

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

To register in advance for this meeting, click on the link below or copy and paste this into your web browser:

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_ttvv7U_NTBSuiP4yVm2K-g

You are required to register in advance to join the meeting over Zoom, a unique meeting ID and password will be provided once you register. Public comments can be emailed in advance to planning@cityofportsmouth.com. For technical assistance, please contact the Planning Department by email (planning@cityofportsmouth.com) or phone (603) 610-7296.

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared COVID-19 outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 2020-04, Section 8, as extended by Executive Order 2020-5, and Emergency Order #12, Section 3. Members will be participating remotely and will identify their location and any person present with them at that location. All votes will be by roll call.

6:30 p.m.

May 20, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Members Reagan Ruedig, Cyrus Beer and Martin Ryan; City Council Representative Paige Trace; Alternates Heinz Sauk-Schubert and Margot Doering

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Dan Rawling

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
Alternate Ms. Doering took a voting seat for the evening.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 73 Daniel Street (this item was continued at the May 13, 2020 meeting to the May 20, 2020 meeting.)

Mr. Cracknell said the item was postponed because the applicant's plumber still had to run airflow calculations and that it may not need an administrative approval if the numbers worked.

2. 250 Market Street

The request was for a small vent and some mechanical equipment. Mr. Cracknell recommended a stipulation that the vent be painted to match the material behind it.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **approve** the item with the following stipulation:*

1. *The applicant shall field-paint the vent to match the existing brick.*

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

3. 111 Maplewood Avenue

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant was seeking minor changes and a few significant design changes, which included the following:

- The window and storefront material was changed;
- A shallower trellis ran along Maplewood Avenue;
- the canopy on the corner of Raynes Avenue and Vaughan Street was removed;
- the fourth floor was 10-20 percent bigger;
- lighting was added; and
- the overhang on Raynes Ave for the 2nd and 3rd floors was moved from 4 feet to 6 feet.

The applicant's representative Chris Lizotte was present and reviewed the minor and major changes in more detail. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the building basically looked the same in spite of all the changes and that he didn't see any major modifications except for the larger overhang, which he preferred. Mr. Ryan agreed and said the spirit of the building that the Commission previously approved was still intact. Chairman Lombardi said the overhang was fine.

*Mr. Ryan moved to **approve** the item as presented, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

II. CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL- EXTENSION

1. Petition of **Joseph J. & Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **103 High Street**, wherein a 1-year extension of the Certificate of Approval granted by the Historic District Commission on June 05, 2019 was requested, to allow new construction and exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify front elevation by adding store-front, landing, and stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 118 as Lot 22 and lies within the Character District 4-L2 (CD4-L2), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the request for the extension, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Patrick Beat and Egle Maksimaviciute Diggelmann, owners**, for property located at **137 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add roof over existing rear patio) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 101 as Lot 55 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project architect Sarah Hourihane representing the applicant was present and reviewed the petition. She noted that the roof would be supported by a square column.

City Council Representative Trace said the column's upper molding protruded and that she'd like to see the molding underneath the roof. Ms. Hourihane said the meet of the column supported the corner. Mr. Beer said the molding standing proud was a standard classical detail and that he supported it. Ms. Ruedig said it was well fitting and that extending the roof to cover the porch worked well and that there was just enough to clear the doorframe. She thought it was a great, easy solution. Chairman Lombardi agreed.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the project as presented, and Mr. Beer seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and help preserve surrounding property values. He said its relationship to the historic and architectural value of the existing structure was excellent. Mr. Beer concurred.

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

IV. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

Mr. Beer recused himself from the petition. Alternate Mr. Sauk-Schubert took a voting seat.

A. Work Session requested by **3A Trust, Guy D. and Elizabeth R. Spiers Trustees, owners**, for property located at **241 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (remove rear porch and replace with new attached garage and porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 111 as Lot 36 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 15, 2020 meeting to the May 13, 2020 meeting.)*

The applicants Elizabeth and Guy Spiers were present. Ms. Spiers reviewed the petition, noting that there were three garage door options and that she and her husband preferred favored Option 2 that was a fiberglass door with wood overlay.

Ms. Ruedig said wood doors were preferable because they were real material and she didn't think the design of Option 2 was appropriate. She said she was fine with the fiberglass but wanted to ensure that it could be painted so it didn't have a glossy fake appearance. She also asked that fake straps or hinges not be put on the door and that it be kept simple. Vice-Chair

Wyckoff agreed. He said he preferred the third option because it had vertical panels that were similar to something seen in an old carriage house door, and if that design could be found in fiberglass with a wood finish, it would be fine. He said he also liked the option of using transom windows on the side and back of the garage. He noted that the Matthews window did not have removal single divided lights (SDLs) and that it should have the grill attached inside and out to the sash permanently. He asked if the clapboards, trims, and corner boards would all be the same as the house. Mr. Spiers agreed. Ms. Spiers asked if the clapboards for the garage could be HardiPlank. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked why the applicants would change to cement claps on the garage when they had a Colonial house with wooden claps. Chairman Lombardi agreed that the doors should be chosen carefully because they faced the street and that the windows needed to have lights separated internally and externally. He said he would discourage fiberboard and preferred to see wooden clapboards on the addition. Mr. Ryan agreed and said he couldn't approve the Option 2 door because it didn't look right. He recommended Option 3. He said he also had a problem with the gliding doors in the back but since it was in the back, he thought it was probably acceptable in the District.

Ms. Doering said she agreed with all the comments and preferred Option 3 for the garage door because she liked the big wide door versus the one with the verticals and it looked like it had a strong thermal protection behind it. City Council Representative Trace said Option 3 was the most appropriate. She said she preferred to see wood siding on the house because of its age and importance in the south end. The Matthews windows were further discussed. The applicants indicated that they would go with the Andersen 100 Series windows.

The garage door was further discussed. Mr. Spiers asked if Option One was acceptable. Ms. Ruedig suggested that he find an actual photo of Option One instead of the presented illustration to see what it looked like in real life. She said she preferred a wood door but didn't have a problem with the fiberglass material because it would be painted. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said Option 3 made more sense because the house was a prominent one in the District but that he would approve Option One if it was field painted. City Council Representative Trace agreed.

Ms. Spiers asked whether they could have 2'x2' square windows on the side and back of the structure instead of the transom windows. Mr. Ryan said he would have to see it drawn before he could approve it. Chairman Lombardi agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

DECISION

*The applicants stated that they would return for a **work session/public hearing** at the July 1, 2020 meeting.*

Mr. Beer returned to his voting seat, and Mr. Sauk-Schubert returned to alternate status.

B. Work Session requested by **Todd and Jan Peters, owners**, for property located at **379 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct 2nd story additions) and exterior renovations (rebuild existing chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 207 as Lot 4 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 15, 2020 meeting to the May 20, 2020 meeting.)*

Architect Anne Whitney representing the applicant was present and reviewed the petition. She noted that several additions had been put on the late 1800s house over the years. She said the renovations would include extending the 2-story gable over the 1-story portion, rebuilding the porch, expanding the west side gable into two stories, adding a second-floor deck, replacing all the windows and siding on the building, and rebuilding the chimneys with brick.

Mr. Beer said he supported the massing and thought the project was a big improvement. Ms. Doering agreed, noting that Ms. Whitney overcame the crazy rooflines and hodgepodge additions and added her own interesting intersecting lines. She said she would be careful with some of the detailing due to the house's size so that it didn't become busy and lose its charm. Ms. Ruedig said the house was a rambling one and obviously had been done several times over. She liked that it was getting back to the simpler design that would be more appropriate to the original two-story block of the house. She said she struggled with the double height bay window on the end because it was a weird feature to have on the side of an early 19th century building, especially with the side large multi-pane fixed window that faced the street. Mr. Whitney said the bay window was part of the original foundation and that there was a lot of stone and brick in that area. She said the building was sitting on the original site, unless it got moved at some point. Ms. Ruedig said the two-story bay window looked strange nevertheless, but that going back to brick on the chimneys would be a positive change.

Mr. Ryan said he liked the existing fieldstone chimneys and that he wasn't as troubled with the double height bay as he was with the extended gable on the right east side elevation. He said there was an awkward silence after the great pattern of windows and suggested something that could either pick up the rhythm or extend the roof up better to deal with the awkwardness. Ms. Whitney said the porch helped balance it and didn't want to add something that would draw the eye away from the five bay Colonial and thought it wouldn't really be seen because of the way the house was oriented. She said putting another 6x6 window would be awkward and thought some square windows might be better. Mr. Ryan said he would leave it up to Ms. Whitney because it wasn't a deal breaker but he still thought something wasn't right about it.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he had the same problem with the second-floor addition and that, even though it couldn't be seen from the road, some respect had to be given to the historic house. He said that extending the roof in the same plane using modern framing and trying to roof over the whole thing so that no one noticed it was awkward, and that it seemed better to offset the roof and have it a bit shorter. It was further discussed. Ms. Whitney said she could re-establish the corner board and make a separation and maybe have just one window to offset the blank wall.

City Council Representative Trace said she understood Vice-Chair Wyckoff's issue with adding onto an existing roofline, but she thought the project would change so many hurts that the house

had suffered over the years and that it would look like a multi-generation house that had been added onto in the right way. Chairman Lombardi said he agreed with all the comments and that he'd like to see a break in the roofline or in the addition. He said the house has gone through so many iterations that anything would be an improvement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

DECISION

*Ms. Whitney said she would **continue** the work session to a work session/public hearing at either the July or August meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **Donna P. Pantelakos Revocable Trust, G.T. and D.P. Pantelakos Trustees, owners**, for property located at **138 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add 2nd story addition over existing garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 124 as Lot 6 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the April 15, 2020 meeting to the May 20, 2020 meeting.*

Architect Anne Whitney representing the applicant was present and reviewed the petition. She said the proposed addition would be a two-car garage with entry and living space on the first floor and the main living unit on the second floor. She noted that the neighbor had agreed to an easement that would allow windows on the side of the building that was situated 2'16" from the back property line. She reviewed the floor plans and elevations in detail.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a charming garage and asked why the two arched garage doors wouldn't be kept. Ms. Whitney said they were eight feet tall and nine feet wide and the header was set up for a square door and that they wanted to get some light into there, so she hoped to pick up the vertical pane size of the 2/2 double hung windows. She said the doors could be 7'6" doors, noting that they were wooden Masonite doors. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the building, particularly in that location, demanded to have rows of windows on the second floor and thought the overhang was charming with the columns. He thought the roof was treated fairly and liked that the cupola would be kept.

Ms. Doering said she was concerned about the massing, especially as it was seen from the waterside, but that she would go back to the site and look at it again. Ms. Whitney said the new roofline would be below the existing one and thought the perspective in the pictures was dramatic because the pictures were taken from below. Ms. Doering said something felt out of rhythm between the size of the garage doors and the more diminutive front doors, and then the peak overhang of the left top gable. Ms. Whitney said she was trying to balance the double hung windows on either side but could add a window to the left of the front door. Ms. Doering suggested that it could be a decorative window up high to help balance it.

Mr. Ryan suggested keeping the arches and infilling as necessary to retain some of the beautiful outbuilding structure. Ms. Ruedig said the building was a fairly recent one and not historic, but it seemed a little large for the massing. She said it would be fine as long as it was shorter in height than the main house and read as a secondary building. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said the existing garage structure was compelling just the way it was and thought that making it a two-story one would change its aesthetics. He also said he wasn't in favor of keeping the two arched garage doors. Chairman Lombardi said he liked the proposed garage and thought it was a nice building, but that he didn't have a strong opinion on whether or not to keep the arched doors.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

DECISION

*Ms. Whitney said she would **continue** the work session to a work session/public hearing at either the July or August meeting.*

V. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **15 Middle Street Real Estate Holding Co., LLC, owner**, for property located at **15 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (new siding and trash enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 12 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

Architect Brendan McNamara representing the applicant was present and reviewed the petition. He said the redevelopment of the Salvation Army Building was changed from a 28-room hotel and restaurant to a 15-room inn and restaurant, and that in the future they hoped to develop the third floor into three residential units. He said there were no substantial changes to the building's exterior on the west elevation and that the dormers would not be added on the south elevation. He pointed out that the east and north sides of the wooden building had to have fire-rated sheathing and noncombustible siding, so they had to remove the wood siding and replace it with HardiPlank. He said the large chimney on the brick building would have to be rebuilt and that the center chimney would be rebuilt in appearance but would work as a venting structure for the elevator beneath it. He said 20 feet of the concrete block building would be demolished to expose more of the wooden church building and would be replaced with a dumpster enclosure.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the most exciting thing about the project besides small dormers for the elevator faux chimney were the dormers that now would not be put on. Mr. McNamara said they were not approved to do the dormers but would try to do so on a year or two, pending Planning Board and City Council approval. He said the two structures were built at the same time, although the foundation at the perimeter of the buildings was not original. He said he would know more after the internal demolition in a few weeks.

Ms. Ruedig said the brick building was 20th century and that the Athenaeum posted a photo of the original little wooden building that was part of the North Church. She said the wooden building had a fascinating history and suggested posting historic photos of it inside the building when it was finished. She said getting rid of the dumpsters on Porter Street would help clean it up. They discussed that some windows in the brick and wooden buildings would have to be blanked off and that the series of double hung windows on the north side of the brick building would have to be removed and blocked up due to the fire rating. Mr. Ryan said he fully supported any measures to get fire protection and thought that the back area in the alley was much improved. Mr. McNamara said they didn't want to do HardiPlank but were forced to.

City Council Representative Trace asked why the owner wasn't going before the Board of Adjustment and City Council for the dormers. Mr. McNamara explained that the Traffic and Safety Committee felt that there would be an issue with Porter and Middle Streets for the 28-room hotel and that a lesser development could get their approval. He said they weren't redeveloping the attached space, so there was no requirement to go before the Planning Board. City Council Representative Trace said she liked the dormers and thought it was unfortunate that they wouldn't be done right away. Mr. McNamara said they were showing the dormers to capture the future needs of the building.

Chairman Lombardi said it was a great project and that he'd like to see the dormers as well. It was decided that the Commissioners would do individual site visits due to the pandemic.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **continue** the work session to a work session/public hearing at a future meeting.*

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary