

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**April 6, 2016  
to be reconvened on April 13, 2016**

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

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

1. 687 Middle Street (*This item was postponed to the April 6, 2016 meeting.*)
2. 404 Middle Street (*This item was postponed to the April 6, 2016 meeting*)
3. 195 State Street
4. 40 Chapel Street
5. 102 State Street
6. 33 Hunking Street

Mr. Cracknell explained that Administrative Approval Item #2, 404 Middle Street, had to be postponed because it needed changes. He then gave brief descriptions of Items 3 through 6.

*Ms. Wyckoff moved to **approve** the Administrative Approval Items #3 through #6. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that everything was very minor and as presented.

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

Chairman Almeida then requested that the Consent Agenda Items be taken out of order and reviewed next, which the Commission agreed to. (See Section III, Consent Agenda Items).

**II. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)**

A. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Tanner Bridge Development, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This application was bifurcated at the March 2, 2016 meeting and continued to the April 6, 2016 meeting.)*

## WORK SESSION

Steve McHenry and Jeremiah Johnson of McHenry Architecture on behalf of the owner were present to speak to the petition. Mr. McHenry stated that they would review minor changes and clarify issues with the storefront configuration.

Mr. Johnson said that what was presented as previously approved on the storefront showed the doors but did not show that they were operable. He said they added a gutter and downspout and noted that they would replace the granite veneer on the rear façade with a different material that would match the granite veneer on the rest of the building. They would also add a guard rail.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the replacement system would simulate the granite on the front and was told that it would. He asked whether the existing concrete could be used instead.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked how the granite veneer could be matched to the actual granite. Mr. Johnson showed a sample of the veneer. Mr. Shea asked what the material under the concrete on the rear elevation was, and Mr. Johnson said it was plywood. Ms. Ruedig asked how the edges of the actual grain would be met. Mr. Johnson said they would return it and then join it.

Mr. Wyckoff said that he agreed with Mr. Mayer about using concrete on the back of the building instead of the granite veneer. They further discussed the issue as well as the foundation. Chairman Almeida concluded that the best solution was to leave the rear façade concrete.

Mr. Johnson then discussed having a center entry to the tenant space on the first floor and also discussed how the floor plate met the first-floor level and was their accessible. He said their original intent was to have the front doors operable but not used as ingress or egress. Since they were not able to have operable doors, they chose not to represent a faux door at those two locations and felt that the center mass would be a better focal point for entry.

Mr. Rawling said that the sidewalk needed to be several feet lower, and they further discussed it. Mr. Shea said he felt that the proposed elevation was better than having faux doors because it emphasized more of a central entrance entering into the more contemporary part of the building. They further discussed the 4" setback and the opportunity for planters.

Mr. Rawling said that the Commission had been clear that they wanted the building to interact with the street, and he thought the change in grade was a significant deviation from the previous approval and that the building was surrounded by a 4-ft wall or grade. Mr. Johnson discussed

the constraints that caused the change. Mr. McHenry stated that the 3.3' dimension was actually 4.3 feet and followed the grade of the street.

Mr. Shea said it was at least one building with one central entrance, and the elements were broken down so it didn't feel like a large building. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that he agreed with Mr. Rawling but added that residents wanted human scale and multiple openings. Mr. McHenry said they had to deal with the grade change but felt that they still respected the massing of the building. They also discussed putting the doors back in, which was the original intention.

Ms. Ruedig said she agreed with Mr. Shea that it was just an unfortunate circumstance of engineering. Even though the Commission had wanted more openings to activate the streetscape, she felt that the location was not a busy downtown one, so the one entrance fit well.

### Public Comment

The abutter Ed Carrier of 7 Islington Street said he had no problem with the new design and noted that the foundation of the Buckminster House included 4-ft concrete slabs that met the proposed building.

Vice-Chair Gladhill remarked that the area would be redeveloped eventually and would be more pedestrian-friendly in the future. Mr. Lombardi said he agreed with Mr. Rawling about the original intent to have smaller stores and not one big facility in an effort to encourage street activation. He thought the steps had to go back in. Mr. Wyckoff said the Commission was simply voting on changing the fake doors to windows. Chairman Almeida agreed, saying that he didn't feel that the proposed change detracted significantly from the building and that the doors were always meant to be like a stage set. He said the material was staying the same and, with the exception of the granite on the back, he agreed with all the proposed changes.

Mr. Carrier asked how the restaurant would get refuse in and out and where it would be put. Mr. McHenry said there would be dedicated storage in the basement and it would go out the garage door. Mr. Lombardi said he liked Chairman Almeida's idea of using the space for the steps for streetscape enhancement, like planters, rather than just two steps. Mr. McHenry agreed that there would be permanent planters.

*It was moved, seconded and agreed to go to a public hearing.*

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Chairman Almeida read the petition into the record.

Steve McHenry stated that there were requesting five changes to the approved plan: storefront revisions on the front façade, adding a gutter, adding a downspout on the rear elevation, changing the granite veneer to a synthetic stucco on the rear elevation, and adding railings.

Mr. Johnson stated that they were asking for Items 1, 2, 3 and 5 on their list and, on Item 4, they would change the stucco back to concrete. He then reviewed the changes.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the Commission could vote on Item #1 separately, and Chairman Almeida agreed.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Chairman Almeida asked for a motion on Item #1, the storefront design revision.

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval to Item #1. Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff stated that, regarding the grade problem with the doors, the doors on the plans were appropriate, but some Commissioners felt that having windows there was more appropriate. He said it was better that the Commission discovered the issue sooner than later. He said that the windows would preserve the integrity of the District and conserve property values.

Mr. Lombardi agreed, saying the building was compatible with the surrounding areas and would add a lot of value to the area. City Council Representative Pearson added that, if the windows were big and operable in the future, it would contribute to the streetscape experience.

Mr. Rawling said the foundation had to be softened and felt that the planters could work. He did not want to see a granite foundation sticking up so high, and he suggested that planters be a stipulation added to the motion. Mr. Wyckoff said that he agreed as the maker of the motion but felt that the planters should be presented as an administrative approval item in the future.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1 with Vice-Chair Gladhill voting in opposition.*

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval to the four remaining items on the petition. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

*Vice-Chair Gladhill said the items were minor and would not change the character of the District.*

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 6 to 1, with Vice-Chair Gladhill voting in opposition.*

### **III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)**

1. Petition of **James Sparrell and K. Towler, owners**, for property located at **125 South Street**, 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 110 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

2. Petition of **Seth F. Peters, owner**, and **Rita Fabbriatore, applicant**, for property located at **112 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install retractable awning) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 54 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

3. Petition of **Hanover Apartments, LLC & Portwalk HI, LLC, owners**, for property located at **11 Portwalk Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install two louvers and ductwork) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Mr. Cracknell read the three Consent Agenda items into the record and briefly commented on each one. Chairman Almeida remarked on Petition #2, 112 State Street, noting that the Commission was familiar with the awning fabricator's great work, and that was the reason the petition was on the Consent Agenda.

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Consent Agenda Items 1, 2 and 3. Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that all three items would preserve the integrity of the District.

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

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)**

4. Petition of **Stephen Lichtenstein and Karen Jacoby, owners**, for property located at **35 Wibird 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 134 as Lot 38 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts.

#### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The owners Stephen Lichtenstein and Karen Jacoby were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Jacoby said they wanted to replace seven windows and install insert windows into the frames.

Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that 3/3 windows were indicated. Ms. Jacoby said it was an error and that she meant 6/6 windows. Vice-Chair Gladhill said the windows were either original to the house or very historic, and he asked whether Ms. Jacoby had considered restoring the windows. Ms. Jacoby said that she had not. Vice-Chair Gladhill said that the Commission was interested in preserving historic windows. He asked to see more documentation on the possibility of restoring the windows before he could consider it.

Mr. Shea asked if it was a single-family house and was told that it was. He said he had walked by the home and noticed other replacement windows on the second floor but the first-floor windows appeared to be original. Ms. Ruedig said there were several local companies that could give Ms. Jacoby prices and discuss restoration. She felt that the windows could be restored and be just as efficient. Ms. Jacoby said she needed more guidance.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the Commission had determined that there were six original windows and a seventh one that appeared to be newer. He recommended Window Woman as a reputable company to restore wooden windows and noted that there were several options for other storm windows. Ms. Ruedig said Mr. Cracknell could give Ms. Jacoby lots of information.

Chairman Almeida said the location was on the edge of the District and not prominent and that half the front of the façade had already been changed out. Vice-Chair Gladhill noted that the windows were at sidewalk level and were obviously historic windows.

Chairman Almeida said the petition could be either voted on or postponed for further review. Mr. Cracknell said that he could provide the applicant with names of manufacturers. He also noted that the guidelines were not official and would not provide a lot of guidance at this point.

Mr. Mayer said he knew the applicants and offered to consult with the applicants about the potential of restoring the windows.

#### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

#### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **postpone** the petition to the May 4, 2016 meeting. Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

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

5. Petition of **David A. Sinclair and Nicole J. Giusto, owners**, for property located at **765 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, install post lights) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

#### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The owner David Sinclair stated that he wanted to replace the windows on the first floor with a Green Mountain wood product. He would also replace two rotten attic windows.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the new windows would match the original design, and Mr. Sinclair agreed, saying there was just a slight change. Mr. Rawling asked what the dimensions of the post lights were. Mr. Sinclair said the post was 6 feet and the lantern was 18 inches. Mr. Rawling commended Mr. Sinclair on his replacement window selection.

Mr. Mayer asked whether there would be just sash replacements. Mr. Sinclair said it would be a full replacement but noted that the plane of the frame and the top sash were the same. Mr. Mayer asked whether the two attic windows would have a different pattern, and Mr. Sinclair agreed. Mr. Mayer said normally a similar design was preferred.

Mr. Shea asked Chairman Almeida whether the applicant could use the windows for other replacements without coming before the Commission again. Chairman Almeida said he meant just the replacement windows, not the original ones. Mr. Wyckoff said he preferred that the Commission vote on the suggested windows and not give a blanket vote on all the windows. Mr. Cracknell agreed, saying that it was bad practice, and suggested an administrative approval.

Mr. Lombardi said he was bothered by replacing original windows with a different design. Mr. Sinclair said those windows were seen all over the south end. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he agreed with Mr. Sinclair because the windows were third-floor rotted windows, and he felt that the proposed design was appropriate for the era of the house.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the petition as presented, and Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the replacement windows were a high-quality wood product from Green Mountain that would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character. It would conserve and enhance property values. He noted that two original windows would be removed but were on the third floor and would be replaced by wood windows, which he felt was an even exchange. Ms. Ruedig said she commended the applicant for going through the extra effort of restoring the windows, especially with Window #9.

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

6. Petition of **Northern Tier Real Estate Acquisition and Development, LLC, owner**, for property located at **172 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing solarium and entry) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate entry, infill windows, add fire stair tower for egress) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 1A and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Sarah Hourihane of DeStefano Architects on behalf of the applicant reviewed the petition, noting that the solarium would be removed, the stairway would be moved inbound, a stairwell would be extended from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor to the basement to provide a second egress, and a gable dormer would be extended to the flat roof and match the existing slate tile. She also noted that certain windows would be infilled, and a storefront would be added. To activate the street, she said they would lower the light fixtures on the Vaughan Mall side, and would also add outdoor dining, planters, and new awnings in the future. She emphasized that there were a few items that were different from the work session: they wanted to add a transom over the door, remove a shed that housed the gas meters and infill a window with brick.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the dormers had wooden shingles on the side and if so, if they would be natural. Ms. Hourihane said there would be wood shingles on the vertical face and slate on the roof and that they would be stained to match existing.

Ms. Ruedig asked what was behind the solarium and if it would have to be infilled. Ms. Hourihane said they would infill it with brick. She thought there was a granite base that they would try to match. Ms. Ruedig emphasized that they have an exact brick and mortar match.

Mr. Lombardi asked why the brick by the door was being painted. Ms. Hourihane said they wanted it to feel like a true infill. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked whether it would be flush with the wall, and Ms. Hourihane said it would be but would have the brick infill. Mr. Shea asked what the material would be when the solarium was removed and was told it would be concrete.

Chairman Almeida said the windows were very high from the dining area and asked whether they had to go that high and if they were walk-through openings. Ms. Hourihane said that Opening B was a walkway and Opening C was existing, and their intent was to match existing. Mr. Cracknell asked whether the C windows were in place, and Ms. Hourihane said they were not. He said they could be cut lower. Chairman Almeida said he appreciated anything to energize the relationship to the sidewalk and felt it was appropriate. Mr. Rawling said it would be great to see divided lights if the window was made operable in the future.

## **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

- 1) The infill brick and mortar shall match the existing on the building.*

*Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*



Vice-Chair Gladhill said the petition would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its character, and the historic character of the District would be enhanced by getting rid of the solarium. It would have compatibility of design with surrounding properties, and removing the solarium would open up Vaughan Street and make it more inviting.

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

7. Petition of **Petra A. Huda and Kimberly A. Schroeder, owners**, for property located at **280 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear mudroom, demolish existing shed) and allow new construction (construct one story rear addition, construct new garage, install fencing) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate front door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 8 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The owners Petra Huda and Kimberly Schroeder were present to speak to the petition. Ms. Huda reviewed the petition.

Ms. Ruedig asked the applicant if she was putting vinyl on the house. Ms. Huda said they were not putting anything on the back, as the Commission had previously suggested. Ms. Ruedig said the Commission had just suggested removing the shutters because they were big and weren't really appropriate to the house.

Mr. Wyckoff remarked that when the fake shutters were taken off, the vinyl siding would be a different color. He said he had visited the site and saw that the garage was an early 19th century structure and not really a garage. He suggested a site walk to look at the inside of the structure. Ms. Ruedig agreed that the Commission had to consider that before approving a demolition.

Chairman Almeida said the application could be bifurcated so that the Commission could take a closer look at the shed. Mr. Cracknell agreed.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Wyckoff whether he had seen a foundation. Mr. Wyckoff said he assumed it was on rocks. Mr. Shea said the existing rear had the final siding and asked how the builder would rework it around the addition and match it. Ms. Huda said they would use the existing siding. Mr. Shea asked whether the foundation would be exposed concrete on the addition, and Ms. Huda said it probably would not due to a granite ledge.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

- 1) Items # 1, 2, & 4 are approved as presented and item #3 (removal of the shed building) shall be reviewed on a site walk scheduled for May 4, 2016.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a simple addition on the back that would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character. Although the front door would be moved and the building had changed quite a bit, he said he didn't have a problem with it. He also felt that the fence was appropriate for the District.

Chairman Almeida said that the motion would require an amendment due to the rear elevation, which the Commission had previously requested that it be corrected. He said the casings around the window were clapped together and the sills were separate, which was not appropriate. Mr. Rawling agreed, noting that the mold should be a 4" one.

Mr. Wyckoff also said there should be a continuous window sill.

*Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Wyckoff and Ms. Ruedig whether they would accept those two changes as an amendment, and they both agreed.*

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

- 1) Items # 1, 2, & 4 are approved as presented and item #3 (removal of the shed building) shall be reviewed on a site walk scheduled for May 4, 2016.*
- 2) The rear windows shall be mulled 4" with a continuous window sill.*

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

8. Petition of **Sarah R. Baybutt Revocable Trust, Sarah R. Baybutt, owner and trustee**, for property located at **591 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (remove and rebuild third floor deck) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace five windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 16 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

#### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The owner Herb Ross said he wanted to replace five windows with the same type of windows that were approved for the back. He said the back deck would be replaced and explained how it would be rebuilt.

He said the 1<sup>st</sup>-floor windows were 1850 windows, even though the house was from the 1830s. He asked whether he would have to go back to the Commission if he pulled the sash off himself. Chairman Almeida said there would be no need if he restored the windows.

Vice-Chair Gladhill said the house was listed as 1780, but Mr. Ross said it wasn't that old. Vice-Chair Gladhill asked how Mr. Ross knew the upper floor windows were replaced in the 1970s, and Mr. Ross said it was because the last time a permit was pulled was in the 1970s.

Mr. Shea remarked that the upper two left windows were from the 1970s and asked whether the replacements would have the same profile, saying he preferred to see just some sash replacement matching the single-pane sash on the rest of the house and not Thermopane. Vice-Chair Gladhill agreed, noting that modern window replacements would stick out. They discussed single pane glass with small muntins. Mr. Rawling said that a window made to match the existing windows would fit the best.

Mr. Wyckoff said the house had aluminum triple track storm windows and noted that the Commission had decided that they would stay. He thought they were appropriately designed. He suggested that the 7/8" muntins be changed to 5/8" muntins. He also said it would be easier to do the whole front of the second floor. Mr. Wyckoff also made suggestions to fix the support of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor deck. Mr. Rawling said that replacing all the windows on the top floor would still leave the original windows on the bottom with storms, and he felt it would be inconsistent. Chairman Almeida said he was comfortable with the proposed windows but asked that the muntins be narrowed on the front side. They further discussed it.

Vice-Chair Gladhill asked to see a sample to visually verify that what would go up would be very close to the existing muntin width.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the windows on the sides of the building could be dealt with and the façade windows left as they were and possibly replaced all at once eventually. Vice-Chair Gladhill agreed and asked that the two front façade windows be removed from the application.

Chairman Almeida asked Mr. Ross to bring in close-up photos of the windows he was trying to match for the next meeting. Mr. Shea also asked that Mr. Ross bring a piece of the sash from the 1970s window and a sash from the ones already replaced so they could be compared.

Mr. Lombardi asked for more detail on the deck's structural design. Mr. Wyckoff said he felt it was a simple fix that would be between the owner and the Building Inspector.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the brackets would be painted, and Mr. Ross said yes. Mr. Rawling suggested that the four brackets be centered between the bays of the fenestration above and below it, and Mr. Ross agreed.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

## DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Gladhill moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the exception of the two front façade windows, which would be removed from the petition and postponed to the May 4, 2016 meeting. He also gave the following stipulations:*

- 1) That the deck structure will be field painted and have up to four support brackets, and*
- 2) That the other replacement windows for the side façade will be 5/8" and not 7/8".*

*Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill said the application would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its historic character, and it would conserve and enhance property values.

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

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

## SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Jennifer Ramsey of Somma Studios on behalf of the applicant was present to speak to the petition and gave the Commission a replacement sheet for Page 3. Ms. Ramsey noted that the Planning Department had asked her to do more research on the gas meters because the meters could not go inside the building. She said that the adjacent building had the meters inside because the owner has his own utility company and could bill the apartment tenants accordingly.

Chairman Almeida asked whether the roof venting could have copper piping instead of being on the slate surface. Ms. Ramsey said that the vent on the roof would be less obvious than coming out of the roof itself. Chairman Almeida said he preferred not to see all the little bumps on the building and emphasized a copper pipe instead. They further discussed it.

Mr. Cracknell said that the abutting property owner had been opposed to having the meters in the alley and that he had not been made aware of the new proposal. He suggested deferring the item to the next meeting so that he could confer with both parties. He also noted that the Planning Department and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had approved the meters inside the building and not outside and said an amendment would have to be submitted to the Planning Department. Ms. Ramsey said the meters were originally on the back of the building and then relocated to the side. She said they could not go on the inside of the garage because they needed a 36" clearance, and there was no room in the building to stick them anywhere else. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the gate blocked the meters, and Ms. Ramsey said the meters were lower than the gate and were not visual unless up close. She said the egress from the Connie Bean development was in the corner and the small courtyard was shared property.

Chairman Almeida said the Commission would have to bifurcate the petition. Mr. Wyckoff said the gas meters didn't bother him because they would be hidden by the gate. He was more concerned about the transformer. Mr. Cracknell explained that the transformer was a result of the City and Eversource dropping the utilities from the edge of Prescott Park. He said the transformer could support the building as well as the Connie Bean Building and would prevent more clutter. The Commission further discussed it. City Council Representative Pearson suggested that it be referred to Art Speak.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

- 1) The revised meters location shall be removed from the application and heard at the April 13, 2016 meeting.*
- 2) The proposed transformer shall be painted and referred to ArtSpeak as a public art project.*

*Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill said the petition would conserve and enhance property values.

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

10. Petition of **Harbour Hill Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **77 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace trim and siding on corner elements and bays with composite material, re-flashing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 30 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The owner Arthur Carakatsane and the engineer Tim Little were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Carakatsane said that he preferred not to paint the upper levels for maintenance reasons.

Chairman Almeida said that painting at street level and not above was acceptable. He asked about the sealing. Mr. Little explained why the need for sealant would be eliminated.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented. Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.*

Mr. Wyckoff said the applicant was replacing everything so that it looked like existing, which would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character.

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

11. Petition of **Hanover Apartments, LLC & Portwalk HI, LLC, owners**, for property located at **5 Portwalk Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add signage, install lighting for existing signage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The owner of Row 34, Mr. Jim McDonnell, reviewed his petition.

Chairman Almeida asked about the corner column. Mr. McDonnell said that it was pulled out. Chairman Almeida then asked whether there were surface conduits on the face of the building, and Mr. McDonnell said there were not.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the frosted vinyl banner on the glass was applied from the inside. Mr. McDonnell said yes and explained that it wasn't completely opaque but that movement would be seen through it up close and the letters would be cut out and clear.

## **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Lombardi moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion.*

Mr. Lombardi stated that the application was appropriate to the character of the building and to the character of the area, and the design was compatible and would also maintain the character.

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

12. Petition of **Harbour Place Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **135 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing fencing, replace with new fencing with gates) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 2-1 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios on behalf of the applicant stated the condominium association agreed to replace the arbor-style fence with a simple sweeping gate that would be removable in the winter. She reviewed the petition.

Chairman Almeida said the entrance gate fence looked like it had two columns set side by side, and he asked whether the gates could share the same posts of the fence. Ms. Ramsey explained it further. Chairman Almeida, Mr. Lombardi and Mr. Shea agreed that the design was simpler and more elegant. Mr. Shea thought, however, that leaving the posts flat on the top was disappointing. Ms. Ramsey said the applicant had no preference.

Mr. Rawling asked what the blank space under the gate was and was told that it was a standard 3-4 inches of space so that the gate could swing back and forth.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

- 1) A ball cap may be used for a post cap.*

*Mr. Wyckoff seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Gladhill stated that the fence would prevent people from wandering into the yard and that the application would preserve the integrity of the District and maintain its special character. He also noted that a fence on a property was common in the District.

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

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

## WORK SESSION

The owner Keith Frizzell stated that the front of the building had headers, sills and lintels and that the front ten windows of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors were rotted. He said he wanted to use granite instead of wood.

Mr. Lombardi asked whether the current wood was original to the building, and Mr. Frizzell said he didn't know. Mr. Lombardi said he had a problem with changing the material from the original wood to granite, noting that if there was no indication that there used to be granite, there was no precedent to have granite. Ms. Ruedig agreed and was also concerned what adding a harder material instead of soft wood would do to the structure.

Chairman Almeida said granite was invasive to the brick surrounding, and if the window sill was removed, it would have to be replaced. He was hesitant to change anything because the structure was a vista coming up Market Street, and he felt that the new granite would give it a very different look from the weathered granite around it. Mr. Frizzell said his mason recommended that the headers, sills and lintels come out completely and granite be put in, which would have a thermal finish to match the granite below.

Mr. Shea said it seemed to be an original detail and suggested replacing the sills and lintels in kind. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he was hesitant about doing granite and thought that putting a heavier material into an old building would cause structural concerns. Ms. Ruedig said that if wood was used as a replacement, other brick areas would have to be addressed as well, and she hoped the mason would be extremely delicate putting in new flashing and so on.

Mr. Frizzell asked whether it would be considered a change if flashing was exposed. Chairman Almeida said it wasn't known if there was a wood lintel but he would hesitate putting in a different material. They needed to know what was behind the rot. Mr. Shea said he was concerned about how taking the windows apart would affect the frame and asked Mr. Frizzell whether the whole window frame would be pulled out. Mr. Frizzell said he didn't know.

Chairman Almeida emphasized that the building was a landmark focal building and there was no relief in faking the windows. He suggested replacing things in kind, with the cooperation of the Building Department. Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the contractor repair each opening as needed and painting them. They further discussed it. Mr. Wyckoff recommended that Mr. Frizzell look at a Brosco catalog for single pane wood windows that were exact matches.

Mr. Cracknell stated that if the windows were replaced in kind with wood, Mr. Frizzell would need a written document and a building application. He suggested that the mason provide a methodology and a point of contact and said he could confer with the mason. He said a sidewalk permit would also be needed.

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the May 4, 2016 meeting.*



**V. OTHER BUSINESS****A. Review of Design Guidelines**

Mr. Cracknell said that the Commissioners had received the final version of the guidelines, and proposed making a motion on April 13 to forward them to the City Council for adoption. He also proposed amendments to the exemptions. He said he had changed one word and would distribute new copies. He asked that it be reviewed and voted on at the next meeting.

Mr. Cracknell said the Commission should think about what to do with the remaining \$50,000 left in the Design Guideline toolkit and asked for suggestions, noting that it was earmarked for survey work and that guidance for infill buildings was needed. Chairman Almeida said there was also a need to discuss the community's ideas of what good architecture was. He said the public could attend a forum and bring photos of contemporary architecture and compare them. Mr. Wyckoff said the Commission should discuss demolition in the City and whether or not they needed an overlay district to make it legal. Mr. Mayer suggested that the surplus be used for building awareness in the contractor and realtor communities about the need for notification that the property buyer was in the Historic District.

Mr. Cracknell said the Design Guidelines would be available on line.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

*It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 10:45 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on May 11, 2016.