

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**October 7, 2015
to be reconvened on October 14, 2015**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

Chairman Almeida acknowledged receipt of a letter dated 9/27/2015 regarding the paint color on a house on South Street but stated that the Commission had no jurisdiction on house colors.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. July 15, 2015
- B. September 2, 2015

*The motion to approve both sets of minutes **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- 1. 41 Pickering Street

Councilor Kennedy and Mr. Shea recused themselves from the vote.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as present, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with all in favor, 7-0.*

- 2. 333 Marcy Street

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as presented. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.*

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

3. 319 Vaughan Street

Chairman Almeida and Ms. Ruedig recused themselves from the vote. Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed Chairman Almeida's voting seat.

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as presented. Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

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

4. 456 Middle Street

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as presented. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.*

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

5. 72-74 Jefferson Street

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as presented. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.*

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

6. 46 Livermore Street

*Councilor Kennedy made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as presented. Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.*

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

7. 275 Islington Street

Mr. Shea recused himself from the vote.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the petition had been before the Commission before, and he went through the changes. Mr. Mayer asked how big a factor the elements were to the Commission previously, and Mr. Cracknell replied that they were all very minor adjustments. Councilor Kennedy asked whether there were major material changes, and Mr. Cracknell said there were not. Mr. Lombardi noted that the Commission had previously recommended that the trim thickness be three-quarters, and Mr. Cracknell replied that it was but had not been stipulated.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **approve** the Administrative Approval as presented. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

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

8. 46 Market Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the Commission had asked that the applicant be present to clarify the awning replacement because the canopy image shown in the packet did not look like a copper awning. He had also requested additional drawings but had not received them. He asked that the petition be tabled until the end of the meeting.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **postpone** the Administrative Approval to the end of the meeting, noting that if the applicant did not appear, it would be postponed to the October 14, 2015 meeting. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

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

III. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Rhonda E. Stacy-Coyle Revocable Trust, Rhonda E. Stacy-Coyle, owner and trustee**, for property located at **36 Richards Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct awning over rear entryway) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 14 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the September 2, 2015 meeting to the October 7, 2015 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The builder Mr. Patrick Murphy representing the applicant stated that he submitted revised drawings. Mr. Cracknell said the issue was a lack of understanding regarding how the roof canopy would look and how far it would project, and he asked Mr. Murphy to summarize the petition. Mr. Murphy stated that the canopy would be cedar shingles and painted to match the house and would be supported by small brackets. It would be 15" tall and projected 15" from the house, and the pitch max would be 7'12".

In answer to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. Murphy stated that the brackets were steel, the ceiling material would be flat, and the extension of the roof coming off the edge of the house would be around two feet. Chairman Almeida said the Commission could stipulate that the ceiling be plywood and painted. Mr. Rawling asked about the edging around the ceiling, and Mr. Murphy replied that it would be recessed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented and advertised, with the following stipulation:

- 1) That a paneled wood ceiling shall be used.

Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it was a minor application and the applicant would match the siding of the existing house, so it would not affect anyone else in the neighborhood. He was satisfied with the additional detail in the drawings, and he noted that the compatibility of design would preserve the integrity of the District.

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

Note: The Commission addressed the first two items together because Councilor Kennedy had to recuse herself from Consent Agenda Item #3.

1. Petition of **Strawbery Banke, Inc., owner**, for property located at **60/62 Marcy Street (Jefferson House)**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct access ramp) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 8 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

2. Petition of **William T. and Annelise Ellison, owners**, for property located at **687 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing) 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.

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

Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **approve** Consent Agenda Items #1 and #2 as presented and advertised, and Councilor Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that both petitions would preserve the integrity of the District and were consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties.

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

3. Petition of **Jonathan M. Roberts and Susan M. Hechler-Lynch, owners**, for property located at **311 Marcy Street (also known as 11 Pickering Street)** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Councilor Kennedy recused herself from the vote.

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

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **approve** Consent Agenda Item #3 as presented and advertised, and Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the petition would preserve the integrity of the District, would conserve and enhance property values, and was consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties.

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

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

4. Petition of **Douglas F. Fabbriatore, owner**, for property located at **536 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct second story addition at rear of structure) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 56 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Mr. Douglas Fabbriatore stated that the petition was for an addition above the kitchen and to replace the siding, windows and shingles on the roof.

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Fabbriatore if he would replace the clapboard in kind, and he replied yes. Ms. Ruedig also confirmed that Mr. Fabbriatore would bump up the back ell addition, which she found appropriate because it was common in the neighborhood. Mr. Shea asked how old the ell and the foundation were, and Mr. Fabbriatore said he didn't know how old the ell was but said the house was built in 1853. The foundation was cement and he thought it was solid. Mr. Shea noted that there were gutters on both sides of the pitched gabled roof over the rear door and a dormer that was part of the roof over the door, but there was a flat face to the board and no gutter or shadow board. He remarked that, even though it was the 'back of the house', the Commission sometimes had trouble with just a flat face. Also, the lack of a gutter with nothing over the door would allow the water to come down. Mr. Fabbriatore stated that he would amend the plan to install a gutter over it.

Ms. Ruedig asked why the siding was being replaced and Mr. Fabbriatore replied that a lot of the paint had peeled off during the winter and there was rot. Ms. Ruedig noted that the older wood on the house would last longer because it was denser and was a better material than any of the new material, and she thought it might be worth considering what needed to be replaced. Mr. Fabbriatore said he would salvage what he could but thought a lot of it needed to go.

Councilor Kennedy asked whether Mr. Fabbriatore would replace it with cedar, and Mr. Fabbriatore said he wasn't sure but would use high-grade materials. Chairman Almeida referred to the window details, saying that one drawing showed a brick mold casing. He suggested stipulating that it either be flat or brick mold. Mr. Fabbriatore replied that it was set up for full screens. Ms. Ruedig said half screens were preferred over full, and no screen was even better. Mr. Fabbriatore said it didn't matter to him. Mr. Cracknell asked whether Mr. Fabbriatore would follow Mr. Shea's advice about putting a gutter over the small flat roof dormer over the kitchen door, and Mr. Fabbriatore agreed that he would do so.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That a gutter will be added over the kitchen door as shown on Sheet A-201.*
- 2) That flat casings shall be used.*
- 3) That half screens shall be used.*

Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy stated that the project would preserve the integrity of the District and was compatible with surrounding designs. She appreciated that the applicant would use wood siding and windows and use compatible technology for surrounding properties.

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

5. Petition of **Judith L. Hiller and John B. Wilkens, owners**, for property located at **18 Manning Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (to allow full screens on windows instead of approved half screens) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 67 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Shea recused himself from the vote.

The owner Ms. Judith Hiller referenced her original appeal and stated her reasons for not following the Commission's stipulation for half screens. She said when she bought the windows, they had full screens. She submitted a letter from the former owner stating that the windows were previously approved and that various upgrades were done over the years. She also presented an appeal with photos from the owner of a surrounding property who said she had received approval for her windows. Ms. Hiller read the names and dates of other neighbors who

had full screens installed and noted that, since there was no requirement for half screens at those places, it seemed logical that it could apply to Manning Street as well. She also referenced Zoning Section 10.630 as well as the Secretary of the Interior Standards, saying that they made no reference to a requirement for half screens vs. full screens. She asked the Commission how they determined the stipulation for half screens and what the criteria and historic relevance were.

Chairman Almeida replied that the Secretary of the Interior Standards were irrelevant once the historic windows were removed from the house. He noted that there was great leniency in allowing the historic windows to be removed. Mr. Cracknell told the Commission that it was not an appeal but was a new application, and the applicant had received an approval with a stipulation to install a half screen and have brackets under the balcony. He further explained how a full screen could be granted if Mr. Wyckoff were absent from a meeting or if the Commission forgot to stipulate it, and he said the Commission had no jurisdiction after the fact. He also noted that the Commission had been consistent during his four years on the Board in requiring half screens. The issue was further discussed, and Mr. Cracknell noted that the 2006 approval on Pleasant Street for full screens occurred because the Commission wasn't as adamant on half screens at the time. He emphasized that full screens covered all the muntins, especially on historic or 6/6 windows.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that buildings in the south end were right on the street and the Commission had insisted on half screens for the past seven years or so. Since the Commission had asked Ms. Hiller to install half screens, he felt they should maintain their consistency. He said that a house at the back of Islington Street was more subjective than a house close to the historic core.

Ms. Ruedig noted that the Commission was in the process of putting together a guidelines document that emphasized half screens and visible muntins. Vice-Chair Gladhill brought up the 2006 decision on Pleasant Street and said they were a quasi-judicial Board and could not answer for the decision, but as they moved on and learned more, they realized that full screens were not appropriate for the Historic District. The Commission and Ms. Hiller further discussed the issue. Ms. Hiller distributed handouts that identified five properties with full screens. Blanket approvals and stipulations were discussed. Chairman Almeida stated that the Commission had always stipulated half screens. Mr. Cracknell said he wasn't sure if all the examples presented by Ms. Hiller were in compliance, and he stated that the properties would be inspected. Chairman Almeida closed the discussion by saying that Ms. Hiller's home was in a prize location and a significant spot in the south end.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **deny** the Certificate of Approval as presented and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the Commission had discussed preserving the integrity of the District and maintaining its special character as well as complementing the architectural and historical character. He reminded everyone that a large building with hundreds of windows across from the Rosa restaurant had come before the Commission a few months before to ask for full screens and was turned down. He said he felt that the denial was warranted.

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

6. Petition of **F & C International Trading, LLC, owner**, for property located at **195 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows on second and third floor apartment, add window opening to left side façade, restore front door assembly, install two condensers on platforms at rear of building, install propane tank, install electric meter box, and install metal flue for fireplace) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107as Lot 39 and lies with the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Charles Hoyt of Charles Hoyt Designs representing the applicant was present to speak to the petition, and he introduced Mr. Dana Joy of Joy's HVAC Services, and a representative from LePage Windows. Mr. Hoyt said they wanted to convert the second- and third-floor apartments into one and planned to do a lot of interior work like gutting the floors, opening up the ceiling to expose the ancient rafters, and replacing the front windows and the ones on the ground floor business. They would replace the roof shingles if needed. Mr. Hoyt also discussed the condensers on platforms at the back of the building and restoring the fire escape. He said they would put new windows on the side elevation on the third floor and would replace the rake detail with Azek, painted to match the windows.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked what the existing roofing material was, and Mr. Hoyt said it was asphalt shingle. Vice-Chair Gladhill also noted that one of the new windows looked like a different size than the existing and asked for a stipulation that the original window size be replicated. Mr. Hoyt agreed.

Councilor Kennedy asked what the platforms would be made of, and she also noted that the materials of potential egress were missing. She also asked about the propane tank. Mr. Hoyt said they would remove the tank and said the window material was mahogany wood, which he showed a sample of. Councilor Kennedy said it should be stipulated. She asked what the condenser units would be placed on, and Mr. Hoyt said it would be a metal platform. Mr. Joy explained that it would depend on the metal wall brackets they had that would be inside the building. He said they would probably go with white metal brackets. Councilor Kennedy asked whether they would build a meter box. Mr. Hoyt said they would replace the existing meter box on the left elevation in kind but slightly larger, 36"x36" vs. 24"x24".

Mr. Hoyt noted that all the screens would be half screens. Mr. Wyckoff said he strongly felt that all the windows should be 6/6 ones because it was an 1820 Federal building. Mr. Hoyt agreed.

Chairman Almeida noted that some windows on the drawings were 6/1, and Mr. Hoyt said it was an error and that they would do all 6/6 windows. Ms. Ruedig asked about the existing windows, and Mr. Hoyt said they were disintegrating and that he thought they were all vinyl.

Mr. Shea asked for the dimensions on the metal flue for the gas fireplace and how far up it would protrude. Mr. Hoyt said it would protrude as little as possible and would be painted black.

Mr. Shea also brought up the issue of the 3rd –floor windows being 6/6 and the panes being square and asked if they were originally 3/3 windows. After further discussion, Chairman Almeida said that as long as the glass panes on the 3/3 window at the top were the same width, he felt it would be okay because the windows were much taller. They further discussed the swing casements and window openings, and it was decided that the top windows would be 3/3.

Mr. Shea asked whether the entire corner building would be reroofed, and Mr. Hoyt said they would stop at the fire wall. Mr. Mayer asked about the location for the condensers, and Mr. Hoyt replied that it was the only spot to put them. Mr. Mayer asked whether they could be screened off with plantings, and Mr. Hoyt said it wasn't an option because the building was on the property line. Chairman Almeida asked whether the flashing and drip edge were copper, and Mr. Hoyt said it was presently aluminum but would be copper.

Chairman Almeida also discussed the conduit and asked what the plans were to minimize it. Mr. Hoyt noted that a large tree obscured the elevation and that there were no plans to minimize the conduit. Chairman Almeida suggested that the condensers could be side by side and that the conduit could be passed through the interior. Mr. Joy replied that their goal was to keep the conduit inside and that they would put the condensers side by side if they had room. It was suggested that the conduit and vents be painted black to minimize them, and Chairman Almeida agreed that it could be a stipulation that all supports and mechanics be painted black.

Mr. Shea agreed that the rear elevation windows looked bigger than the front and that a 3/3 window might only be appropriate on the front.

Chairman Almeida asked about the chimney conditions. Mr. Hoyt said they were not up to code, so they could not use them and were proposing a gas fireplace instead. Chairman Almeida said he wanted to see as little of the metal flue sticking out at the top as possible, and Mr. Hoyt said they would darken it.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Rawling noted that the building's exterior had a lot of integrity and suggested a slate roof.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The 3rd floor window on the left elevation shall be sized to match the existing window.*

- 2) *The the propane tank is removed from the application.*
- 3) *The windows shall be solid wood mahogany LePage windows as presented and shown.*
- 4) *The windows shall have half screens.*
- 5) *The third floor windows on State Street shall have a 3/3 muntin pattern in the sashes and all other windows shall have a 6/6 muntin pattern.*
- 6) *The refrigerator lines shall be located inside the structure if feasible and all other conduits shall be located inside the building.*
- 7) *The flue shall be painted a dark grey or black color.*
- 8) *All supporting structures and electrical services shall be black in color.*
- 9) *Copper flashings and a drip edge shall be used.*
- 10) *The conduits and box for the electrical service shall be painted to match the brickwork.*
- 11) *All efforts shall be made to minimize the visual impacts to the outside of the building.*

Mr. Joy noted that the units were white and would contrast if the brackets were black, so he suggested that they be kept white unless the whole unit was painted black. Mr. Rawling said that the intent was to have the other metals painted and that they should not get into units.

Chairman Almeida asked about a stipulation for copper flashing. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked about the conduit and meter box and whether they should be kept as proposed. Chairman Almeida said they should be minimized. Therefore, further stipulations were added.

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would maintain the character of the District by upgrading the vinyl windows to mahogany. It would conserve and enhance property values and was consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties. The openings would be the same size as the existing ones, so there would not be much difference.

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

7. Petition of **Brad Lebo and Andrea Ardito, owners**, for property located at **121 Northwest Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 122 as Lot 1 and lies within General Residence A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owners Mr. Brad Lebo and Ms. Andrea Ardito noted that the original house was built in 1885, the addition was built in 2010, and there was a variety of windows. They would replace them all with Anderson 400 Series with half screens and would duplicate the 6/6 pattern. Ms. Ardito stated that there were no original windows and that no windows had sashes, although one had an aluminum sash track.

Mr. Shea confirmed that the owners would do insert windows in existing frames and that the old sill and casing would remain. He asked how far down the window would be closed, and Mr. Lebo replied an inch and a half. Mr. Shea asked whether it would be finished off with a molding, and Mr. Lebo agreed, saying that they would also remove the aluminum track. Mr. Rawling asked whether the windows were white, and Mr. Lebo said they were white with white pre-painted jamb liners. Mr. Rawling said it needed to be specified.

Mr. Mayer noted that the top view window looked original, and Mr. Lebo said that part of the window was not original and that the addition was done in the 1960s. He noted that it was in poor shape and hard to open. Mr. Wyckoff said he was familiar with the new windows and suggested using the option of the 14-degree angle at the bottom of the sill.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That the windows will be pre-painted white.*
- 2) That half screens shall be used.*
- 3) That a 14 degree +/- angle shall be used on the sill bottom to provide a historic sill appearance.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Councilor Kennedy stated that the project preserved the integrity of the District and was consistent with surrounding properties and design and had compatible technologies.

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

8. Petition of **Middle Street Baptist Church, owner**, for property located at **16 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (replace three parking lot poles/lights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 2 and lies within the Civic and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects representing the applicant told the Commission that she received a phone call about the light fixtures and wanted to replace the light poles behind the building in the parking lot for safety reasons, noting that the rear parking lot also served the library. She said a light pole was lost during the winter, so they were down to two. The electrician felt that he could replace the pole in kind, but Ms. DeStefano had discovered, after the application was submitted, a more historic light that met the City requirements for night-friendly

skies and she preferred to use that one. She showed the light to the Commission and said it would be the same height. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked what envelope photometric area it would cover, and Ms. DeStefano said it would match the existing. Mr. Shea asked what the finish was, and Ms. DeStefano said it was aluminum, like the existing. Mr. Rawling asked why it was aluminum rather than the darker finish, and Ms. DeStefano said it would be lighter and brighter than the darker color that might draw attention to the area.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That the revised light specification, Resonance 1.0 LED, shall be used as presented and shown on the submitted plan dated stamped 10-07-15.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would be compatible with innovative technologies, especially because of the LED light, which was modern technology.

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

9. Petition of **Middle Street Baptist Church, owner**, for property located at **640 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, add one window on right side elevation, remove and replace existing railing, increase door size of garage, replace garage door, remove lower half of chimney, rebuild main chimney, install sliding doors) and allow demolition to an existing structure (remove rear mudroom and stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 20 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects stated that she and her husband bought the parsonage and were excited to restore it. The house was built in 1890 and needed a lot of work. Ms. DeStefano reviewed the proposed exterior work, which included replacing the windows, removing the back mudroom, replacing the vinyl rail system, reroofing the asphalt roof, increasing the garage door size and rebuilding the chimney. She noted that the storm windows would be replaced and that the leaded glass windows were in good shape. The chimney had to be rebuilt due to cracks but would be matched exactly. She also remarked that the existing side entry and stairway would be removed to expose the stone foundation. They would remove the stained glass window and infill it with shingles, and they would also remove the casement

windows in the existing kitchen and replace them with double hung windows. All the windows would be replaced with Marvin windows. The fireplace would be removed to allow a slider to access the porch. Ms. DeStefano further discussed the replacements in more detail.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether the windows were original to the house, and Ms. DeStefano replied that most of them were but a lot in the back were not. Vice-Chair Gladhill felt that it was a drawback to lose true divided light windows on such a beautiful house and reminded Ms. DeStefano that the Commission usually mandated that original windows be kept. Councilor Kennedy agreed. Ms. Ruedig also agreed, noting that, although the house was far away from the street, she hated to see the intact windows go, even with the storm windows. Mr. Shea asked whether Ms. DeStefano had considered other types of storm windows that might look appropriate. Ms. DeStefano replied that she liked seeing the shadow lines and reveals and found that it gave the house more character and value. Mr. Shea said he was willing to maintain the preservation of the windows and allow a storm window over them. Vice-Chair Gladhill suggested a site walk before the next week's meeting, and Chairman Almeida and the other Commissioners agreed. Mr. Mayer suggested an alternative thermal double-glazed internal storm, but Ms. DeStefano said it would make it difficult to access the window. Mr. Lombardi agreed with Mr. Mayer that Ms. DeStefano was a noted architect in Portsmouth and could make a statement by preserving the original material.

Chairman Almeida said it was an opportunity to do a true proper window replacement and couldn't think of a better steward for the building. Mr. Wyckoff agreed with Chairman Almeida, noting that there was a difference between windows made before 1830 and the project's windows and wouldn't see such a great loss if they were replaced. Mr. Mayer agreed with Mr. Wyckoff but said he struggled with the Commission's purview that encouraged the preservation of a building with integrity. Councilor Kennedy noted that the Commission had made other applicants preserve the windows and felt it was their protocol and they should stick with it. Chairman Almeida added that the Commission had replaced a lot of windows as well.

Ms. DeStefano reminded the Commission that the house was not right on the sidewalk and that there were always reasons to find an exception and analyze a project for specifics. She agreed that it would be beneficial to do a site walk for the windows but asked that the other items on the application be considered. Ms. Ruedig said she thought that the other proposed changes were acceptable, although she was amazed that the fireplace would be replaced by slider doors, but since it was the rear of the house, she felt it wouldn't make an impact on the exterior view. Mr. Wyckoff asked why Ms. DeStefano would not allow the windows to be changed on the back of the house since she was removing the chimney bottom, and they discussed it further. Mr. Wyckoff asked why the stained glass window was being removed, and Ms. DeStefano said it had sentimental value to another family and she would donate it to them. Mr. Mayer asked whether the fireplace removal was to make access to the porch and whether the chimney was original to the house, and Ms. DeStefano said yes to both questions. He asked whether the stained glass was original, and Ms. DeStefano said that it was not.

The Commission further discussed the chimney and the fact that the part of it that the public would see would be kept. Mr. Shea asked whether the 2nd-floor fireplace would be maintained, and Ms. DeStefano said no because it didn't function but added that she would maintain the

brick on the outside. Mr. Shea thought it would look odd if they removed the chimney and the fireplace on two levels to keep a brick form on the back, and Vice-Chair Gladhill thought it would be better than a faux chimney. Chairman Almeida said he had no issue with the chimney because only the owner and abutters would see it. Mr. Mayer suggested that the Commission look at the chimney during the site walk and remove it from consideration that evening, and Councilor Kennedy agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) That all replacement windows shall be removed from this approval and the review shall be continued to the October 14, 2015 meeting.*
- 2) That the chimney removal shall be removed from this approval and the review shall be continued to the October 14, 2015 meeting.*
- 3) That a site walk will be held prior to the October 14, 2015 at 5:45 p.m.*

*The motion **passed** with a 6-1 vote with Chairman Almeida voting opposed.*

10. Petition of **Cathy G. Barnhorst, owner**, for property located at **24 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove window glass and mullions, replace with new glass with no mullions) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 24 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owners Ms. Cathy Barnhorst and Mr. Steve Barnhorst were present to speak to the application. Mr. Barnhorst stated that they wanted to replace five true divided light street level windows with plate glass. He said they would not change the detail of the sills unless they found rot, in which case they would replace them with wood.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the 1978 photos showed full granite, and Mr. Barnhorst replied that it was corrugated aluminum. Mr. Wyckoff asked what held up the building, and Mr. Barnhorst said there was a steel column in the corner of the gray building and steel beams on both sides that were supported by the column. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether they would keep the same wood trim and so on, and Mr. Barnhorst agreed that they would.

Chairman Almeida said he would be fine with the removal of the awkward-sized panes of glass if the windows proposed were surrounded by wood. Mr. Barnhorst said that they would not put in any metal. Mr. Rawling said he was troubled by the austerity it would create by seeing the

square black holes and suggested something to break it up more into rectangular proportions. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he generally didn't notice the window size on storefronts and was more concerned with what he saw through the window, so he thought the square windows were fine, as did the other Commissioners.

Ms. Barnhorst noted that a structural engineer had found a problem after the application was submitted, but Chairman Almeida said it was a maintenance issue that did not have to be addressed by the Commission. Mr. Cracknell stated that he would put it in his file and give the Barnhorsts an exemption form. Ms. Ruedig recommended that the mortar for the brick work be softer and darker to match the existing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would maintain the special character of the District because the applicant would replicate the single plate window, which was common to the street. He said the project was consistent with special and defining characteristics of the neighborhood.

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

11. Petition of **Kenneth Charles Sullivan, owner**, for property located at **40 Howard Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (changes to the material of the foundation, replacement of storm windows, install wooden pediments above windows, modifications to basement windows, modifications to the water table trim board, change to glass in transom above front door, add iron hand railing) 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.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Shea recused himself from the vote.

The owner Mr. Kenneth Sullivan showed the Commission some photos from 1985 of what the house looked like and a picture of the foundation at the east corner of the house, which showed that the foundation was below grade. A third photo showed drainage issues. He discussed the foundation in detail, noting that his mason had said the existing brick was a cheap fix.

Chairman Almeida asked where the veneers would be placed, and Mr. Sullivan said he wanted to put a stone veneer of the original type of stone, and he showed four stone samples. Councilor

Kennedy asked how much it would stick out, and Mr. Sullivan replied that the veneer would be 2” maximum down to half an inch. He further explained it, referencing his report throughout.

Chairman Almeida noted that some examples of the water tables stepping out were unfortunate and suggested adding a piece to cover it all up and give a clean line. Mr. Sullivan explained how the stones would be placed on the brick.

Mr. Sullivan then reviewed the other items on the petition. Councilor Kennedy asked whether there would be internal screens, and Mr. Sullivan said there would not. He discussed the glazed glass and his desire for ‘bullseye’ glass. Chairman Almeida asked if it would remain in the same plane, and Mr. Sullivan said it would. They further discussed the water table and the veneer. Mr. Mayer asked whether it was more cosmetic than functional, but Mr. Sullivan said it wasn’t.

Ms. Ruedig was concerned that Mr. Sullivan would create a history where there wasn’t one, but since the Commission didn’t know what was there before, they had to figure out what was appropriate. She thought what Mr. Sullivan proposed was fine.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Rick Shea stated that he was a direct abutter across the street and felt that everything Mr. Sullivan proposed was okay because he already had stone veneer on the house and would replicate it.

Ms. Foster stated that she was also an abutter across the street and felt that Mr. Sullivan was a fastidious steward of the property. She said she was very much in support of it and that the work he had already done had really improved the home.

Mr. Lombardi noted that Mr. Sullivan seemed to have a continuing water problem and that the proposed water table might resolve it. He thought it seemed to be more of a functional improvement than historically accurate. Ms. Ruedig had an issue with the addition of the mantels above the windows because, although what was proposed was beautiful, it was putting something on the house that the Commission didn’t have a history for. She had the same issue with the transom glass because in the 1985 picture there was just a panel and no glass. She suggested that Mr. Sullivan keep it as simple as possible.

Chairman Almeida said the Commission should just determine whether the change was appropriate, like the bullseye glass in its particular location. Councilor Kennedy said she agreed with Ms. Ruedig because the 1985 photo showed just wood and no glass. Mr. Wyckoff said it was obvious that there was once an awning window there, and he asked why it was a problem that Mr. Sullivan wanted to put bullseye glass there. He noted that every house in the south end had been morphed over several times. Councilor Kennedy said that the Commission typically asked for railing material for consistency, and Mr. Cracknell said they could stipulate it and do it as an Administrative Approval.

No one else 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 as presented with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the handrail is removed from the application and will be submitted at a later date as a new application once a detailed design has been submitted.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the project would maintain the special character of the District and complement and enhance its historic character, and it was consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties and had compatibility of design with surrounding properties.

*The motion **passed** with 6 in favor and Ms. Ruedig opposed.*

In **additional business**, Mr. Cracknell stated that he had just received information on the 420 Pleasant Street application from the structural engineer and that there were a number of actions that needed to take place as emergency actions. The tenants would be moving out due to the imminent collapse of the chimney. A main concern was that the large chimney was the same size as the chimney on 428 Pleasant Street and was in bad condition. He said he would notify the owner that he had to return before the Commission and report on what was being done. He also advised that the chimney be replaced in kind.

Mr. Cracknell stated that Ms. Dominique Hawkins would be at the October 14 meeting to discuss site improvement elements in the design guidelines for landscape features and site grading. He also said that the 2016 work plan would be discussed.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 11:30 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on November 4, 2015.