

**MEETING OF
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**May 4, 2016
to be reconvened on May 11, 2016**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
A site walk was held prior to the meeting (5:30 p.m.) at 280 South Street.

Chairman Almeida read the three petitions with requests to postpone into the record. Mr. Cracknell noted that there was no need for a motion on Public Hearings-Old Business Petition C, 591 Middle Street, because it was administratively withdrawn.

*It was moved, seconded and **approved** by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone Public Hearings-Old Business Petitions A and E.*

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. April 6, 2016

Mr. Lombardi had a question regarding the 40 Bridge Street petition about a change from veneer to stucco, saying that he thought it went back to granite. It was agreed that the issue would be resolved and the minutes would be voted on at the May 11 meeting.

B. April 13, 2016

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **approve** the April 13, 2016 minutes as presented.*

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 102 State Street

2. 275 Islington Street
3. 28 Walden Street
4. 91 Lafayette Road
5. 34 Cabot Street
6. 138 Congress Street

Administrative Approval Items #2 and #4 were removed for discussion. Mr. Cracknell reviewed the other items.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Items #1, #3, #5 and #6. Councilor Pearson seconded the motion.*

Ms. Ruedig stated that they were all minor changes that fit into the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Administrative Approval Item #2, 275 Islington Street

Mr. Shea recused himself from the discussion and vote.

Mr. Cracknell stated that there were five minor changes consisting of the rear door style, the window and column spacing on the rear gable, the removed lintel, a change in trim width, and an added pan to the mansard roof on Cornwall and Islington Streets.

Mr. Mayer asked why the door changed from the 6-panel to a 2-panel. Mr. Cracknell said he didn't know, but that it was the same size with a different design. Mr. Rawling noted that there were several other 2-panels on the other elevations. Mr. Lombardi referenced the fifth item, saying that the trim didn't go down to the sill. The project designer Richard Shea stated that the dormers were pushed in a bit further, causing the dormers to have less presence.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the changes as presented, and Mr. Lombardi seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they were relatively minor changes on a building that matched the style of the neighborhood very well.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Administrative Approval Item #4, 91 Lafayette Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that there were several field changes that occurred during construction, including two windows installed on the front façade and new dormers that were larger than they appeared on the submitted elevation plans. He said the window schedule indicated that the windows would be egress double-hung windows, and they were the same size as submitted, but the elevation was off, resulting in wider windows on the second floor. He concluded that the conflict between the elevations and the detail needed to be resolved.

Mr. Cracknell said there were many adjustments made to window and door placements on the rear façade, and he passed out illustrations of them.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the Commission always trusted the renderings to be proportionally correct, and he asked whether it was actually the rendering that the Commission approved. Mr. Cracknell said that the plans governed the building permit and that it wasn't a rendering but an elevation, which the Commission used and required to be scaled, and they expected that the details would match the drawings. Mr. Wyckoff said that the elevations were significant and noted that, although the windows looked about 8 inches wider than drawn, they would mostly be viewed from an automobile, and the building was at the very edge of the District, so he felt it tempered the mistake in the elevation. Chairman Almeida added that the building was a very high-quality design and construction, which should be considered.

Ms. Ruedig said she didn't think the change was acceptable because the front façade was important, and she thought that adding dormers and huge windows was a mistake and altered the design. Mr. Shea agreed and said he would not have approved them if they had been rendered correctly originally. Chairman Almeida suggested shutters to balance the windows above. Mr. Wyckoff noted that the building code required only one egress window, and if the sides were capable of egress, he felt that the front windows could be brought down to what was approved. Mr. Lombardi said he was disappointed that all the changes were constructed before coming back to the Commission and felt that the issues could have been mitigated.

Mr. Cracknell said he thought no one would have done it intentionally if they had known the process, and he suggested that the Commission consider a checkbox in the Letter of Decision form indicating whether or not a pre-construction meeting was necessary, which would help minimize further similar outcomes.

The project architect Tom Emerson stated that he drew the elevation and found that the smallest egress window was 4" wider than what he drew. He said he thought it would be imperceptible from any vantage point, although it was perceptively different.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why the egress windows could not be on the side. Mr. Emerson said they would have to raise a portion of the ceiling. Mr. Shea asked whether the City required egress windows, and Mr. Emerson said they did not. Mr. Shea asked what Mr. Emerson could do to balance the ratio of the windows with the others. Mr. Emerson said they could increase the size of the lower windows to match in order to keep it an egress window, but noted that it would change a historic piece of the structure. They further discussed alternate windows, but Mr. Emerson said the only similar egress window was too tall. Ms. Ruedig said she felt that the window proportions were not consistent with the character and design of the house, and Mr. Rawling agreed. Mr. Mayer asked about using the side windows as an egress, but Mr. Emerson said it would need a guard rail, which would be visible through the glass.

The project contractor stated that he installed the windows according to the schedule, and he noted that there would be a hardship to the owner if the windows had to be removed and changed due to a 4-6" difference in window size.

Mr. Cracknell suggested bifurcating the item from the petition. Mr. Wyckoff agreed, but said he still thought the windows were a minor change when viewed from someone driving by and that it was an honest mistake. Chairman Almeida said the installed window was the one that was submitted and approved, which created a complication for him in changing it. Mr. Rawling felt that the Commission could not make a precedent for accepting that kind of mistake.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **grant** the Administrative Approval for the petition, with the exception of the front façade and dormer windows. Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he thought the changes on the back were minor.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Chairman Almeida voting in opposition.*

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **deny** the changes made to the dormer windows. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said that by removing the egress capability of the front windows, the sides of the building would have to be changed, and the side windows were the original size. He said that any increase in width or height would put the windows into the trim, and he felt that the only alternative in order to have an occupancy permit was to change the side. Mr. Rawling said it would not go into the trim. Ms. Ruedig said there must be another solution, like other casement windows that look like double-hung windows, because the façade of the house was important.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the only fair thing to do was to withdraw the motion and postpone it.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that he would withdraw his original motion. He moved that the petition be **postponed**. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Stephen Lichtenstein and Karen Jacoby, owners**, for property located at **35 Wibird Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow minor renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace seven windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor's Plan 134 as Lot 38 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 6, 2016 meeting to the May 4, 2016 meeting.)*

*It was moved, seconded and **approved** by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone Petition A.*

B. Petition of **Petra A. Huda and Kimberly A. Schroeder, owners**, for property located at **280 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear mudroom, demolish existing shed) and allow new construction (construct one story rear addition, construct new garage, install fencing) and allow exterior renovations to an

existing structure (relocate front door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 8 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. (*This item was postponed at the April 6, 2016 meeting to the May 4, 2016 meeting.*)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owners Petra Huda and Kimberly Schroeder stated that they had nothing further to present or discuss. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that the house was already approved and that the barn/garage structure was the outstanding item to review and approve.

Mr. Mayer asked the owners whether they had considered rebuilding the garage and if not, whether they would keep the same configuration if the structure was demolished. Ms. Huda said they wanted something newer. Mr. Rawling asked whether they would model it after the same design to keep the character. Ms. Huda said they wanted to put functional doors on the front, and they further discussed it. Mr. Shea said he agreed with Mr. Rawling and thought it should look similar but kept functional, with similar roof lines. He suggested that the owners replicate the neighbor's garage and incorporate some of the old materials into the new one.

Mr. Wyckoff emphasized that the structure had original fabric and could be saved to function as a one-car garage, and he pointed out that the structure was a focal building on South Street. Ms. Ruedig said it was more of a contributing building and that the Commission considered every project individually for its own merits. Vice-Chair Gladhill agreed with Mr. Wyckoff, noting that it was an accessory structure with mostly original wood, and he said there weren't many left in the District. Ms. Schroeder said they appreciated the history and would retain the structure if it wasn't rotted and the windows were more visible to the street. Mr. Lombardi said the windows were very old and repairable and spoke to the age of the structure. He said he was hesitant to put a garage in but recognized the need to make it useful. Mr. Shea said he saw a lot of problems and recommended rebuilding it to make it look like the existing structure and keep some of the components. Chairman Almeida said that the roof, doors, hinges and vinyl siding were not original and that the early wood wasn't original as well. He suggested salvaging the old material to be used in other applications but felt that the structure was not worthy of restoration.

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 moved to **postpone** the petition to the June meeting to give the applicants the option of a work session/public hearing. Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

C. Petition of **Sarah R. Baybutt Revocable Trust, Sarah R. Baybutt, owner and trustee**, for property located at **591 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new

construction to an existing structure (remove and rebuild the floor deck) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace five windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 16 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 6, 2016 meeting to the May 4, 2016 meeting.)*

D. Petition of **Wright Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **77 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (install mechanical vents, relocate gas meters, relocate gate, install transformer) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 18 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 6, 2016 meeting to the May 4, 2016 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

No one was present to speak to the petition. Mr. Cracknell explained the history of the petition and said the applicant was asking that the meter bank be located in the alleyway, as originally presented. Mr. Cracknell suggested that the Commission support additional screening if the Planning Director found it suitable. He also noted that Mr. Wilson was willing to accept the location if all other options were exhausted.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) The Historic District Commission supports consideration for additional screening of the proposed meter bank if deemed suitable by the Planning Director in amending the final site plan.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the application would conserve and enhance property values.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

E. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **2 Bow Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **2 Bow Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood sills and lintels with granite) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 23 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 6, 2016 meeting to the May 4, 2016 meeting.)*

*It was moved, seconded and **approved** by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone Petition E.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Terry Bennett, owner**, for property located at **211 Union Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 70 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project designer Brendan McNamara explained the history of the structure and said they wanted to demolish it and build a 3-story eight-unit condominium unit with a flat roof and a red-brick school appearance. He also noted that the new building would not be in the District.

Mr. Lombardi said he thought the proposed building would look good in that location but was concerned about the property next to it because it was in the District. He said he wanted to see an image of the building stepped back a bit further. Mr. McNamara said he didn't have another image but that the setback would fall within the neighborhood range. Mr. Wyckoff said the Commission normally liked to look at replacement buildings before deciding on demolition. He felt that it was a large project to casually vote on. City Council Representative Pearson asked whether there was an opportunity for smaller, affordable-housing units. Mr. McNamara explained that a workhouse model would lower the property value.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the existing building was within the Historic District boundaries and that the Ordinance required that any portion of the structure located in the District be jurisdictional to the Commission. He said that if the new replacement structure was not located in the District, it was not in the Commission's jurisdiction. He noted, however, that the Commission could ask the Planning Board to make a determination if they felt that the boundary was uncertain. Ms. Ruedig suggested that the Commission discuss in the future what the boundaries were and the reasons.

Ms. Ruedig said she wasn't sure that the flat roof reflected the character of the street. Mr. McNamara said those issues were addressed through the Board of Adjustment and felt that the flat roof gave the appearance of a traditional building and was a highly energy-efficient one.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said he liked City Councilor Pearson's idea of workforce housing. He also said that the Commission was trying to get the Master Plan to change the Historic District borders. He said the part of the old building that bisected the District wasn't pictured, and he felt that the existing building was unique, so he couldn't see demolishing it. Mr. Wyckoff said he was more concerned about hearing from the abutters. Mr. Mayer said it would be worth having a record of the building's history. Mr. McNamara said it was well documented in the City records and had gone through several alterations. Mr. Rawling said he knew the building from its evolution and said the layers were extensive and lacking in quality, and he felt that it was incomprehensible how the building could be saved for a useful function. He thought a

demolition was necessary. Mr. Shea agreed but thought that the existing scale blended in better with the neighborhood than the proposed building. City Council Representative Pearson said she had talked to a lot of the neighbors, who said they all hoped the building would be demolished. Mr. Lombardi said he had no problem with the demolition or the new flat roof.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) A photographic inventory shall be submitted of all elevations including the building interior prior to the commencement of construction.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the brick part of the building was not close to the Historic District and that the back of the building cut a little corner of it, so he was viewing the brick part as outside of the District. He said that the demolition would enhance property values better than what existed, and he clarified that his vote was based solely on demolition.

Mr. Wyckoff said he had spoken publicly concerning demolition in Portsmouth and homes being torn out of their neighborhoods to be replaced by much larger structures. He said it was unusual that the proposed building had a smaller footprint, which he felt was good in relieving problems on the back of the property. He said he would support the application, considering that the front of the existing building was changed since 1995 and the rest was industrial. Ms. Ruedig said she would support it for Vice-Chair Gladhill's comments.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

2. Petition of **Julian Frey and Ana Barndollar, owners**, for property located at **59 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish chimney) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct faux chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 48 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Chairman Almeida recused himself from the petition, and Vice-Chair Gladhill assumed his seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Julian Frey stated that he wanted to remove the chimney and replace it with a faux chimney. He reviewed the history of the petition and said he had worked with multiple contractors and engineers, who concluded that the chimney was unsafe and should be removed. He introduced his father-in-law, Steve Barndollar, and said he would go through the details.

Steve Barndollar passed out photos of materials and designs to the Commission. He discussed the chimney issue in detail and explained why the existing chimney should be removed and replaced with a faux chimney.

Mr. Shea stated that it was a thorough presentation, which was the reason that there were no questions from the Commissioners. Ms. Ruedig said she appreciated all the background work that Mr. Barndollar did.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Bruce Boley of 88 New Castle Avenue stated that he lived across the street and was happy that the house was being renewed.

Graham Openshaw of 86 New Castle Avenue said he was in support of the project.

Joan Boyd stated that she lived in the south end and that she and her husband renovated homes in the area. She said that, when done correctly, faux chimneys had little impact on the exterior of the home and an enormous impact on the interior.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Shea seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff said he previously thought that the chimney could be rescued and supported under the roof, but as a contractor seeing the seal of approval from a professional engineer, he realized it could not. He said the chosen method was well documented and would be identical to an old chimney. He thanked Mr. Barndollar for finding the product and said it related to the historic and architectural value of the existing structure and was compatible with innovative technology.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

3. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **303 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **303 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct third floor gable dormers, construct second story on rear façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 11 and lies within the General Residence C and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architecture on behalf of the applicant reviewed the history of the petition and said the biggest change was the context, pointing out that it used to be next to the recently-demolished Olde Port Traders. He stated that there were dormer and guard rail issues that were taken care of, and he reviewed the minor material changes they were requesting.

Mr. Wyckoff said that there did not appear to be any egress windows, and Mr. Johnson replied that the building had a sprinkler system.

Mr. Mayer noted that the alignment of the new wall was flush with the existing wall and asked whether it could be stepped in to separate the old from the new material. Mr. Johnson agreed, and they further discussed it. Mr. Mayer asked whether the roof line could be stepped down a bit to differentiate it. Chairman Almeida suggested that the reveal could be a way to separate it. Mr. Johnson showed an illustration of how the corners were held back and other pieces stepped back. Mr. Rawling said either option was acceptable.

Vice-Chair Gladhill confirmed that there were no changes to the front door of the building. Mr. Shea confirmed that the new windows would be the same width as the existing ones. He said he liked the suggestion of stepping back the corners, and he asked whether the siding material would have a larger exposure. Mr. Johnson agreed, saying that it would be a 9" exposure.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked Mr. Johnson to bring something more visual to the next meeting, and Mr. Johnson agreed.

There was no public comment.

*Mr. Lombardi moved to **continue** the petition to the May 11, 2016 meeting for a public hearing, and Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

4. Petition of **Eric and Johanna Landis, owners**, for property located at **540 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new garage, construct two dormers, install screen/storm system on porch) and allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish shed) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 79 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Julie MacDonald of DeStefano Architects on behalf of the owners was present to speak to the petition and reviewed the updates. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether the door opened up, and Ms. MacDonald said they were swing-in door and not sliders.

Ms. MacDonald said that some windows were pulled out and new skylights added. Ms. Ruedig asked whether it was a storm and screen system, and Ms. MacDonald agreed. In answer to questions from Mr. Lombardi and Mr. Shea, she said the system was made of wood and the dormer on the front elevation was the same width as the window below it.

Mr. Mayer asked whether a porch with a railing system could be simulated, and Ms. MacDonald said they wanted to balance a clear view with some historic detail to the screen porch. Mr. Mayer noted that the columns holding up the porch roof didn't succeed in terms of what the

Commission suggested at the previous meeting. Mr. Wyckoff said he felt that the porch was compromised a bit but was comfortable with the division of the top screen panel. Chairman Almeida said it would be cased and framed, so it was successful. Ms. Ruedig said she would give the design a bit more leeway because it was a new house

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) Approval of the proposed garage as presented is contingent on receiving Board of Adjustment approval.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the improvements would maintain the special character of the District. He said it was a modern house and felt the additions would complement and enhance the historic character of the house.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

5. Petition of **Darryl Mojdehi, owner**, for property located at **137 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (change location and size of misc. windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 55 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project contractor Adam Jackson was present on behalf of the owner and stated that they wanted to modify a few of the windows in addition to replacing existing windows.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether it was the same type of window, and Mr. Jackson said it was. He explained that the windows needed to be spread apart because of the kitchen design and that they preferred to do casings and would keep the same size lights. Ms. Ruedig said it was appropriate to keep the same proportions of the lights. Mr. Shea confirmed that the same window casing and detail around the casements would be used, including the exterior trim and window sill. He asked whether the railing would be part of it, and Mr. Jackson said it would not.

Mr. Rawling said he could accept the casements and the two proposed windows in the kitchen area, but felt that the paired windows proposed as casements did not need to be casements. Mr. Jackson stated that they weren't visible from anywhere on the street and that they would match

the casement sizes to the other two casings. Mr. Rawling said they were smaller-sized windows, and Mr. Jackson said they would match the other proposed casements. He also said the upstairs windows were double-hung windows and would be replaced in kind.

Ms. Ruedig asked Mr. Jackson to clarify whether he would have a 9-light casement because it was drawn as a 12-light casement. Mr. Jackson said it would be a 12-light. Mr. Wyckoff said the window was only 3.2” in height, so the proportion would be off. He said the Andersen quote of 9 lights was a good proportion. Mr. Jackson said they would ensure that the lights were equally-sized lights. Mr. Rawling confirmed that the window schedule was correct.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Eric Landis of 540 Marcy Street stated that he was an abutter and supported the project.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulation:*

- 1) The proposed windows shall match the proposed window schedule/quote submitted and date stamped April 15, 2016.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the windows would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character. Ms. Ruedig noted that the Commission often struggled with casement windows, but the windows were going on a section of the house that wasn't that historic.

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

6. Petition of **Strawbery Banke Museum, owner**, for property located at **14 Hancock Street (Tyco Visitor Center)**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct three season porch, construct new patio and deck) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Tracy Kozak of JSA Architects on behalf of Strawbery Banke was present to speak to the petition. She reviewed the history of the existing building and stated that the porch addition was intended to be sympathetic to the building as well as to the size and scale of recent additions. She went through the packet of drawings and noted minor changes.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked what the screen would be framed in, and Ms. Kozak said it would be a wood frame. Mr. Rawling said he thought the addition might need some distinction for the

operable doorways because there were several panels that were all the same. Ms. Kozak said there would be hardware and crash bars, which would help differentiate them.

Mr. Shea noted that the hip roof on the left side would look more barn-like if it wasn't there. Ms. Ruedig said it was a lovely design with good detail and quality, but she struggled to see how it matched the building and fit into the character of Strawberry Banke. She said the effect of several layers of patios, railings, benches and planters was more of a grand residential presentation than an addition to a simple utilitarian barn-like structure opening onto a very historic setting. She said she felt that the paneling, wood, and panes of glass were busy and could possibly detract from focusing on the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Mayer noted that the addition would relieve the pressure on the site when the skating wasn't in operation, so there was a collateral benefit. Ms. Kozak agreed, noting that the seasonal structures wouldn't be built once the addition was built. Mr. Mayer also agreed with Mr. Shea that eliminating the hip portion would relate to the other bump-out shed. Ms. Kozak said it turned the corner with a hip and wrapped. They further discussed changing the hip.

Mr. Lombardi said he agreed with Ms. Ruedig that the porch was a bit out of character and thought it might be helpful if it blended in with the rest of the building in color. Ms. Kozak said the trim would match exactly and the wood panels of the doors could be painted or stained any color. They discussed how to make it look more rustic. Mr. Wyckoff suggested using bleaching oil, painting it gray, or painting it the same color trim. He emphasized that he didn't want to see a clear and bright mahogany look. Ms. Kozak agreed that they could use bleaching oil.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1) The mahogany shall be treated with a gray bleaching oil/stain.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the materials were some of the highest quality, like copper gutters and mahogany wood, and would maintain the special character of the District and conserve property values. The quality materials would also preserve the quality of the District and blend in with the surrounding buildings and the design itself.

Ms. Ruedig stated that she couldn't support the application and referenced her previously-stated reasons. She said the current paneling and design of the porch, planter and posts were not in keeping with the design of the building itself, nor of its surroundings in Strawberry Banke, and they were not compatible with current designs.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Ms. Ruedig voting in opposition.*

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the Commission would have time to discuss demolitions in the rest of Portsmouth. Mr. Cracknell said they would make time to discuss it.

A. Vote to adopt zoning amendments

Mr. Cracknell said he had added two references in the Zoning Ordinance as a draft to the Design Guidelines that were adopted at the previous meeting. The first reference pertained to Section 10.632, the Guiding Principles for review, and he said the Design Guidelines would be utilized by the HDC as a tool in reviewing applications. He said the second reference was in the review criteria itself, and he proposed to amend Item 3, which he read.

Mr. Cracknell stated that there were 22 or 23 current exemptions, and he proposed that they be adjusted to ten. He briefly reviewed the 10 amended exemptions, which included issues like upgrading asphalt shingles to faux slate, replacing fences and lighting in kind, amending certain HVAC equipment, and encouraging solid waste enclosures downtown.

Ms. Ruedig said there was good faux slate and bad faux slate, and she felt that the Commission needed to see it. She also said that certain buildings should not have a slate roof. Mr. Cracknell suggested removing both composite and slate from the list, and everyone agreed.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether a request for a large decorative enclosure for garbage would still be presented to the Commission, and Mr. Cracknell said it would. Mr. Wyckoff asked about temporary structures, and Mr. Cracknell said they would only be allowed up to 30 days, at which time they would need a variance.

City Council Representative Pearson asked whether Chairman Almeida would formally present the Guidelines to the City Council. Mr. Cracknell agreed that a full report of the Design Review Tool Kit would be presented, but that it would be no earlier than June.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **recommend** to the City Council the adoption of the Zoning Amendments, with the change of slate and faux slate removed. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

*The motion **passed** by a unanimous (7-0) vote.*

B. Vote to adopt the Design Guidelines for the Historic District Commission

Mr. Cracknell said he would put together a Table of Contents and index, and possibly some tabs.

VI. 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 June 1, 2016.