The Commission discussed that since the daylight hours are getting shorter, that site walks be scheduled to a time on Saturday morning. All the members agreed.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1) Petition of The City of Portsmouth, owner, and Dan Hartrey, applicant, for property located at 1 Junkins Avenue wherein permission is requested to allow the partial demolition of top 30’ of smoke stack and repairs to the brick for remaining stack as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 001 and lies within the Municipal and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 5, 2001 meeting to the October 3, 2001 meeting.

Mr. Becksted made a motion to take the application off the table; Ms. Grasso seconded and all agreed with a 7 – 0 vote.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Steven Parkinson, the Director of Public Works, stated they were proposing to remove the top 30’ of the existing smokestack since it is in need of repair and is a safety factor at this time. After the top 30’ has been removed, the existing bricks will be repaired and repointed. The smokestack was built for coal many years ago and gas is used at the present time and is still an active chimney. At the present time, water condensation builds up in the stack because it is so tall; therefore, damage to the stack has occurred and the bricks have deteriorated causing a safety hazard.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.
DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Grasso made a motion to accept the application as advertised and presented; Mr. Becksted stated that reluctantly he will second. Ms. Grasso stated this is a dangerous situation and the recommendation of the experts in the business warrants this Board to accept the application. Mr. Becksted stated he feels that after the top 30’ is removed the chimney will look squat. The report from the experts of Boston Chimney and Tower, the expense to repair the stack will be very expensive; therefore, he will vote in favor of the application.

Ms. Fineberg stated the photographs generated for the project do not appear as though the chimneys are one and the same. The photographs appear as if one of the chimneys are wider. Mr. Parkinson replied that it is the same chimney; however, the angle the camera took the photographs would make the chimney look different.

Chairman Rice stated he agreed and added he will support the motion.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he was staggered by the amount of money that is required to repair the smokestack. After 30’ of the chimney has been removed, in time we will not remember how tall it was and added that the chimney will no longer soar.

Mr. Katz stated this chimney serves a function and to keep the chimney as tall as it is presently would not be functional.

The motion to grant passed with a 6 – 1 vote with Vice-Chairman Adams voting in the negative.

---

2) Petition of Nancy Oeser, owner, and David Witham, applicant, for property located at 33 Humphrey’s Court wherein permission is requested to amend approval given at the September 5, 2001 meeting to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace 1’x3’ fascia trim at eaves of covered porch with a Brosco 8005 crown molding to match the bay window roof and door entry roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 041 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. David Witham, the architect for the project, stated approval was received last month for this project; however, after we reviewed the project a second time, we realized that the 1’x3’ fascia trim at the eaves on the covered porch would not work; therefore, at Vice-Chairman Adams suggestion, we would like to use a Brosco crown molding and will match the bay window.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented; Mr. Becksted seconded enthusiastically.

The motion was approved unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.
Let the record reflect that Mr. Golomb arrived.

Ms. Grasso made a motion to take the application off the table; Mr. Becksted seconded and all approved unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.

3) Petition of Robert Scagliotti, owner, for property located at 46 Livermore Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace all (37) existing windows with Pella Architect wood exterior windows; replace four single double hung windows with 2 large double hung elliptical windows mulled above on right facade; and change 3’ door to a 6’ french door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 4 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 5, 2001 meeting to the October 3, 2001 meeting.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mrs. Scagliotti, an owner of the property, stated at the last meeting they requested a work session/public hearing. Chairman Rice replied that a work session could be done at this time.

Mr. Scagliotti, the owner of the property, stated they wanted to replace all 37 windows with the Pella Architect wood exterior window. There is only 37% of the original glass remaining in the windows and what is there now is new glass or broken glass.

Mr. Scagliotti stated that they researched all the window companies and found that Pella windows had the best configuration of the muntin that perfectly matches what is existing.

Chairman Rice asked if the Commission could accept the proposed window having the same size lights. Ms. Fineberg stated that she was concerned about replacing the entire window sash in all the windows because she feels it will destroy the character of the house. This house is such a beautiful house and there are other ways to solve this problem.

Mr. Scagliotti stated the issue for this home is the energy cost in keeping the house warm.

Mr. Becksted stated that he feels Pella has come pretty close to perfecting a modern energy efficient window that is this good. If this was the Moffatt Ladd House he would not support it; however, this is not, it is a home.

Mr. Katz asked how the sash differs from what exists. Mr. Scagliotti stated the muntin design is almost identical, the sash rail on the bottom, the medium rail and the top rail will be identical to what is existing. After the windows are installed, the trained eye of Vice-Chairman Adams may see a difference; however, the average person would not see any difference.

Mrs. Scagliotti stated there is a drawing in the packets that showed that the windows or the design cannot be seen from the road. He asked who would be seeing the carriage house or who would be looking at it. The carriage house is original and was built approximately the same time as the house in 1810.
Vice-Chairman Adams stated he feels some of this application is wrong for the carriage house and the historical material that is there. He feels it is an extraordinary stretch to think of this as a back of the house shed.

Ms. Grasso feels it is too ornate and too much window. Chairman Rice suggested a larger six over six window to give more light and more window and would not be quite as ornate and would respect the simplicity of the carriage house rather than have four windows. Mr. Scagliotti asked if the french door would be accepted. Chairman Rice replied that he feels that this would be acceptable.

Mr. Katz stated this carriage house is not very visible and added that he was uncomfortable about designing people’s houses. Mrs. Scagliotti stated she agreed and added that she wants to do the best that she can with the windows on the front. The back of the house is barely visible.

Chairman Adams asked the Scagliotti’s if they would withdraw that part of the application on the carriage house and table it to another work session/public hearing on November 7, 2001. He asked the Scagliotti’s to put together various proposals with the french doors and without the french doors and with larger six over six windows.

Mr. Scagliotti requested that the second portion of the application for the carriage house be tabled until the next meeting to a work session/public hearing. The motion was made and seconded and approved unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.

The Work Session was closed and the Public Hearing was opened.

Let the record reflect that Mr. Golomb abstained from the vote and Mr. Katz voted on the application.

Mr. Scagliotti asked the Commission if they had any other alternatives for the proposal. Chairman Rice stated that to replace the broken glass on the front windows with the windows from the side and rear.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked Mr. Lamontagne of Pella Windows to describe the glass and if it is coated glass or if it has a color. Mr. Lomontagne replied a soft coat Low E is applied to the windows is basically not visible and there is no color.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve as presented; Mr. Katz seconded. Mr. Becksted stated the visual technology of the window units and detail of shade lines have reached a point that he would approve this particular replacement windows because of their energy efficiency and comfort levels with the exception of a museum quality building that has tremendous historical significance; however this is someone’s home. Mr. Katz stated the objections to this proposal seem to be that if someone passes by and sees the reflection of the glass. To deny this petition because of this fact, puts a burden on the homeowner. If the storm windows should be put back up, nothing will be seen at all.
Vice-Chairman Adams stated it has been stated that this home is not a museum; however, there are some museums that would die to look like this home. The house retains much of its original sash; therefore, the surviving historical fabric on the building is also part of the argument. He feels that to allow this application will have an impact on the building. The sidelights on the front door will remain as they are; however, we will loose that bit of charm. The sash replacement will be better; however, he has doubts. He added he will not support the motion.

Ms. Grasso stated she would like to amend the application that the windows on the rear and side be replaced; however, the windows on the front remain and be restored with the old glass that will be removed from the windows on the side and rear; Ms. Hibbard seconded. The amendment passed with a 6 – 1 vote with Mr. Fineberg voting in the negative.

Ms. Fineberg stated she will not support the motion because she feels her job is to preserve the original fabric of the building and finds it hard to believe that another solution cannot be made.

Chairman Rice stated he feels this is a win win situation that to restore the windows on the front will keep it more beautiful than it is now and to replace the windows on the side and rear will enhance the structure and will make the house more efficient and should not have an impact visually because of the distance from the street. He added that he agreed with vice-Chairman Adams statement that it is not a museum but it is as close as you can be.

The motion to grant with the above amendment passed with a 5 – 2 vote with Ms. Fineberg and Vice-Chairman Adams voting in the negative.

4) Petition of Leah Caswell, owner, for property located at 37 South Street wherein a stipulation was made at the meeting of September 5, 2001 that “accurate drawings be submitted showing the front and side elevations with dimensions provided of the chimney”. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 039 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A districts.

Accurate drawings were submitted to the Commission members on the front and side elevations that the Commission members requested last month.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to accept the plans as submitted; Mr. Becksted seconded and was approved unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1) Petition of Karl Belilah, owner, for property located at 244 Newcastle Avenue wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install eight (8) aluminum combination storm windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 039 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A districts.
SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Karl Belilah, the owner of the property, stated he was requesting to install eight aluminum combination storm windows on the dwelling. He stated that he has researched and tried to locate wood windows; however, he was unsuccessful since he discovered that they are not made anymore.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if all the windows would be divided evenly? Mr. Belilah replied that they would be.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as submitted; Mr. Becksted seconded and was approved unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.

2) Petition of Brad and Alyssa Duncan, owners, for property located at 36 Rogers Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct one-story addition to connect the dwelling to a detached studio) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 046 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Joseph Almeida, the architect for the project, stated a work session was scheduled for last month; however, due to the tragedy in New York, we cancelled the application. Because of time constraints, we are going to go for the public hearing. He presented an original photograph of the property as well as an approval letter from last months Board of Adjustment meeting.

At this time, Ms. Fineberg requested the application be put into a Work Session/Public Hearing mode.

Mr. Almeida stated that they did not know what the reveal was underneath the existing siding and would present a photograph once the project has been started as well as present a cut sheet on the doors.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to accept the application with the following stipulations:

?? That all the new doors be installed with permanently affixed exterior grills; and
?? That the applicant present a plan showing the existing reveal of siding and trim under the existing aluminum siding.
Vice-Chairman Adams stated he feels that the neighborhood can handle the glass on all the doors.

Chairman Rice stated this is Rogers Street and the proposal may not be the character of the district, but may be for Rogers Street and added that he liked the addition.

The motion to grant with the above stipulations passed with a 5 – 2 vote with Vice-Chairman Adams and Mr. Becksted voting in the negative.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting of September 5, 2001; Ms. Becksted seconded and were approved unanimously with a 7 – 0 vote.

IV. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by Platt/Hichborn Architects for property owned by Louis Clarizio located at 880 Middle Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 152 as Lot 048 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

B) Work Session requested by Marie Roth for property located at 500 Market Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 002 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A districts.

C) Joint Work Session requested by Lisa DeStefano for properties located at 325 State Street and Porter Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 001, 006 and 007 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

D) Work Session requested by Anne Whitney for property owned by John and Barbara Gregg located at 69 Hunking Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 040 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to come before the Commission, the Commission acted unanimously to adjourn to the next scheduled meeting on November 7, 2001 in the City Council Chambers.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Long
Secretary
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