

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**June 12, 2019
Reconvened from
June 05, 2019**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to hear the 202 Court Street petition at the end of the meeting.*

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Note: The items were addressed in the following order: Items 4, 5, 6, 3, 1, and 2.

1. 211 Union Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that the new building was complete. He said the applicant had intended to send several photos of the old building to the Planning Department, but they were lost through the printing process, and as a result, only three photos were submitted.

*City Council Representative Roberts moved to **approve** the item, and Ms. Ruedig seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

2. 73 Prospect Street

Mr. Cracknell circulated drawings to the Commission that highlighted several changes. He noted that a significant change was that the awning casement was changed to a double-hung window. The Commission discussed that the windows weren't as high as previously approved, the first-floor windows were shorter, the attic window should not be removed because the Fire Department required access to the attic, and there were no details for the dormers.

The project contractor was present and said the windows were shorter due to the kitchen cabinets. He said he would put the attic window back in. Mr. Cracknell said the pediment detail on the two dormers was different and that the Commission required a detailed drawing.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the request, with the following three **stipulations**:*

1. *The ground floor windows shall be changed to “A” size windows (except for two kitchen windows)*
2. *An attic window shall be added to the east elevation.*
3. *A detail shall be provided for Administrative Approval for the pediment and the trim on the dormers.*

*City Council Representative Roberts seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0*

3. 180 Washington Street

The project designer Juli MacDonald representing the applicant was present. She said her client wanted to replace all the window sashes with Green Mountain ones. She said they also wanted to put a new window and door on an elevation and replace a window on another level. Ms. Ruedig said she was fine with the first-floor window replacements in the back but wanted more time to look at the second floor. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the Green Mountain windows were good but felt that every window should have been looked at before submitting the request.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **approve** the request, with the following **stipulation**:*

1. *The additional window replacement request shall be removed from the request and submitted for review with a survey and assessment of the windows.*

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote, 7-0.*

4. 206 Northwest Street

The request was to replace a 3” sill with a 2” sill.

5. 299 Vaughan Street

Mr. Cracknell said the request for a wall sign and first-floor sign were approved by the Board of Adjustment but that the ribbon lighting was not and was no longer in play. He said the roof deck was a bit larger than approved and that the mechanical screen was on the back of the building. Chairman Lombardi noted that one of the new signs was internally illuminated, which wasn't allowed in the District. Mr. Cracknell said the applicant was granted an exception by the BOA.

The applicant (no name given) was present to speak to the request. He said the illumination was subtle and had a translucent face with LED lighting behind it. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the building wasn't historic and thought the sign was appropriate and was willing to approve it. Mr. Rawling said it depended on the intensity of the illumination. The applicant said the letters wouldn't be seen from Maplewood Avenue and would not project light off the property. City

Council Representative Roberts noted that previous applicants had miscalculated the brightness of LED lights and asked how the Commission could be assured. The applicant said some of their other properties had the same type of sign and pointed out that the new police department had a similar sign. Ms. Ruedig said she thought the sign was fine as long as it didn't glow and project a bright light. She said it was a contemporary sign on a contemporary building.

6. 410-430 Islington Street

The request was to relocate a faux chimney.

*Ms. Ruedig moved to approve Items 4 and 6 as presented. Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously, 7-0.*

*Ms. Ruedig moved to approve Item 5. Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Chairman Lombardi voting in opposition.*

II. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **PNF Trust of 2013, Peter N. Floros Trustee**, owner, for property located at **266-278 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (278 State Street) and new construction to an existing structure (4-5 story addition at 266 & 270 State Street) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is located on Assessor Map 107 as Lots 78, 79 & 80 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. *(This item continued from the May 05, 2019 meeting.)*

The petition was postponed per the applicant's request

B. Work Session requested by **202 Court Street Property Group, LLC, owner**, for property located at **202 Court Street**, wherein permission is 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 (CD4-L1) and Historic Districts. *(This item continued from the May 05, 2019 meeting.)*

The contractor Matt Silva was present on behalf of the applicant. He submitted revised plans to the Commission. He said they wanted to add a dormer to the front of the building and ease back the deck, which would result in a double dormer roofline; remove one chimney and add two chimneys on the south side; and add solar panels to the south side between the two chimneys. He said the north elevation changes included creating an open space in the attic, softening the dormer area, installing a gate railing, and adding a dormer. He discussed a metal roof. He said they wanted to remove several windows and replicate the wood trim.

Mr. Rawling said he'd like to see historic photos of the elevation. He thought the dormers were the primary issue, noting that there were versions of different dormers showing up all at once on the rear elevation and that it looked too busy. He recommended simplifying the detailing on the added dormers and concentrating on a consistent form. He said the railings had a busy design and suggested a horizontal top rail with verticals punctuating them. He thought the scrollwork was too fancy and distracting. He said he didn't support a metal roof. Mr. Silva said they could do a slate roof. Mr. Ryan said he had no problem with the dormer on one side because it wouldn't be seen from the street but thought that some of the details could be improved. He asked for more details on the solar panels.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was in support of the solar. He said the trim on the dormers could be simplified and thought the returns were too busy and unnecessary. He suggested simplifying the railing. Chairman Lombardi noted that the dormers were stacked up against the outside wall and didn't look good. Mr. Silva said it was due to the building's structure. Ms. Ruedig said it was tucked back and wouldn't be seen from the street. She said she was fine with all the changes and thought the wood trim would be great. She said the windows would be hard to replace because they were delicate. Mr. Beer asked whether the small roof on the front was needed. Mr. Silva said it wouldn't project far. The molding was discussed. Mr. Beer asked for a specification on the garage door. Mr. Rawling discussed what Mr. Silva should look for in new windows and explained how the trim should match the jambs, and so on.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the July 17, 2019 meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by Salvation Army, owner, and James McSharry, applicant, for property located at 15 Middle Street, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (10 new attic dormers on the north and 5 on the south elevations and new shed dormer on the east elevation) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (new door and balustrade system) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 118 as Lot 12 and lies within the Civic, Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. (This item was postponed at the May 05, 2019 meeting to the June, 2019 meeting.)

The petition was postponed per the applicant's request.

III. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **Alan W. & Wendy G. Wong, owners**, for property located at **179 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new free-standing structure (garden pergola) and new construction to an existing structure (replace roof and structures of existing ells and expand middle ell) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 118 as Lot 15 and lies within the Mixed Research Office (MRO) and Historic Districts.

The applicants Alan and Wendy Wong were present, along with project architect Tracy Kozak and the landscape designer Terence Parker. Ms. Kozak reviewed the petition. She said the mansion and carriage house were connected by a series of barns, an annex, and ells. She reviewed the history of the property. She said there would be no changes to the main house or annex and that they wanted to fix up the carriage house and the back ells. She said they also wanted to improve the property with landscaping that would include a formal garden, a terrace, reflecting pool, and pergola. She reviewed the elevations, roof plan, and site plan. Mr. Parker reviewed the landscaping plan.

Mr. Ryan said it was an ambitious project but that it would bring new life to the property and bring grandeur back to the mansion. He said the massing was segmented well and thought the applicant was off to a good start. Mr. Beer agreed. Ms. Ruedig said it was a respectful project that warranted a formal garden and upgraded landscaping. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a good job conceptually, and Mr. Rawling said he supported the concept and thought it was a good job of beautifying the property into a delightful retreat.

Ms. Doering said she was concerned about whether the arches would replace the unique square doors. Ms. Kozak said there would be no changes to the front fenestration or the doors. The terrace and steps in front of the carriage house were discussed. Mr. Rawling said that maintaining more of a carriage house entrance would be appropriate, even if wasn't a real entrance. He thought the terrace and steps were out of character with the original use of the carriage house. It was further discussed. Mr. Cracknell suggested small cobbles for the driveway material, like those found in Europe. A site walk was discussed.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was decided that the work session would be **continued** to the July 17, 2019 meeting and that a **site walk** would take place before the meeting at 5:30 p.m.*

2. Work Session requested by **Dagny Taggart, LLC, owner, and Mark A. McNabb, applicant** for property located at **3 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow renovations and new construction to an existing structure (3-story, 2000 ± s.f. addition to the rear and modify the roof of the building with office space) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 31 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD 5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

The project architect Tracy Kozak was present, along with the applicant Mark McNabb and landscape designer Robbie Woodburn. Ms. Kozak noted that the project would be developed in conjunction with the Daniel Street petition so that the spaces would be unified. She said the project would make the streetscape an enlivened pedestrian one, with street-level retail and restaurants, dedicated areas for art and street musicians, outdoor dining, gardens, and so on. She said it would be a link from Market Square to the McIntyre Building and the waterfront. She said the office spaces would remain on the upper floors and that the street level would be a

restaurant. She said an addition would be added to the roof that would look like a penthouse. She reviewed the history of the building, noting that it was originally a public market and that Market Street and Market Square were named after it. Mr. McNabb said the name Brick Market would be used for the entire project, including the Daniel St. parcel.

Ms. Kozak said the windows would remain, noting that there was a back 1970s addition that would be expanded to match the width of the building. She said the penthouse would be oval shaped with a vaulted roof and that the mechanical equipment would be smaller units on a lower roof area. Ms. Ruedig asked if the current molding on the roof would be changed. Mr. McNabb said the eave line detail would remain. City Council Representative Roberts said he was ambivalent about round penthouses and had a negative reaction to the project's elliptical penthouse because the building had a very rectangular, vertical orientation, but he liked the rest of the design. Ms. Ruedig said she was fine with the elliptical shape because it didn't stick way out and couldn't really be seen. She said she didn't want to see the building's original historic design and concept obscured by the dental brackets that were on top of the crown molding. She suggested keeping it simple and wasn't opposed to putting a bit of an extension there. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the flat soffit would work into the copper parapet and that it didn't have to be loaded up with dental moldings. Mr. Ryan said he liked the elliptical oval, noting that there weren't enough of that form in the city and thought the oval was a nice resistance of the flat-top trend. He said the profile could be even taller. Chairman Lombardi agreed, saying that he liked the round shape for the same reasons. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he would support it. Mr. Rawling said the roof extension was an enhancement to the building that helped extend it and that the elliptical addition added some interest and stature to the building. He said the detailing on it could be enhanced and that he supported the additional height as long as it was well done.

Mr. Beer suggested keeping the back brick and not going up four inches. He said the current roof looked cut off and that the roofline could be softened. He asked whether the mechanical roofline was higher or the elliptical. Ms. Kozak said the stair overrun in the back was a flat roof that was higher than the bottom of the elliptical roof but lower than its top. Ms. Doering asked if the window in the rear addition would become lost. Ms. Kozak said it wouldn't function as a window anymore and would be either a door or an infilled window. Ms. Doering asked if the east elevation windows would be fashioned after the existing side windows. Ms. Kozak said they would have a bit more of a contemporary detail. It was further discussed.

Mr. Ryan said the back addition needed some work. He said it was important that the masonry be detailed well, due to the arch in the curve. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he didn't see the wall as a façade because it wasn't a real wall. Mr. Rawlings asked why the addition on the back couldn't be just a small building.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the July 17, 2019 meeting.*

3. Work Session requested by **Dagny Taggart, LLC, owner**, and **Mark A. McNabb, applicant** for property located at **Daniel Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new free-standing (3-story, 50,000 ± s.f.) commercial structure as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown in Assessor Map 107 as Lot 27 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

Project Architect Tracy Kozak was present on behalf of the applicant, as were the applicant Mark McNabb and the landscape designer Robbie Woodburn. Ms. Kozak stated that the project would be part of the overall development called Brick Market. She said the goal of the project was to have wide sidewalks, outdoor dining, and artist spaces. She said some parallel street parking spaces would be removed due to two levels of low-grade parking and that utilities would be buried underground. She said all the area around the building would be pedestrian friendly. She said it would be an open public market, similar to Boston's Quincy Market. She said the new building would allow people to walk through it and would itself become a pedestrian way. She discussed the context images of buildings surrounding the project.

Ms. Ruedig asked whether the applicant would hire an archaeologist to record what was unearthed during the excavation, and Mr. McNabb said he would. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested a large sailing ship's mast as an art piece that would create a lot of interest.

The Commission's comments included the fact that the project was a great idea, amazing, thoughtful, and involved considerable research. Ms. Doering asked about the building height. Ms. Kozak said the building would be a bit shorter than most of the surrounding ones. Ms. Doering suggested adding some height to match the jaggedness of buildings in other parts of Portsmouth. Mr. Rawling said he was concerned that the building would be a monolithic box and asked that the massing be scaled down. Mr. Ryan said the building would be a study in density and liked that the vacant lot would be infilled. He said the project would create a Commercial Alley kind of street. Chairman Lombardi said he liked the design, noting that the applicant proposed a permeable building, with open space that people could go through and enjoy. City Council Representative Roberts suggested breaking up the building more vertically so that it wouldn't look like a 'pancake' development like others elsewhere in the city.

Ms. Woodburn discussed landscaping and materials that suggested water and flow, interesting shapes and forms, and other ways to activate pedestrian space.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the July 17, 2019 meeting.*

4. Work Session requested by **Hunking Holdings, LLC, owner**, and **Arilda Densch, applicant** for property located at 170 Mechanic Street, wherein permission is requested to allow the construction of a new free-standing structure (24'x 24' garage), new construction to an existing structure (enlarge front porch and rear shed addition), and exterior renovations as per

plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as Lot 7 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

The designer Arilda Densch was present on behalf of the applicant. She introduced the owner Peter Morin. Ms. Densch reviewed the petition and discussed the garage, front porch, roof, dormers, and expansion of the shed addition. She noted that the house was a 1933 Dutch colonial. She said they wanted to replace the vinyl with clapboards, replace the 6/1 windows with 4/1 windows, upgrade the front door, widen the front porch, and add a small window near the door. She said they wanted to replace some windows with Andersen windows and use full screens. Chairman Lombardi said half-screens were required.

Ms. Densch said they wanted to add a back window to the shed addition. She said all the trim would be PVC and painted white, and the clapboards would be cedar, with Azek corner boards. She said they wanted to use composite slats and add more fence, which she showed a sample of. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said the Azek or composite if field painted didn't bother him, but the back of the garage with no window did. Ms. Ruedig asked why the applicant wanted all plastic for the front porch when wood would be preferable. She said all the window changes made sense and that the garage design was fine. Mr. Rawling said he supported the improvements in general but thought the porch's design seemed awkward and the top fascia seemed very heavy with the small entablature under it. He said the column appeared undersized for carrying the porch size. He explained why the Andersen replacement windows weren't like historic windows. He said the ranch-style fence and garage didn't fit the neighborhood's character. Mr. Beer agreed about the garage and felt that the PVC trim should be wood. He said the garage's fascia was big but matched the house. Mr. Ryan said he preferred a picket fence but had no problem with the garage because he thought of it as more of an outbuilding. City Council Representative Roberts agreed with the fence comments and thought making the garage look like an outbuilding would be a great solution. Ms. Doering agreed that the front porch being right on the street warranted more of a wood focus and that the size of the garage didn't fit the neighborhood.

Ms. Densch asked if PVC would be okay for the back and sides because it looked like real wood. Ms. Doering said it wasn't what was seen, it was what was felt when someone put their hand on it. Chairman Lombardi said the pediment was oversized. He asked whether all the trim would be replaced. Mr. Morin said it would. Chairman Lombardi said he had a problem with PVC put all over the house. Ms. Ruedig said she thought the garage was appropriate in general. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he didn't like the garage and was 'on the fence' about the fence. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed that the fence should be a wooden picket fence but thought the garage was fine.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that he would **return** for a future public hearing.*

5. Work Session requested by **Melissa and Halil Ozkurt, owners**, for property located at **287 Marcy Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate one existing window, add two new windows to rear elevation, and remove

existing chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 46 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

The applicants Melissa and Halil Ozkurt were present, along with their contractor Aaron Henderson. Mrs. Ozkurt reviewed the petition. She said they wanted to raise one window in the kitchen and add another one; add two windows on the third floor; remove two non-functioning chimneys; and replace three exterior vents with three new ones.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked if the three windows would fit in the back without engaging the frieze boards. Mr. Henderson said they wouldn't affect the frieze boards. Ms. Ruedig said she had no problem with adding windows on the first floor but was hesitant about three windows on the third floor, especially when they were visible from the public way. She said she could envision two windows close together. She said she would have to walk around the house to get an idea of the chimney. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was also concerned about the three windows and thought it might be very crowded, and he suggested two windows instead. Mr. Rawling discussed the windows and trim, noting that the factory-mulled window had a different appearance than a traditional window. He said he preferred triple windows and thought the Marvin replacement window wouldn't have the appearance of the original window. Mr. Henderson said they'd have to use a stud pocket between the two windows if they decided on the paired windows. It was further discussed. Mr. Henderson said he would bring in a sample of the window with the trim. Mr. Rawling further discussed window details that would make the windows look historic. Mr. Ryan agreed with Mr. Rawling's recommendations. The Commission decided that they would do a site walk to look at the chimney.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **continue** the work session to the July 17, 2019 meeting.*

IV. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 11:30 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary