

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**November 06, 2019  
To be reconvened on  
November 13, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice-Chairman Jon Wyckoff; Members Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Martin Ryan, and Cyrus Beer; Alternates Heinz Sauk-Schubert and Margot Doering

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** City Council Representative Doug Roberts

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

.....  
Chairman Lombardi said the Petition 5 for 95 Mechanic Street was postponed by the applicant.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the petition to the November 13, 2019 meeting.*

Alternate Heinz Sauk-Schubert assumed a regular voting seat to replace City Council Representative Doug Roberts, who was absent.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. October 02, 2019

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **approve** the October 2, 2019 minutes as presented.*

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

**1. 33 Holmes Court**

The request was to replace a front door and storm door. Ms. Ruedig said it was preferable to have a wooden storm door to match the new wooden front door and asked if the door was painted. Mr. Cracknell said he would suggest to the applicant that the door be painted.

**2. 99 Bow Street**

The request was to have two small black lights installed near the previously-approved balustrade. It was stipulated that there be no exposed conduit.

### 3. 232 Court Street

The request was to 1) remove the bulkhead to make the driveway more functional; 2) replace the wood landing with a granite step; 3) remove the rear handicap ramp; 4) remove the trio of windows on the back kitchen addition and center one over the sink; and 5) remove the non-contributing rear breezeway. The applicant Gary Beaulieu was present and said his contractor suggested a smaller window over the kitchen sink using wood from the original windows.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the three Administrative Approval requests, with the stipulation on Item 2, 99 Bow Street, that there shall be no exposed conduits. Mr. Rawling seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

### III. CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL - EXTENSION REQUEST

1. Petition of **Deer Street Associates, owner**, for property located at **163 Deer Street (Lot 4)**, wherein a second 1-year extension of a Certificate of Approval granted by the Historic District Commission on February 14, 2019 and originally granted on February 14, 2018 is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new freestanding structure (construct new mixed-use building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17-2 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

The applicant was not present.

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the request to the end of the meeting.*

### IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. (*Work Session/ Public Hearing*) requested by **202 Court Street Property Group, LLC, owner**, for property located at **202 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (new dormer addition to the north elevation) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace siding, roofing, windows and doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 35 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts. (*This item was continued at the October 02, 2019 meeting to the November 06, 2019 meeting.*)

### WORK SESSION

The contractor Matt Silva was present on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the new design, noting that the brick façade was removed, the garage doors were replicated, the side dormer was pushed back, the upper railing was different, and a wooden fence was added for screening. He showed an example of a wood double-hung window and requested that double-hungs be used on the building's side and rear elevations, with single-hungs on the façade.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the siding would be wood clapboard. Mr. Silva agreed and said it would have Boral trim. He said the owners would have the final decision regarding solar panels. Chairman Lombardi noted that Green Mountain windows were originally specified. Mr. Silva said it was a cost factor but noted that the chosen window's specifications were the same.

Mr. Rawling said he had supported the dormers only if a restored front was shown. He said the garage doors were too busy and didn't look historic. He said the old photos showed panels between the pilasters that were similar in siding color, unlike what was proposed. He noted that the Commission had suggested playing the dormers down by cutting back on the elaborate trim and using colors that matched the roof more. He said the rail wasn't appropriate. The dormers were further discussed. Mr. Rawling suggested simplifying the trim and siding on the dormers to minimize them. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was fine with the design but thought the field between the pilasters could be accented and that the emblems could be simplified. He thought the garage doors represented the original doors but had a lot of glass. He suggested a simpler rail system, and Ms. Ruedig agreed. Mr. Ryan said the friez board trim on the dormer was too much and that the lettering on the emblems seemed too big. The height of the garage doors and the emblems were discussed. Chairman Lombardi agreed that the dormers should be minimized. Mr. Rawling said the new windows looked heavier than typical historic windows, and it was further discussed. The amount of glass on the garage doors was also discussed.

There was no public comment, and the public hearing was not held due to the suggested changes.

## **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the public hearing to the December 04, 2019 meeting.*

B. Petition of **Perley Lane, LLC, owner**, for property located at **55 Lafayette Road**, wherein permission was requested to allow the construction of a new freestanding structure (single-family home with attached garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 151 as Lot 10-1 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts. *(This item was continued at the October 02, 2019 meeting to the November 06, 2019 meeting.)*

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant Joe Caldarola was present to speak to the petition. He presented a slide show of surrounding houses and their heights, elevations, and street perspectives. He said he dropped the first floor of his home design two feet, which meant that the retaining wall was no longer needed. He said the porch and colors were changed and the grades were different, showing less concrete.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the factory mold transoms and details were awkward and thought a separation of 3-4 inches between them would make a difference.

Mr. Caldarola discussed the front entrance in detail and compared the columns to other homes on the street that had columns. He showed three front door choices.

Mr. Rawling said he thought the structure was an appropriate size but suggested that the columns on the front entry porch be taller and that the hip roof be flattened to give the entry more presence. He suggested that the factory mold windows be separated and have a stud pocket to give them a traditional look. He said the transom window in the dining room wasn't necessary. Mr. Salk-Schubert said the historic photo showed double columns on each side of the entry that were probably small and thought the applicant could increase the horizontal dimensions of the width and depth of the single column. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed and also thought the height of the columns could be increased and the roof pitch lowered. Mr. Beer agreed with the others and said the middle wooden door looked appropriate.

Ms. Ruedig said she didn't think the design was successful and felt that just cherry-picking random historic details from different time periods and matching them together in one house didn't make sense. She said the design should have had a better direction from the beginning because it had become a jumbled mess. She noted that designing a new house in the Historic District was difficult and that she didn't think the applicant's design was strong enough. She said she couldn't justify all the different elements in one new home in the Historic District. Mr. Rawling said that replicating all the details from neighboring houses for the porch was inappropriate and suggested that it be simplified and made more contemporary instead of Victorian. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed that the applicant was picking out a lot of unnecessary details from other homes. He suggested that the front entry piece be removed from the approval so that the applicant could return with a new design. He said he liked the rest of the house and wouldn't want to see another contemporary structure in that location. Mr. Ryan said he didn't think the house's façade was the same as the one in the photo and that the spacing between them was not accurate. He said lowering the building was a positive thing but thought the applicant missed the point by not giving an accurate representation of the streetscape. He thought the mixing of styles was like throwing a stew of different historical languages together. He said the applicant had come a long way and had made the front entry much better but wished there was a better comparison with the streetscape. Mr. Salk-Schubert said the applicant's calculations seemed to benefit his project. Ms. Doering said she still felt that the structure's size and scale were too big for the location and that the columns were too ornate. Mr. Rawling noted that the smaller-scale houses on the street stood out more. Chairman Lombardi said it was a simple house except for the porch and thought the design should be simplified.

Chairman Lombardi opened the public hearing.

### **SPEAKING AGAINST THE PETITION**

Tim Malinowski, of 91 Lafayette Road said the lot needed a variance when it was subdivided due to the frontage and that it was still a tight lot. He said it was obvious that the drawings of the street elevations were inaccurate. Mr. Ryan asked if Mr. Malinowski if the applicant could measure the front of his house, and Mr. Malinowski said the applicant had already done so.

No one else rose to speak. And Chairman Lombardi closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

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

- 1. That the front entryway be removed from the application so the applicant could return with a new design; and*
- 2. That all paired windows be separated by stud pockets and trim boards.*

*Mr. Beer seconded the motion.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the project would preserve the integrity of the District, conserve and enhance property values, maintain the special character of the District, relate to the historic and architectural values of existing structures, and be compatible with innovative technologies.

*The motion **failed** by a vote of 3-4, with Mr. Ryan, Ms. Ruedig, Mr. Sauk-Schubert, and Chairman Lombardi voting in opposition.*

## **V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)**

1. Petition of **Daniel L. Hale Revocable Living Trust, D. L. and C. J. Hale Trustees, owners**, for property located at **356 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install A/C condenser) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 145 as Lot 16 and lies within the Character District 4-L2 (CD 4-L2) and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant Daniel Hale was present and said the building had four units, one of which was an office, and that no exterior renovations would be done other than routing the conduit up one floor to the inside of the office. He requested approval for two mini-split units instead of one. He said all the utilities were on one side of the building and were screened by a new 6-ft fence.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the applicant would paint the conduit the same color as the clapboards, and the applicant agreed.

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

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

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with the following stipulation:*

- 1. The applicant shall field paint any exposed conduit to match the siding of the house.*

*Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Mr. Ryan said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and would be consistent with the special and defining character of surrounding properties.

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

2. Petition of **Blue Heron Condominium Association, owner,** and **Stephanie A. Burra, applicant,** for property located at **46 Dennett Street, Unit 2,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add skylights to existing roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 140 as Lot 12 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and the Historic District.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Julio Burra was present to speak to the petition on behalf of his daughter the applicant. He stated that the six skylights were part of an attic renovation for a home office.

In response to Ms. Doering's question, Mr. Burra said the first skylight would be three feet from the front of the structure. Ms. Ruedig noted that the skylights were very close to the front wall of the house and asked if the applicant would be willing to eliminate the first skylight to provide more space. Mr. Burra said it wasn't necessary to have six skylights.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he passed by the building every day and had never looked up at the roof because all he noticed were the wonderful front bays and the yellow color. He said the skylights would be difficult to see and that he was fine with the project as presented. Mr. Salk-Schubert said he couldn't tell from the roof plan where the skylights lined up with the first-floor and second-floor windows. Mr. Burra said he was trying to line them up.

### **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, with the following stipulation:*

- 1. The front two skylights on each side shall be eliminated to make a total of four skylights instead of six.*

*Mr. Ryan seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the project would conserve and enhance surrounding property values and make the third floor of the house usable, and that it would be compatible with innovative technologies.

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

3. Petition of **33-47 Bow Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **35 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace second and third floor windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 49 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant was not present.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **postpone** the application to the end of the meeting, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

4. (*Work Session/Public Hearing*) requested by **Karen L. Bouffard Revocable Trust, Karen L. Bouffard Trustee, owner**, for property located at **114 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow the partial demolition and reconstruction of an existing single-family structure (located in the rear yard) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 124 as Lot 4 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts.

Ms. Doering recused herself from the petition.

### **WORK SESSION**

Project architect Anne Whitney and the applicant Karen Bouffard were present. Ms. Whitney reviewed the changes on each elevation. Ms. Bouffard reviewed the property's history. The front door was discussed in detail. Ms. Ruedig noted that everyone seemed to be installing Craftsman-style doors with no regard to the building's style. The foundation was discussed. Mr. Beer pointed out that a thicker historic sill would be preferable and thought the brackets for the roof overhang on the front door should be set on top of the casing. It was further discussed.

Mr. Sauk-Schubert said the front elevation looked awkward and that he had trouble with the round window next to the rectangular window. He said they both looked too close to the roof and thought the rectangular window could be bigger. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he liked the design, and Ms. Ruedig said it was a good simple design.

There was no public comment. Chairman Lombardi closed the work session and opened the public hearing.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Whitney reviewed the petition that incorporated the Commission's suggestions, noting that she would add a trim piece and a more decorative bracket.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was satisfied with the revised proposal and said the Commission would need specifications for the garage door, the brackets and detail. Ms. Ruedig asked for photo documentation of the building and any artifacts that were found.

### **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, with the following stipulations:*

- 1. A historic sill shall be used.*
- 2. The vertical "V" boards shall be added to the garage door, the brackets shall be seated on trim board, and additional detail shall be submitted for Administrative Approval.*
- 3. Photo documentation of the existing building shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to demolition.*

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the project would preserve the integrity of the District, conserve surrounding property values, and be compatible with the design of surrounding properties.

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

5. Petition of **City of Portsmouth, owner**, for property located at **95 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of an existing structure (3-family structure at LaCava Wharf) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 28 and lies within Waterfront Business (WB) and the Historic Districts.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the petition to the December 04, 2019 meeting.*

6. Petition of **Gregory R. and Mary D. Thomas, owners**, for property located at **303 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace rear door, add transom window, and replace (1) basement window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 109 as Lot 28 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant Mary Thomas was present to speak to the petition. She referred to the Addendum and said it contained a preferable solution for the rear door replacement, which was a salvaged door with wavy glass and a band molding that matched the rest of the house. She said the transom window would be custom-built to include wave glass.

Mr. Rawling asked if the basement window would cause a problem if it opened out, and the applicant said it wouldn't. Ms. Ruedig suggested an interior screen and thought the salvaged door was appropriate.

### **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 Addendum that contained the proposed salvaged door. Mr. Beer seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and relate to the historic and architectural value of the existing structure.

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

7. Petition of **Karen P. Wiese, owner**, for property located at **105 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (enclose existing rear porch, adding new windows, siding and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 5 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4) and Historic Districts.

Mr. Beer recused himself from the petition, and Alternate Ms. Doering assumed his voting seat.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant Karen Wiese was present to speak to the petition. She said the porch was 40 feet back and that she wanted to enclose it and put in six Andersen double-hung windows. She said that all the siding and trim would be replaced with new wood clapboards.

Ms. Ruedig asked about the window dimensions. Ms. Wiese said the window was a smaller one, so there would be a gap between each window. It was further discussed. Chairman Lombardi said it was a good project. Mr. Rawling said he would support the windows because it was new construction that did not have a historic appearance. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said there was no need to do half-screens in that location.

### **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 for the application as presented. Ms. Ruedig seconded.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a simple project of reinforcing the porch and putting in new windows and that it would preserve the integrity of the District, maintain its special character, and be compatible with the design of surrounding properties.

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

At this point, the applicants for 163 Deer Street and 35 Bow Street petitions were still not present.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** both petitions to the November 13, 2019 meeting.*

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 9:36 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary