

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**January 3, 2018
to be reconvened on January 10, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; City Council Representative Doug Roberts; Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea, Martin Ryan; Alternates Molly Bolster, Cyrus Beer

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
A site walk was held prior to the meeting at 5:45 p.m. at 28 Dennett Street.

Chairman Lombardi introduced the new member of the Commission, City Council Representative Doug Roberts.

I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. Chairman
2. Vice Chairman

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **re-elect** Vincent Lombardi as Chairman and Jon Wyckoff as Vice-Chairman for the upcoming year..*

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. December 6, 2017
- B. December 13, 2017

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed to **approve** both sets of minutes.*

III. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 40 Mount Vernon Street
2. 174 Fleet Street
3. 10 Humphrey's Court
4. 35 Bow Street

Mr. Cracknell addressed each item non-sequentially.

Item 2. 40 Mount Vernon Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the applicant requested that three items not be included in the final renovation plans as approved: 1) that the windows on the rooftop west elevation be E and F windows, 2) that the wood planking not be included, and 3) that the acrylic paneling on the ground floor not be installed. The Commission discussed the changes and Mr. Cracknell said he would check into whether the conservatory would still have windows.

Item 3. 10 Humphries Court

Mr. Cracknell stated that the applicant requested that the existing wood door be replaced with a steel door. It was stipulated that the steel door be field painted.

Item 4. 35 Bow Street

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to install lighting on the sign and place spotlights on it. It was stipulated that there be no exterior conduit on the side and that the lighting be down lit.

Item 1. 40 Mount Vernon

Mr. Cracknell stated that the applicant offered to plant two shrubs to screen a mechanical unit at the end of the driveway.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote to **approve** Items 1 through 4, with the stipulations on Items 3 and 4.*

Chairman Lombardi announced that the Lucky Thirteen Properties LLC Work Session/Public Hearing was postponed to the February meeting.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Islington Common, LLC, owner**, for property located at **410-430 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish misc. additions) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct four free standing duplexes, construct misc. additions to existing structures) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovations to three existing buildings, total number of units - 12) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan145 as Lots 34, 35, and 36 and lies within the CD4-L2 and Historic Districts. *This item was postponed at the December 13, 2017 meeting to the January 3, 2018 meeting.*)

WORK SESSION

Project Architect Rob Harbeson was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the application. He stated that one of the back units was eliminated, which reduced some density on

the property which now allowed a courtyard. He said the eliminated structure would be replaced with a single-family unit with a similar footprint but detached.

Mr. Harbeson reviewed Building 410. The siding was discussed. Mr. Harbeson said that any siding that had to be replaced would be done so in kind. Mr. Rawling noted that the existing 8" exposure siding was most likely a 1960s treatment and was unusual for the site. Mr. Cracknell suggested that the right exposure for the age of the home be decided.

Building 420 was discussed. Mr. Harbeson said the front building would remain and the later addition would be removed along with the upper-level deck and replaced with a new one. In response to the Commission's questions, Mr. Harbeson said the shutters would be hinged and removable and that the sash would be a wood sash.

Mr. Harbeson said the front side of Building 430 would be revitalized and the one-story side would come off to allow a driveway, with the back portion renovated. Mr. Shea noted that the existing windows were aluminum clad. Mr. Harbeson said they were proposing new windows throughout the project and that the casings and sills would be painted Azek. He said they were doing wood claps on the front building. Chairman Lombardi and Ms. Reagan said they preferred wood on the front façade because it was so close to the street.

Mr. Harbeson reviewed the new single-family building. Mr. Rawling asked whether the grade lines were accurate. Mr. Harbeson agreed and said the printout was inaccurate. He said railings were not required on the back porch, and that there was no exposed concrete foundation because there was no basement.

Chairman Lombardi asked about utility meters. Mr. Harbeson said Buildings D3 and D4 would have meters at the front and back corners, and the meters for the front buildings would be located on the back. He said there would be no generator for the properties and that he would return for an approval for the common mailbox and the site lighting lampposts. He noted that the floating corbels were adjusted.

Ms. Ruedig noted that there was originally a raingarden proposed in the back corner and asked whether the property would be soggy. Mr. Harbeson said it was discussed with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and that they were meeting with various City agencies. He said the area was lower than everything up front and that they would regrade to that.

Mr. Harbeson discussed the windows. Mr. Ryan noted that the window boxes were seasonal. Mr. Harbeson said they were an important element to add life to those elevations but could be removable. Ms. Bolster asked why the doors were faux wood. Mr. Harbeson said they wanted a durable product that gave the appearance of traditional wood and noted that they would be in keeping with what was approved elsewhere in town and would be field painted.

The Commissioners commented on the changes. Mr. Shea said he liked the site plan better and liked the addition of the single-family home as well as the minor changes made to the other buildings. He said he was on board with the design plan. Mr. Rawling agreed, noting that the site plan improved the project except for the grading items, which needed some detailing. He said the

Islington Street improvements would be immense for improving the streetscape. Ms. Ruedig agreed that the restoration and renovation of the Islington Street buildings would improve Islington Street very much. She said the applicant did a great job on a complicated project. Chairman Lombardi said he agreed with all the comments. Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that the project had gone on for five months or more and that great improvements were made.

There was no public comment.

Chairman Lombardi closed the work session and moved to the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Project Architect Rob Harbeson on behalf of the applicant reviewed the petition, briefly reiterating what was discussed in the work session.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the final HVAC and lighting plan would be submitted for administrative approval. He asked the Commission for a decision on the siding exposure on Building 410. Mr. Shea said the Commission would decide once the siding was removed.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff referred to the grading issues on Buildings D3 and D4 and recommended that there be at least eight inches of foundation showing and that the trim not be brought down to the grade. He said the floating porches as drawn would have rectangular lattice work underneath them. Ms. Ruedig asked that correct drawings be resubmitted but said it was clear what the design was meant to portray. Mr. Cracknell asked for a clean set of plans.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1. The final HVAC and lighting plans shall be submitted for administrative approval.*
- 2. The windows on the 430 Islington Street building shall be Marvin SDL, double hung wood windows with wood trim, sill, and casing. The windows on the 420 Islington Street building shall be Marvin SDL replacement windows. The windows on the 410 Islington Street building shall be restored or replaced in-kind.*
- 3. The siding on the 410 Islington Street building shall have an 8" exposure and any modification shall be submitted for administrative approval.*
- 4. The siding on all buildings shall be raised at least 8" off of the ground.*
- 5. The revised site plan shows eleven (11) residential units within seven (7) separate buildings.*
- 6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the plans and elevations shall be revised to reflect these stipulations and the design changes at the public hearing.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig said it was an extremely complex project and that the applicants worked long and hard to get it to a good and appropriate design. She said the restoration and enhancement of the buildings along Islington Street were a huge improvement to that section of the street as well as to the Historic District and would help revitalize the area and improve and enhance surrounding property values. She said the new construction in the back was appropriate and the designs were consistent with the character of the District and surrounding properties. She commended the applicant for all their hard work in coming up with a very appropriate and successful design.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff concurred with Ms. Ruedig and said he had nothing to add.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

B. Petition of **Lori A. Sarsfield, owner**, for property located at **28 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 Plan140 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts. (*This item was postponed at the December 6, 2017 meeting to the January 8, 2018 meeting.*)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Ms. Sarsfield and her window representative Ben Killary were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Sarsfield noted the site visit held before the meeting.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the Commission agreed that the first-story windows were all newer replacements with no storm windows, except for the two on the front. He said the five 2nd-floor windows all appeared to be original sashes except the window on the driveway side, which appeared to have the original top sash and a replaced bottom sash. Mr. Shea, who hadn't attended the site walk, asked whether the 1st-floor replacement windows were total replacements. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was just a sash replacement and that he hadn't looked at the sills. He said there was rot showing on one of the sills in the photos and thought there could be some new work done on the outside. Mr. Killary said that replacing and matching the interior and exterior trim would require full-frame window removals.

Ms. Ruedig said she would have trouble allowing the replacement of the 2nd-floor sashes because they were original and had a lot of character for the house. She thought there were ways to improve the windows without having to rip them out, and suggested installing new storm windows on the outside or a fitted interior storm window that would block the gaps. It was further discussed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the older upstairs sash could be weather-stripped and agreed that he couldn't see the 9/6 sash removed because it was rare. He said he was willing to compromise on the first floor and the 2nd-story window on the driveway side. Mr. Shea recommended a sash replacement kit so that more of the original house would be kept intact. It

was further discussed. Mr. Rawling said he supported the replacement of the ground-floor windows and agreed about repairing the historic 2nd-floor windows. Mr. Beer asked whether a replacement would change the window's energy efficiency because there was no weather stripping around the sashes. It was further discussed.

Chairman Lombardi said he wasn't at the site walk but trusted the other Commissioners' observations. He said there were ways to tighten windows to make them draft-free and keep them functional and that he would have a hard time replacing the historic windows. He said he would have less of a hard time with the 1st-floor windows but noted that the trim was part of the overall wall and it would be a lot of work to remove that trim and restore it and the wall.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval with the following stipulations:*

- 1. The four (4) first floor windows and the second floor (driveway side) window shall involve only wood clad replacement windows as presented with trim replicated/revised in-kind, as presented at the public hearing.*
- 2. The other second floor windows shall be preserved and be restored or repaired.*
- 3. All windows shall be field painted.*
- 4. Half or no screens shall be used.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a difficult situation because the house had been worked over extensively. He said the Commission recognized new moldings and casings on the downstairs windows and felt that there was no harm in replacing those windows. He said the sashes were 40 years old at best. He said the 2nd-floor 9/6 windows were very old and rare and wanted to see them saved and that the applicant could put new storm windows on them without going back to the Commission. He concluded that the 1st-floor windows and the 2nd-floor window near the driveway could be replaced and would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its character by the replacement of the sashes and the trim.

Ms. Ruedig said the sashes would be wood sashes inside and out and that she would stipulate that they be field painted and have either half-screens or no screens. She agreed with Vice-Chair Wyckoff that the process had been a long one because the applicant had a beautiful house right on the street and it would be a very visible replacement. She said the windows were a major part of the character of the house. She realized that the 2nd-floor windows were a problem, but they were beautiful and had a lot of character and historic value. She hoped the applicant could find another solution to help with the comfort of her home, and she said she was willing to go ahead with the replacement of the 1st-floor windows because they were not historic.

*The vote **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Shea voting in opposition.*

Mr. Shea said the reason he was opposed was because it would look odd to have insulated glass on the first floor and single-pane glass on the second floor and it would not be a consistent façade anymore.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Susan P. MacDougall, owner**, for property located at **39 Pray Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace front and left side windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 38 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. She said they proposed to do a full Marvin wood replacement window and explained why they wanted to use a clad sash.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked what was existing. Ms. Whitney said the existing windows were Brosco replacement ones with aluminum sashes. She said the aluminum jamb liners and sash were 9/6 on the first floor and 6/6 on the second floor. She said the sills and head casings were very rotted and that she had to remove all the exterior trim. She said the exterior casing would be as shown and that she planned to get the Azek profile. She said the trim would be a double-treated pine and primed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he preferred all wood trim on the house. Ms. Whitney said it would all be painted and would be difficult to tell the difference. She said the sills could be replicated and painted, or she could do the modern cedar or treated pine.

Mr. Shea verified that the dimensions of the head jamb and sill details were accurate. He asked whether the double sill detail would be seen on the windows. Ms. Whitney said she didn't think so but would check. She said she could customize it. It was further discussed. Mr. Shea said his issue was that an historic house looked brand new when all the windows and frames were replaced, which removed some of its value. He said he preferred to see wood historic replicas with wavy glass. Ms. Whitney said the house didn't have the original old windows.

Mr. Rawling asked what the jambs and liners on the proposed windows were. Ms. Whitney said that any new wood window would probably have a vinyl jamb liner. She said all the windows would be white with white trim and white jamb liners. Mr. Rawling said he thought it was a more sensitive treatment than the all-clad windows previously proposed. Ms. Bolster asked whether the metal band from the white vinyl lacking the window track would be visible. Ms. Whitney said it usually wasn't because it was very thin, and she explained how it would look.

In response to Mr. Ryan's questions, Ms. Whitney said she wasn't keeping the storm windows and that the new windows would be the same configuration as the existing ones, which were

Brosco single-pane windows with aluminum jamb liners. Mr. Ryan said he could support the application because the windows were not historic and the applicant was improving the situation.

Mr. Rawling said he shared Mr. Shea's concern about the Commission having granted many window replacements that could have been more refined, but he thought the applicant had addressed many of those concerns. He said it wasn't a replica window and would be an acceptable replacement. Mr. Shea said he was trying to be consistent with the information the Commission gave to surrounding homes and felt that a compromise would be to have a wood sash and a wood surround. It was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig asked whether Ms. Whitney would be willing to paint the cladding along with the trim and the wood. Ms. Whitney said she would but didn't think it needed to be painted because the finish was similar to a painted finish. Ms. Ruedig said that painting it would give it a consistent look and said the Commission usually stipulated field painting, even with a factory finish.

Chairman Lombardi asked how the original windows would operate in the frame of the window. Ms. Whitney said it was hard to say until they started ripping it out. She said there would be a vinyl insert to provide tension so the window could stay open, and it would only be slightly seen on the lower sash. Chairman Lombardi said he agreed with Mr. Shea about the amount of replacement windows coming before the Commission and said he was alarmed. He said a good old window and a storm were just as good as a replacement window. Mr. Shea said if it was a single-hung window, the vinyl liner wouldn't be seen. Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that Pella made a wood window with beveled exterior muntins. It was further discussed. He said a double-pane glass window was more efficient and that he would be more inclined to support the proposed replacement if the windows were wood. He said he didn't like that the storm windows were 6/6 and the sash was 9/6 and said he was taken aback by clad metal sash.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** a Certificate of Compliance for the application as presented, with the following stipulation:*

- 1. The window sash shall be clad with wood trim around the windows and shall be field painted.*

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

Ms. Ruedig said she wasn't thrilled about a clad sash, especially since the Commission saw a previous application that had a reasonable wood sash detail and molding, but said granting it would preserve the integrity of the District and the look and design of the house by having 6/6 and 9/6 windows.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff observed that the Commission was replacing replacement windows and getting rid of the storm windows that were inappropriate and didn't fit. He said the Commission

wasn't doing anything to the house that would significantly change the structure and that he was in favor of the petition. Mr. Rawling said each window replacement was unique and felt that the applicant had solved many of the problems the Commission had seen in past window replacements. He said he preferred the putty profile of the clad window, and if it were field painted, the differences would be imperceptible. He said he supported what was proposed.

Mr. Shea said he wouldn't be able to support the motion but would if the window sash were a wood one. He noted that the Commission had talked at length about old homes sitting on the street and the option of looking at clad windows vs. not looking at clad windows. He said he preferred to do the right thing with old homes and go back to more of the traditional style that they were built as, which was wood products and not aluminum clad, vinyl siding or pvc parts.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 5-2, with Mr. Shea and Chairman Lombardi voting in opposition.*

2. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Lucky Thirteen Properties, LLC, owner,** and **Kerry Cargill, applicant,** for property located at **361 Islington Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct 90 s.f. addition, modify existing canopy with patio enclosure structure) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new siding and glazed garage doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 23 and lies within the CD4-L2 and Historic Districts.

*The work session was **postponed** to the February meeting.*

3. Petition of **82 Court Street, LLC, owner,** for property located at **82 Court Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior 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 Plan 116 as Lot 48 and lies within the CD4-L1 and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Joe Almeida was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He submitted additional information to the Commission, noting that the Green Mountain specifications were in greater detail and more relevant to a landmark property. He also showed a sample of the proposed glass. He reviewed the project's history. He said that the Marvin product was deemed not appropriate for the building's seven 1st-floor windows on the street side, so they proposed a new product, a Green Mountain wood window. Mr. Almeida read the window description and explained it in detail, noting that it was a sash replacement only, and said he felt that the window would meet all the Commission's criteria for a landmark building.

Mr. Shea thanked Mr. Almeida for doing the research. He said the dimensions and type of glass were important on a replacement window for a historic structure. Mr. Rawling said the removal

of the original sash was disturbing and that he wasn't prepared to accept anything but a replacement window, but he thought Mr. Almeida's proposal was the best possible alternative to a thermal replacement window. Ms. Ruedig thanked the applicant for his strong attention to detail and said she looked forward to seeing the window installed. She said hopefully the Commission would have a gold standard to point to for future replacement sashes and replacement windows.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the applicant was replacing replacement windows that were totally inappropriate and that the product was the best that the Commission had seen. He said the project would maintain the special character of the District, would complement and enhance the architectural and historic character of the District, and was consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote.*

VI. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS - CONTINUED)

A. Work Session requested by **77 Daniel Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **77 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct third floor addition and mechanical screening to rear of existing building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 10 and lies with the CD4 and Historic Districts.

The project architect Brandon Holben and the owners Josh Sheets and Chris Griener were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Sheets stated that new discoveries led them to deconstruct the back portion of the building, pour new foundations and footings, and reconstruct a portion of the rear wall of the building. He said they wanted to gain space in the third-floor back area.

Mr. Holben reviewed the petition. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the ventilation equipment on the 2nd-floor roof was approved, and Mr. Holben agreed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said one of the abutters submitted a letter saying she was concerned about having the fan right in her face. He said adding a third floor would push the fan up another ten feet. Mr. Holben said the fan was already approved and that everything that was already approved would be moved up nine feet.

Mr. Shea asked how much of the addition had to come down. Mr. Holben said the masonry in the middle was coming down in order to get the excavator equipment in and that all the blocks

on the side would stay, which allowed the foundation to be improved and the 3rd-floor space to be added. He said he floor joists would be removed and that they'd have basically a steel box all around the building. He said the block was the back of the house. Chairman Lombardi disagreed, stating that Custom House Court was not a back-of-the-house street, and said he was concerned about the whole form imposing on the little lane. Mr. Shea said it could use more refinement because the mass felt a little big and seemed to overpower the alleyway. He said that the nearby additions seemed to be smaller and stepped down toward the pedestrian, and he suggested that the addition step in a bit going up, and that it blend in more with texture and some detail. He suggested wood materials to blend in with the nearby wooden additions. Mr. Holben said they had a chimney screen element to break up the rail. Mr. Shea said one view of it competed too much with the Custom House and suggested that it be scaled back and blended in more to let the Custom House be the most important feature in that area.

Ms. Ruedig agreed. She said the massing was a bit too much as one solid block all the way up three floors. She asked whether more of the third floor could be stepped back to leave a bit of space on the second floor to get the mechanical equipment out of the neighbors' way, have more roof room in the back, and have the massing step back. She said Option D had more of the utilitarian feeling of the existing building.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he liked the traditional brick veneer look of Option C and was taken aback by all the proposals. He said Option C would make the addition look like a two-story building with some kind of setback townhouse. He said the chase for the duct work could be set back so that it didn't go totally straight up. He said the proposed other options didn't fit the back-of-the-building criteria. It was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling suggested blending a few of the schemes. He said he liked the play of textures on the alley side and the screening wall as shown on Page 3, and thought the banding, breaks and upper cornice on Page 5 as well as the material change between the second and third floors. He said it would help break up some of the starkness seen in the first scheme. He said he could visualize the brick look as a relating element to the surrounding elements on the site. He said the idea of roof forms was appealing but would be difficult to do, and that he was opposed to the metal box in the Page 6 scheme.

Chairman Lombardi said his immediate impression of the massing was that it was the dominant feature on that lane and dominated the Custom House. Mr. Griener asked Chairman Lombardi whether at some point a higher building would set a precedent for massing in that area. Chairman Lombardi said that what the applicant proposed was setting a precedent for height and massing, and he found it concerning. The massing was further discussed. Mr. Ryan said the applicant could probably get away with the massing but felt that it was symmetrical and monumental. He said the alley was organic and rambling, with exposed conduit, wire, and trash cans, and that the addition could be more playful in responding to that rambling playful massing next to it. He suggested exposing all the mechanical equipment. It was further discussed. Mr. Sheets said that they were leaning toward simplified contemporary shapes and materials that would subordinate the addition to the historic buildings around it.

Mr. Shea said the addition was covered up from the alley side and said the Commission generally tried to consider whether an addition could be removed and still have the old building. He said it seemed that the applicant was covering up an old building and suggested that the applicant think about how to separate the new addition from the old one, like using a glass connector. It was further discussed. Ms. Ruedig said it was possible to have a contemporary addition on a historic building and didn't think there should be phony historic details put on anything. She said she also thought that the context of that particular location was very important. She said that having a strong, formal statement on the back side of an alleyway might be too jarring for everyone and wouldn't fit very well in a historic district. She said it was a hard balance to find and would take a lot of creativity.

Mr. Beer said he was very surprised that the addition was originally approved because the Commission's charge was to preserve the historic character of Portsmouth. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said that part of the problem was structural issues with the blank wall. He said he recalled a request to place street art on it. Mr. Harbeson said that was their intent. Mr. Sheets said the rendering looked starker, which was another reason they did the minimalistic approach to keep the simplicity of what was approved. Mr. Rawling referred to Mr. Ryan's comments about the utilitarian nature of the alley and materials used. He said he had done work that treated duct work, piping, and so on as sculptural and decorative forms to give relief and form to otherwise austere structures and suggested that it could be a way to temper some of the applicant's design.

Ms. Bolster asked the reason for the transition from two floors to three. Mr. Sheets said the footings were compromised and needed to be infilled with a new footing all around. He said they were building a structural wall inside the existing masonry wall and that a third floor could be supported. It was further discussed.

Public Comment

Karen Bouffard said she was representing the 79 Daniel Street Condo Association and said she didn't see the monolith as an improvement at two stories and felt that the third story was more of an assault to the alley, which she felt was more of a lane. She said the design was not sympathetic to the abutting properties and felt very industrial, and the height was out of character and blocked the light and view of the decks next to it. She also felt that the 5-day notice was insufficient, especially during the holidays.

Anarita Warfield of 73 Daniel Street said she was concerned about the roof equipment because it was right next to her porch as well as her neighbor's porch. She said it would be better if the equipment were lower on the second-floor roof.

Gene Fisk said he was the property manager of 79 Daniel Street and that the 2nd-floor owners were concerned that their deck views and light would be obliterated. He also agreed that the 5-day notice wasn't sufficient on a holiday weekend.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the February 2018 meeting.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*At 10:34 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on Feb. 14, 2018.