evaluate a different frosted glass instead of the film that was applied, but he had not received any information, and he suggested that the petition be postponed to the August 12 meeting.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **postpone** the administrative approval to the August 12, 2015 meeting. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

Councilor Kennedy recused herself from the 35 Salter Street administrative approval.

B. 35 Salter Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition was for a minor adjustment to modify windows. Two windows were removed and one was relocated, and they were not in public view.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Administrative Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Shea seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 6-0.*

Councilor Kennedy resumed her seat for the next application.

C. 143 Daniel Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition concerned a privacy panel on the railing system

*Mr. Rawling made a motion to **grant** the Administrative Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

III. OLD BUSINESS – REHEARING REQUESTS

1. 99 Bow Street, Martingale, LLC, owner, Certificate of Approval granted on June 3, 2015
This item was postponed at the July 15, 2015 meeting to the August 5, 2015 meeting.)

Mr. Cracknell stated that the Commission had previously voted to suspend the approval and continue the rehearing to that evening, and they had heard from the applicant that they were contemplating withdrawal pending the final decision of the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES). They subsequently received an email from the applicant indicating that they had withdrawn their design application from the State. Mr. Cracknell said he then heard from Mr. John Ricci that the applicant was withdrawing everything, including the Building Permit application. Mr. Cracknell recommended that the Commission acknowledge the August 5, 2015 email that was written confirmation that the applicant had withdrawn his petition, which would negate the need for a rehearing.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **accept** the August 5, 2015 email stating that the applicant had withdrawn his application, and the acknowledgement that the individual that submitted the application for a rehearing have an understanding of it and no longer need to move forward but would have to file a new application if he returned. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

As a result of the above request, Martingale, LLC, owner for the property located at 99 Bow Street has withdrawn their Building Permit #15-409 from consideration at this time. This action invalidates the Certificate of Approval granted by the Historic District Commission on June 3, 2015. A new application and public hearing will be required if this project commences moving forward.

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

IV. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

A. 173-175 Market Street - Request for one year extension of the Certificate of Approval granted on September 10, 2015 – submitted by Eport Properties 1, LLC

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the one year extension of the Certificate of Approval and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was standard process to grant the extension because the project had gone through several rehearings. Councilor Kennedy stated that she hadn't voted for the project and did not like how the structure extended out to the street, so she wouldn't vote for it.

*The motion to **grant** the one year extension of the Certificate of Approval passed by a vote of 6-1 with Councilor Kennedy voting in opposition. The Certificate of Approval will now expire on August 26, 2016.*

V. OLD BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARINGS)

A. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **PNF Trust of 2013, owner, Peter N. Floros, trustee**, for property located at **282 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace clapboards/trim on north east and, replace front columns, changes to door and window casings/details, repairs to substrate as required) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 8 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 15, 2015 meeting to the August 5, 2015 meeting.)*

Mr. Rawling recused himself.

WORK SESSION

The architect Mr. Michael Keane stated that the petition was previously split up to separate the entrance details. In looking for historical data to document the entrance surround, he found an old photograph that showed the bay window, so he knew that it was either original or very early. He told the Commission that he had two solutions for the surround, one of which was to replicate it by extending the trim to the outside edge of the beam, or using pilaster to be more in keeping with existing. Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Keane whether he had any new information, and Mr. Keane replied that he had an amended package that showed the trim around the arch detail. However, the package did not include a copy of it, so he distributed it to the Commissioners.

They reviewed the two options. Mr. Shea asked what the diameter of the columns was, and Mr. Keane said it was 10 inches. Mr. Shea said that the pilaster should be the same width to be more appropriate, and Mr. Wyckoff agreed.

Chairman Almeida opened the public comment session, but no one spoke, so he closed the work session and moved the application into a public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Keane briefly went over the application, stating that the entrance detail was revised with a built-out pilaster and crown molding detail and would be replaced with a new pilaster detail, which was Option 2.02. Mr. Wyckoff said he noticed that a crown molding above the frieze was used in a support area instead of on top, where it would normally be used, although he said it was not a critical issue. Mr. Keane stated that he could change it by removing the existing crown and replacing it with a similar profile. Mr. Wyckoff suggested a 2-1/2" bed molding and further discussed why it would be better. Chairman Almeida agreed that the bed molding would be smaller, and Mr. Keane said he would switch it out. Mr. Cracknell told Mr. Keane that he could submit it as a follow-up for the file.

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

- 1) That the entryway and door detail (sheet A-2.02 date stamped July 10, 2015) shall be used.*
- 2) That the pilaster width shall be 10" to match the column widths.*
- 3) That a 2 1/2" (+/-) bed moulding shall be used where the crown moulding is shown on sheet A-2.02.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was an attempt to bring the building back to a more historical realm and was a good restoration. Vice-Chair Gladhill said the project would maintain the special character of the District, complement the architectural and historical character, and preserve the integrity of the District by restoring the home more to its original edition.

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

B. Petition of **David A. and Regina H. Schirmer, owners, and Richard S. Hayes, applicant**, for property located at **241 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (repair siding and trim, replace windows on sides and rear of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 36 and lies in the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the July 15, 2015 meeting to the August 5, 2015 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Type here]

Mr. Rawling resumed his seat.

The current owner Mr. Rick Hayes was present to speak to the petition. He stated that the front façade of the house was done with Andersen replacement windows in 2011 and approved by the HDC, and he wanted the windows to match all the way around the house. The Commission had asked for quotes for restoring the current windows that wrapped around the house and had also suggested that wavy glass windows be found as replacement windows and that they also could replace the front windows to be consistent. Mr. Hayes went through the quotes that he received and also noted that he could not find wavy glass windows. He stated that Options 2, 3 and 4 were cost-prohibitive and felt that removing the current windows on the front of the house didn't make sense to him. If he were to do wavy glass, he would have to put aluminum storms, which he thought would detract from the historical look.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the amount of window trim to be replaced was 100%, and Mr. Hayes agreed. They further discussed the siding that would have to be replaced and the new casing of the windows that would have to match the existing profile. Mr. Rawling asked whether the front windows were clad, and Mr. Hayes replied that they were aluminum clad. Mr. Shea asked whether the whole window unit would be replaced and what the material of the casing and window sill was, and Mr. Hayes agreed that the whole unit would be replaced and that the material was wood. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the Andersen windows had pre-manufactured casings, and Mr. Hayes said they did not because it was a new construction window. Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was unacceptable, but after further discussion and discovering that the contractor would replace all the trim around the windows in kind, including the band moldings and the sill, he said it would be fine.

Chairman Almeida verified after reading the specifications that Mr. Hayes would not need the casing kit that Mr. Wyckoff had mentioned and would be getting a complete hung window. Mr. Rawling said there should be drawings submitted showing what windows were going in and how they would be installed because it was unclear to him what was actually being proposed. He also thought there were other manufacturers that were more suitable. Mr. Wyckoff stated that the front of the house was already done with the Andersen product and felt that the applicant should be allowed to use the same window. Councilor Kennedy agreed with Mr. Rawling but was also concerned about saving the wavy glass. They discussed donating the wavy glass windows and sashes, and Mr. Hayes agreed that he would donate them to Strawberry Banke.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the opening would be reduced in size after the Andersen windows were installed, and Mr. Hayes replied that the only change would be the modern glass and sash.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. George Dodge of 16 Sheafe Street stated that it would be easy to take the old glass out and do reproductions that would save Mr. Hayes a lot of money, and he volunteered to show Mr. Hayes how to remove the old glass.

[Type here]

Ms. Erica Dodge of 16 Sheafe Street said she was concerned whether the window pattern would remain the same so that the look would be preserved.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That the replacement windows, casing, trim, and sill shall be installed and field applied to match the existing window location, mullion pattern, and profile.*
- 2) That the 9/6 mullion pattern shall be replicated.*
- 3) That a half screen shall be used.*
- 4) That the sashes and glass shall be donated to Strawberry Banke.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea stated that he was about preserving old homes and noted that his house's windows were restored and less expensive than replacement, so he thought the windows could be restored. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that he would approve the petition because the front façade was already done and Mr. Hayes was willing to donate the historic windows to Strawberry Banke. Mr. Rawlings stated that, just because a bad approval had been given or a bad product selected, the Commission couldn't allow that to become the new standard to judge the house by. Councilor Kennedy agreed with Mr. Shea that the wavy glass was precious and she knew a lot of people who had restored windows reasonably. Chairman Almeida said he was in the business of restoring windows, and after seeing Mr. Hayes windows up close, he noted that the majority of them fell into Category 4, which was a replacement window. In the past, the Commission had very successful window replacements, and if they wanted the process to be better, they had to do better as well. He said he looked forward to the day when he Commission didn't wrestle so much with the window issue. He would support it because the rot was so extensive and he thought the chosen window package would be successful.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would maintain the special character of the District by keeping the pattern of windows the same. It would have compatible innovative technology with surrounding properties due to the District's common pattern of windows.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 4 to 3, with Mr. Shea, Mr. Rawling, and Councilor Kennedy voting in opposition.*

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Thirty Six Market Street Condominium Association, owner, and Danicha Properties, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **36 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install new window in existing opening) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 29 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Cracknell said the petition was for a window that had been bricked over, and the applicant wanted to reintroduce the window, which would be a good improvement.

2. Petition of **Victoria Condominium Association, owner, and Clyde Logue, applicant,** for property located at **210 South Street (also known as 10 New Castle Avenue)**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (remove existing fencing, install new fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 35 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

Mr. Cracknell stated that a cedar fence would replace the existing one and that the image showed the profile and location.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Kennedy made a motion to grant Certificates of Approval for Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2. Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

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

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

3. Petition of **Eport Properties 1, LLC, owner,** for property located at **173-175 Market Street and 65 Ceres Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a second one year extension of the Conditional Use Permit originally granted on August 7, 2013 and again on September 10, 2014, as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 3 & 4 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Chris Erickson stated that he was present to ask for an extension, and he went through the history of the petition, noting that they had needed the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the number of stories that were added to the Zoning code and were simply trying to maintain the set of stories that always existed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Richard Katz of 59 Kensington Road stated that he had followed the progression of the application. The existing building was savaged in the 1950s and had all its original historic features removed, and the Commission had agreed that they wanted to see the original façade restored or replicated. Seeing that the applicants agreed to the stipulations, he felt that the Commission could look more kindly to the back of the building, and if they reneged on that process, it would be an example of bad faith. He stated that the way the Commission conducted themselves in coming to the final determination was a classic example of how a good Historic

[Type here]

District Commission worked with the applicant, so he was asking the Commission to grant the stipulation so the building could get started.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the extension for a second year based on the same elements as the original proposal as follows:*

1. Other than minor changes to the roof design, the façade of the existing historic building at 175 Market Street is being restored to its original period;
2. The overhead utility lines on and immediately adjacent the properties are being buried which will provide less visual clutter and removal of an adverse visual impact on the neighborhood;
3. The proposed parking for the building is being relocated from the exterior surface spaces behind the building to the basement level which will provide less visual clutter and removal of an adverse visual impact on the neighborhood; and,
4. The applicant is providing a publically accessible sidewalk along the rear of the building.

*Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1 with Councilor Kennedy voting in opposition.*

4. Petition of **George A. Dodge III Revocable Trust 2002 and Erica C. Dodge Revocable Trust 2002, owners**, for property located at **16 Sheafe Street (also known as 25 Penhallow Street)**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install custom wood carriage house doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 43 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Ms. Erica Dodge was present, and she reviewed her petition.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that the elevation of the street was changing and asked whether there would be an additional sill or base for the doors. Ms. Dodge agreed that there would be a base. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the doors would be hung on existing pintles, and Ms. Dodge replied that some pintles existed and others would be replaced.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded.*

Councilor Kennedy stated that it would preserve the integrity of the District, assess its historical significance, enhance the property, maintain the special character of the District, and enhance its architectural and historical character. Vice-Chair Gladhill thanked the owners for putting back historic features into a historic building. Chairman Almeida noted that the Commission had discussed whether or not they should give out awards and had decided not to, but the Portsmouth Advocates were trying to resurrect it.

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

5. Petition of **Michael and Amy Quigley, owners**, for property located at **40 Mt. Vernon Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace trim on rear bay window, replace clapboard and trim above porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 28 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Councilor Kennedy recused herself.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. Michael Quigley stated that the bay window at the back of the house needed to be replaced. He would replace the board and trim with Azek and replace the existing trim and clapboard with cedar and Azek. He would also replace the wooden front steps with granite.

Chairman Almeida asked what the surface of the Azek would be, and Mr. Quigley replied that it could be flat or whatever the Commission recommended. Chairman Almeida suggested a smooth finish and that it be field painted, and Mr. Quigley agreed.

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 made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the exposed side of the Azek shall have a smooth finish and is field painted.*

Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the applicant would replace to match existing style and would also use innovative technology in preserving the integrity of the District.

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

6. Petition of **RJF-Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (locate mechanical units, misc. changes to the structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 8 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic Districts.

Councilor Kennedy resumed her seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Rob Harbeson of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the petition and stated that the technical components needed to be refined. He noted a letter that detailed all the amendments and said he would review them with the Commission and also present additional items. He went through the nine sheets of amendments that indicated both previously approved and proposed. He also noted that the 9' steel fence could be either a 9' aluminum fence or an 8' steel fence. He passed out an addendum and explained it, noting that there was a landscaping screen issue. He clarified the final item, saying that the previously approved one had callouts for polyurethane, but details showed a metal coating, which was intended.

Sheet 1: Mr. Shea noted that there were changes that didn't seem to affect the spirit of what the Commission had previously approved. Chairman Almeida stated that there were significant changes to the deck from what was previously approved that showed more human activity. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the baluster, and Mr. Harbeson said it would be used for screening.

Sheet 2: Councilor Kennedy asked what the landscape planters would be made of, and Mr. Harbeson said he didn't remember.

Sheet 3: Mr. Wyckoff said that the planters could be seen more clearly and that they looked like masonry. Chairman Almeida said that the vent caps were placed with care and seemed almost like a feature, and he asked why they were painted red. Mr. Harbeson said it helped make them disappear, but they could be metal. Chairman Almeida said he preferred to leave them alone because it forced them to be symmetrical. Mr. Wyckoff preferred that the caps be painted red so they would not be noticeable. Councilor Kennedy asked why the new windows were changed out, and Mr. Harbeson said it was to make the ones on the opposite side more relevant and said they were changed in width by a few inches in accordance with the Building Code.

Sheet 4: Mr. Wyckoff asked why the case stone base was removed, and Mr. Harbeson said that it was more cohesive to carry the lower precast base and change in the header course around the three street front elevations. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he preferred the previous design due to the grade change. Mr. Rawling noted that the previous design with a lighter base livened up the building, and Councilor Kennedy agreed. She asked about the metal egress door and suggested that the look of it be softened. She also questioned the balcony and the fence around it because she thought the design detracted from the balcony. Mr. Harbeson said the balcony material and railing were the same as before.

Chairman Almeida said that the loss of the base on the Raynes Avenue side was not good because it seemed like the window sills were going higher. They further discussed taking it to the other corner and also the loss of glass on the steel door. Chairman Almeida noted that the base beneath the storefront windows seemed lower and discussed the 6-ft projection from the building. They agreed that the base should be as originally proposed and that the brick was more successful on the garage. Chairman Almeida asked if the garage opening was larger or just shaded lighter, and Mr. Harbeson said it was moving up because the deck would be accessed. Chairman Almeida suggested that the bridge be thickened. Mr. Harbeson said he could increase the depth with a soffit. Councilor Kennedy had concerns about the fence height and the fact that it had been changed from ornate to simple. Mr. Wyckoff preferred the new proposal because it provided more screening, but Mr. Shea preferred the original because it was more inviting. Mr. Rawling said he liked the previous fence's texture, and Chairman Almeida agreed. Councilor Kennedy said she liked the light fixture on it. They discussed changing the base of the fence.

Sheet 5: Vice-Chair Gladhill remarked that the rounded metal bump-out looked bigger, and Mr. Harbeson said it was just the shape of the curve. Chairman Almeida clarified that it was important to look at the site plan itself on the supplemental sheet. Councilor Kennedy asked how high the base of the fence was, and it was further discussed. Mr. Wyckoff said he didn't care which fence was used but was bothered by the new software that sprinkled shrubbery at the base of both fences because Mr. Harbeson had said that it wasn't part of the landscape plan. Mr. Harbeson replied that he did have a landscape plan for the area, and Mr. Wyckoff asked why they should care then if the base went down.

Chairman Almeida suggested that the generator location be a separate discussion, and the Commissioners agreed that it should be removed. Chairman Almeida noted that they concurred about the need to bring a soffit down to eliminate the height of what was looking at the other side of the building. Mr. Harbeson said that the language of the original 8' fence could be retained to be more traditional, and Chairman Almeida agreed. It was decided that the previously-approved fence would be used with only the removal of the base between the columns.

Sheet 6: Councilor Kennedy asked if the painted Hardy panels were a change, and Mr. Harbeson said that it was a modification and that they were changing only the configuration and not the materials. She asked what the privacy screen would be made out of, and Mr. Harbeson said it would be pressure-treated wood and painted.

Sheet 7: Councilor Kennedy brought up the steel door, and Chairman Almeida agreed that most of the Commissioners seemed to prefer a glass door, which Mr. Harbeson said he could do. Mr. Shea said the canopies changing on one side looked good. Councilor Kennedy asked if the canopy was previously copper, and Mr. Harbeson agreed but said it seemed disparate from the rest of the building so they decided to match the approved canopies on the other part of the building. Chairman Almeida noted that the previous canopy was much thinner but the new one was more substantial with a different material. Mr. Harbeson replied that all the entry canopies matched and retained the curved shape. Chairman Almeida said it would have to be segmented, and Mr. Harbeson said he would look at options.

Sheet 8: Councilor Kennedy asked what type of glass would be used on the resident entry, and Mr. Harbeson said it would be storefront glass.

There were no comments on Sheet 9 or on the supplemental handout.

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

- 1) That the pre-cast base on all the elevations shall not be modified and shall remain as previously approved.*
- 2) That the privacy fence shall be an 8'± steel fence as previously approved but the stone base between the piers may be removed.*
- 3) That the deck banding on the Vaughan Street elevation shall be lowered to the top of the pre-cast stone on the first floor.*
- 4) That the light fixtures shall remain on the fence column as previously approved.*
- 5) That the steel doors shall be replaced with glass doors with frosted glass.*
- 6) That the generator location and screening shall be removed from the application and resubmitted for approval when finalized.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor, 7-0.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the project would use innovative technology with surrounding properties, would be compatible in design with surrounding properties in the North End but would have a different look and entity. It would also maintain the special character of the North End.

7. Petition of **233 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (changes to site utilities, roof appurtenances, and one balcony window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 and lies within the Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Ms. Carla Goodnight of CJ Architects stated that she wanted to review the transformer relocation, the addition of the generator, and the associated fencing and landscaping. She noted that there was a request from an owner to revise a window that overlooked his patio into a door, and the third item addressed the relocation of the mechanical fireplace venting system. She discussed the location of the transformer, the introduction of the generator, and the relocated aluminum fence. She said that a wooden gate would be placed in front of the transformers and boxwood hedging would screen it as well. Ms. Goodnight also noted that she

[Type here]

met with TAC and handed out a sketch to each Commissioner, saying that TAC requested that the granite curbing be replaced with a new slab area.

Councilor Kennedy asked what the material around the door was, and Mr. Goodnight said it was brick and granite. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether the tall grass died off in the winter, and Ms. Goodnight said that it did. Councilor Kennedy asked what color the fireplace vents were and how far they stuck out, and Ms. Goodnight said they would be painted to match existing and would stick out 6 inches. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the array of pipes, and Ms. Goodnight said they would be relocated.

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

- 1) That the wall vents shall be painted to match the wall color.*
- 2) That the revised transformer screening plan submitted as Exhibit 1 shall be constructed.*

Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the improvements to the building were minor. Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the changes would be compatible with the design of surrounding properties and would not affect anything.

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

8. Petition of **Portsmouth Savings Bank/Bank of NH, owner, and TD Bank, applicant,** for property located at **333 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install lighting, install concrete island with arm gates, install bollards) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 9 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself and Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed his seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Phil Corbett of CMA Engineers, Inc. was present to speak to the petition.

Councilor Kennedy stated that she received an email from a citizen who was concerned about the lights shining down. Mr. Corbett replied that there would be no new lights and that one would be relocated from the drive-through. Councilor Kennedy asked when it would be done, and Mr. Corbett said it would be early September during business hours. Councilor Kennedy asked how

big the island would be, and Mr. Corbett said it would be 24” wide by 10 feet. Mr. Mayer asked whether the parking area would be available for people to use after hours, and Mr. Corbett agreed that it could be used after hours and on weekends.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That period lighting shall be used.*
- 2) That the hours of construction shall be during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.).*

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy stated that period lighting was always a positive and preserved the integrity of the District, and that granite replaced with granite would keep the historic significance.

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

9. Petition of **29-41 Congress Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **37 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (storefront improvements) 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.

Chairman Almeida resumed his seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Keith Frizzell, the owner of 37 Congress Street, that he wanted to give his storefront a facelift by placing panels over the existing metal and concrete and replacing the front door with an historic one.

Chairman Almeida asked whether or not the awning would be removed, and Mr. Frizzell said it would. He asked what color Mr. Frizzell would paint the aluminum, and Mr. Frizzell said it would be painted black. Mr. Rawling pointed out the photo of the existing conditions, the cast iron lintel supported by cast iron piers, and noted that the drawing showed the panels covering it. They further discussed the entablature that went over the shop, shrinking down the panel, and considering a flush panel design. Chairman Almeida suggested carrying the small detail over to match existing, and Mr. Rawling agreed, saying that something was needed to match the store next to the storefront. Mr. Rawling also discussed the base of the columns, noting that the design

proposal of the framed panels going to the bottom of the street would deteriorate, and he suggested something with a baseboard that could be repaired or replaced. He also suggested that the column detail be carried across.

Mr. Shea suggested doing the bottom parts in PVC and painting it and having a mason patch the broken-up pieces on the concrete cornice that went across the top and then have it painted black. Councilor Kennedy said she liked the panels under the windows and asked that it not be too cluttered at the top. Mr. Mayer noted that it was important to be sensitive to the original fabric on the storefront and suggested not removing cast iron pieces.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulations:*

- 1) That the proposed door will have a single pane of glass.*
- 2) That the aluminum panels shall be painted black.*
- 3) That Azek may be used as a material for the flat panel trim under the windows and the base of the columns.*
- 4) That the upper panels shall be reduced in height or removed in order to maintain the entablature over the columns.*
- 5) A final detail of the proposed improvements shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a building permit.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy stated that the project would preserve the integrity of the District by installing the wooden door and that the historical significance would be met and would maintain the special character of the District by re-using old woodwork. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that the project would promote the education, health and welfare of the District by creating a better storefront with more authentic detail, like highlighting the iron columns, and would be consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties.

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

10. Petition of **Patrick M. and Kristen M. Crimmins, owners**, for property located at **334 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to rear addition) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 1-1 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Type here]

The owner Mr. Patrick Crimmins stated that he wanted to do minor renovations to a 3-season porch and turn it into a 4-season one that would include a bathroom. He would move two existing windows on the west elevation and make an awning window for the bathroom. He would also replace the third window with a matching window that was more energy efficient. On the north elevation, he would remove two windows and replace them with clapboard, and on the south elevation, he wanted to replace a cracked door with an existing inner door that he already had.

Mr. Mayer asked how old the bump-out was, and Mr. Crimmins said it wasn't part of the original structure. Councilor Kennedy asked whether siding would be put on, and Mr. Crimmins said it would be clapboard. Mr. Shea noted that the house could not be seen from anywhere and verified that the materials and shape would remain the same with just a different function.

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 Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Shea seconded.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the design was reasonable and could not be seen from a public way, and that it would conserve the enhancement of property values and maintain the character of the District.

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

OTHER

Chairman Almeida asked the Commissioners whether they thought there was a need for an internal work session due to the number of new members. Councilor Kennedy said she felt the Commission needed to finalize a few things, one of which was drafting a letter that would be sent to new homeowners. Chairman Almeida suggested meeting in the following few months. Mr. Cracknell noted that Ms. Dominique Hawkins was scheduled for the next meeting to discuss the Design Guidelines.

V. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 10:30 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,
Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on Sept. 2, 2015.

[Type here]