

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

September 7, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida, Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative/Vice-Chair 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

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. August 3, 2016

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the August 3, 2016 minutes, and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

B. August 10, 2016

Ms. Ruedig, Chairman Almeida and Mr. Lombardi abstained from the vote because they were not present at the August 10, 2016 meeting.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the August 10, 2016 minutes, and Vice-Chair Gladhill seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-0.*

At this point in the meeting, Public Hearing #1, Work Session A and the Administrative Approvals were taken out of order and heard before hearing the City Hall Façade Replacement presentation.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to take Public Hearing #1, Work Session A and the Administrative Approvals out of order.*

The Commission addressed the 137 New Castle Avenue petition. See page 6 for details.

The Commission then addressed Work Session A, 34-36 Highland Street. See page 7 for details.

The Commission then addressed the Administrative Approvals. See page 3 for details.

II. PRESENTATION – City Hall Façade Replacement – north wall

Director of Public Works Peter Rice, Project Principal Rob Robicsek, Project Designer Alice Carey, and Facilities Project Manager Dan Hartrey were present.

Mr. Rice reviewed the history of the building and said a major concern was the failing façade on the north side. He said immediate interim repairs were necessary, and then a complete replacement would be done on the façade within a year. He said the City Council asked that the Commission give their input regarding the three options for the north wall, after which the City Council would make the final choice.

Mr. Robicsek noted that all the walls would have the same problems eventually and would have to be repaired. He said the police entrance would also be redesigned. He discussed the building's existing materials and said the existing window openings would be left, with a few additional openings put in.

Ms. Carey then reviewed the three options for the façade materials. Option A was the most traditional, and included masonry, red brick, and aluminum operable windows. Option B was more contemporary, with an aluminum curtain wall of spandrel and clear glass. Option C was a metal panel rain screen, with an insulated wall, metal finish and more of a horizontally-oriented gray panel. Ms. Carey also showed the brick samples for each option.

The Commissioners said what options they preferred and briefly discussed them. Mr. Shea said he favored Option B because it respected the building's 1960s architecture and the original intent of the building. He noted that Option C looked like a brand new building. Mr. Lombardi said that he originally felt that Options A and C presented a flat feeling, whereas Option B made the building more interesting, but then he thought Option C was pretty good, so he was torn. Ms. Ruedig said it was important to pay homage to the original design of the building. She thought that Option A made an enormous brick wall, and she preferred Option B because it broke up the horizontality. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that Option A made the wall look massive and said he preferred Option B. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he preferred Option A, the conservative option, because it felt best. City Councilor Representative Pearson said she preferred Option B. Chairman Almeida said he preferred Option B because he liked the texture changes and thought it maintained respect for the original design intent. He also suggested that a sculpture form be added to the building in the future and that a seal be placed on the roof's metal box.

Mr. Rawling said that, because the building was a transitional building in the center of the Historic District, it needed a high-quality architectural statement reflecting the community's values. He presented some sketches in which the flat box roof was replaced with a pitch roof to soften the building and make it more compatible with the complex, and he further discussed them. Mr. Mayer said he preferred Option B because it respected the 1960s architecture of the building. He asked whether the roof's elevator box could be diminished and whether some public space could be reclaimed. Chairman Almeida suggested that the steep hill be terraced.

Chairman Almeida asked whether further mechanical units would be added, and Mr. Robicsek said they would not.

At this point in the meeting, Councilor Pearson left the meeting.

The Commission then addressed Work Session A, 34-36 Highland Street. See page 7 for details.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 2 Bow Street (*This item was postponed at the August 10, 2016 meeting.*)
2. 77 State Street
3. 303 Islington Street
4. 280 South Street
5. 404 Middle Street
6. 28 Dennett Street
7. 172 Gates Street
8. 241 Islington Street
9. 65 Washington Street
10. 143 Pleasant Street
11. 133 Islington Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the 2 Bow Street petition would be heard last. He then reviewed the other petitions.

77 State Street

Mr. Cracknell read the three modifications. Mr. Lombardi said the utilities as an afterthought bothered him, and Mr. Cracknell said it was a code issue. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the generator was required, and Mr. Cracknell said it was because it was elevator backup power.

303 Islington Street

Mr. Cracknell said the windows would be changed from the Marvin to the 400 Series, with the same pattern and profile.

280 South Street

Mr. Cracknell said there was a slab code issue and that three feet had been removed from the shorter end of the building, so the applicant wanted to go back to a cedar siding to match the house. He said gable vents were also added.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why the garage door information was with the packet, and Mr. Cracknell said it was a stipulation. Chairman Almeida said he wanted it documented that there was a previous stipulation that the door be field-painted.

404 Middle Street

Mr. Rawling recused himself, so the petition was pulled out of order and postponed to the end of the Administrative Approvals so that it could be voted separately.

28 Dennett Street

Mr. Cracknell reviewed the petition. Chairman Almeida said he wanted to ensure that the removal of the chimney was documented, per the Commission's previous decision.

172 Gates Street

The petition was to replace a cedar fence with a solid board fence and extend it.

241 Islington Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to put the existing fence along the entire parking area. He said he was concerned as to whether the fence was the appropriate one to be right up against the white house. The Commission further discussed it. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the abutters had been notified and was told that they had not. Ms. Ruedig said she had no problem with putting the fence in that location, but since it was a 5-ft solid wall, she felt that the abutter should know about it. Chairman Almeida agreed.

*It was moved, seconded and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to **remove** the petition from the Administrative Approvals and do it as a future public hearing or Consent Agenda item at the October meeting.*

65 Washington Street

Mr. Cracknell said the petition was to install a maximum 5-ft dumpster enclosure at Strawberry Banke.

143 Pleasant Street

The petition was to reroof a shed and add gutters and downspouts.

133 Islington Street

The petition was to replace the window trim on the newer addition and use AZEK instead of wood. Ms. Ruedig asked why the wood trim failed so quickly. No one knew. Mr. Cracknell said it was a replacement in kind with just a change in material.

The Commission then returned to the 2 Bow Street petition.

2 Bow Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the three brick choices presented previously were not a good match with the existing building, so the applicant wanted to present a new brick sample as well as a granite sample. The applicant Keith Frizzell then approached the podium. He said his mason had looked at the bricks at the Popovers Building. Chairman Almeida asked how much brick removal was involved. Mr. Cracknell said it was a complete replacement of all the brick.

Ms. Ruedig asked for more detail on the brick. Mr. Frizzell complied and then presented four brick samples and a granite sample to the Commission. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether there could be a stipulation that the granite have the thermal rough finish. Mr. Frizzell agreed. Mr. Shea asked whether the applicant had considered a mortar color. Mr. Frizzell said they would use something similar to the brick on the Popovers Building.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the grout would have been tinted pink. Ms. Ruedig said it was possible but assumed it was a general brown mortar. Mr. Rawling suggested a product that was like liquid dirt that made the mortar look older. Mr. Frizzell said the front of the existing layer of brick above the granite was not original. The Commission further discussed the grout colors. Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Frizzell to have his mason determine what would match the grout color, and Mr. Frizzell agreed.

Mr. Frizzell said that the square blocks below the headers on the front would be expensive, to replace, and he asked the Board for relief. Mr. Wyckoff said he felt the pieces were just wood, and Chairman Almeida agreed. He asked that the granite be kept out beyond the face of the brick by a half-inch. Mr. Rawling said he felt that the blocks were a significant feature of the building, and he suggested doing the granite lintel structurally and putting the blocks underneath it in wood to keep the design elements. Several Commissioners agreed. Mr. Frizzell said they were costly. Mr. Cracknell said it could be approved as three pieces per lintel and the applicant could return at a later date. He said the water struck brick could be approved as presented and the lintels would be a 1" projection. Mr. Frizzell said the City was pressuring him to get it done. Mr. Cracknell told him to go with the wood if he couldn't do the granite. Mr. Frizzell said the Inspector didn't want wood near the windows. Chairman Almeida said he felt there was a misunderstanding about the cost and that it could be worked out.

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

- 1) A thermal finish shall be used on the exposed face of the granite lintels and sills.*
- 2) The mortar shall match the color and profile of the bricks at Popovers at 18 Congress Street.*
- 3) The lintels shall project at least 1" and the block elements shall be projected ½" as shown in the existing conditions.*
- 4) The brick used shall be the 2 ¼" colonial water struck Morin brick.*
- 5) The cornice detail shall remain, as well as the copper gutters and downspouts.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

The Commission then voted on the rest of the Administrative Approval petitions, with the exception of the 404 Middle Street petition.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the applications, and Mr. Lombardi seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

Mr. Cracknell then discussed the 404 Middle Street petition, which was a side door change. Mr. Rawling recused himself from the vote.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-0.*

The Commission then heard the City Hall presentation. See page 2 for details.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Darryl E. Mojdehi, owner**, for property located at **137 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing fencing) and allow a new free standing structure (install new fencing) 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

Stephen Huntoon of New England Cedar Fence representing the owner was present to speak to the application. He said they wanted to remove an old board fence and replace it with a new one that was more open and lower. He said it would be stained black to blend in with the house trim and the wrought-iron fence.

Mr. Shea noted that there were two different styles of fence, one of New Castle Avenue and one on March Street. Mr. Huntoon said they were the same style but slightly different heights. Mr. Shea asked whether they would have the same detail, and Mr. Huntoon agreed.

Ms. Ruedig and Mr. Rawling both agreed that it was an improvement.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one was present to speak to the petition, and Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Wyckoff seconded.*

Mr. Wyckoff said the integrity of the District would be preserved and the new fence would conserve and enhance the property values.

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

V. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Jason Lander and Justus C. Bergweger, Jr., owners**, for property located at **34-36 Highland 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 135 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the August 10, 2016 meeting to the September 7, 2016 meeting.)*

The applicant was not present.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to put the petition back in order.*

After the break, the applicant still had not appeared. Chairman Almeida asked for a motion to postpone.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the October meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Thunderbolt Realty Trust of 2011, owner**, for property located at **17 Gardner Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolition of two rear additions, removal of rear deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story rear addition, relocate front gate and fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 14 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the July 13, 2016 meeting to the August 10, 2016 meeting.)*

C. Work Session requested by **Brian J. Bednarek, owner**, for property located at **10 Humphreys Court**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new garage and mudroom) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 43 and lies within the General Residence and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed to the September 7, 2016 meeting.)*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to postpone review of the application at the October meeting.

D. Work Session requested by **Nicole R. Gregg Revocable Trust, Nicole R. Gregg, trustee and owner**, for property located at **13 Salter Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear and side additions and deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new rear and side additions and deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 28 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone to the October 2016 meeting.)*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to postpone review of the application at the October meeting.

E. Work Session requested by **Kimberley A. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, Kimberley A. and James C. Lucy, trustees and James C. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, James C. and Kimberley A. Lucy, trustees** for property located at **127 & 137 High Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to existing structures (construct new building at rear of 137 High Street, construct roof deck at rear of 127 High Street, both with associated parking and landscaping) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the CD 4, Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone to the October 2016 meeting.)*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to postpone review of the application at the October meeting.

F. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use, 4 to 5 ½ story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone to the October 2016 meeting.)*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to postpone review of the application at the October meeting.

Work Session requested by **Michael De la Cruz, owner**, for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild historic parapets, add series of flat roofed dormers, add series of roof walkways and decks, add series of windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 1 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone to the October 2016 meeting.)*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to postpone review of the application at the October meeting.

VI. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

G. Work Session requested by **DeWarren, LLC, owner**, for property located at **69-71 Dennett 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 141 as Lot 8 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

The owner Tim Pesce stated that he and his wife recently purchased the house and had window issues. He said most of the windows were 2/2 on the main structure, except for the porch window which was 2/1. He noted that there were also a few 6/6 windows.

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that none of the windows were original to the house, and he asked whether Mr. Pesce wanted 2/1 windows. Mr. Pesce said the nearby properties all had 2/1 windows. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that 6/6 windows would be the most historically appropriate and that 2/1 windows would not be appropriate. Mr. Pesce said the 2/2 windows had more glass. Mr. Wyckoff said they would only be appropriate if the home had some Victorian changes to it, and he agreed that 6/6 windows were more appropriate. They discussed other types of windows.

Chairman Almeida said that restoring the windows on the Federal-era house would be more appropriate but hoped the final product would be a wood window. He suggested that Mr. Pesce consider just a sash replacement. Mr. Mayer asked about the window trim towards the back. Mr. Wyckoff said the window was cut because the building might have had siding on it, and he explained how it could be fixed. The Commission and Mr. Pesce further discussed restoring the older windows.

Mr. Pesce noted that the downspouts were removed and that the roof would be worked on. He said there were two separate entrances on the back of the house, one of which was a solid steel door going into the porch, which the Commission said should be replaced. Mr. Shea suggested that Mr. Pesce take a photo of a neighbor's trim and bring it back to the Commission if he wanted to upgrade the trim. Ms. Ruedig asked whether there were other older windows on other parts of the home that could be moved to the front. Mr. Pesce said that the really old ones were in the attic and were too big to move out.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant indicated that he would move forward with a public hearing at a future meeting.

H. Work Session requested by **Charles and Patricia Corlin, owners**, for property located at **736 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition, new construction, and exterior renovations to an existing structure (complete restoration of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 24 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

The owners Charles and Patricia Corlin and their daughter Laura were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Corlin summarized the changes, which included replacing the roof and the cedar

shakes, installing dormers in the back of the house, replacing the dilapidated piazza using a concrete foundation, and swapping the location of a window and a door.

Mr. Shea discussed potential problems that would result from removing the bump-out at the piazza. Mr. Lombardi said the dormer was more of an extension of the roof, and he suggested stepping it in from each side. He also suggested changing the row of windows so that it wasn't just a lineup of seven windows.

Chairman Almeida said the side roofline had to be set back at least 3 or 4 feet and said he didn't mind the windows all in a row due to the back-of-the-house rule. They further discussed what to do with the bump-out.

Mr. Rawling noted that the sliding doors were quite a bit lower than normal and asked whether they were drawn short. Mr. Corlin agreed and said he would return with a proper drawing. Mr. Rawling suggested matching the window sizes, and it was further discussed. It was agreed that the same window style would be used throughout the addition.

The Commission discussed the foundation and rebuilding the deck and also suggested ways of improving the porch and rail. They said the steps should be framed. Mrs. Corlin asked whether they should install handrails in the front of the house, and Mr. Wyckoff said they weren't required because the steps had only three risers.

They discussed putting a shed in the backyard and the garage. Mr. Corlin said the garage would match the homes' style. Mr. Rawling suggested overhangs on the front of the garage and bringing the skirt across, and adjusting the top pitch so that it wasn't so steep. Mr. Cracknell said the garage wasn't wide enough for two doors and also noted said that the setbacks would have to be addressed. Ms. Corlin said they would have a small satellite dish on the back of the house that wouldn't be seen from the street. She said they also wanted to remove the metal railing on the side of the house and were considering fencing on the front of the house.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to continue the work session to a future meeting.*

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion: Demolition Review – Draft Ordinance

Mr. Cracknell told the Commissioners that he would email the draft to them in a few days, and they briefly discussed demolition issues.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:05 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote ((7-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on October 5, 2016.