

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

March 11, 2020

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Vincent Lombardi

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner, Planning Department

.....
Chairman Lombardi was absent, and Vice-Chair Wyckoff assumed a seat as Acting Chair.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

1. 249 Pleasant Street

The request was to replace all the windows with Marvin Elite ones. Mr. Ruedig said she wanted to see more documentation on the state of the existing windows due to the location of the home. The applicant's representative architect Jennifer Ramsey was present and explained that all the outside window details would remain the same and that she could submit a video showing the window conditions. Ms. Ruedig said she still wanted to see more documentation or do a site walk to see if the windows could be restored. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said it was a large project with a lot of windows and asked that the applicant return for a public hearing.

*It was moved, seconded, and unanimously passed (7-0) to **remove** the request from the Administrative Approval items and have the applicant return for a future public hearing.*

2. 28 Dennett Street

The request was to replace two metal garage doors with new metal doors of a similar design, but with glass on the top panel. Mr. Ryan said he didn't care for the fake Colonial hardware. Mr. Doering said the arched windows were out of step with the garage's utilitarian look. The applicant Lori Sarsfield was present and said she would consider a window without an arch. The Commission discussed a Madison window and a Stockton window and decided that the Stockton would be preferable.

3. 306 Marcy Street. Unit 2

Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to replace the existing first-floor wood vents with metal ones. City Council Representative Trace recalled that when the applicant came before the Commission before, he had requested more of a dryer vent, and she asked why he now wanted two cooking vents. The applicant John Singer was present and said the original request was for a hood vent but there were structural issues. He said he would place a standard 3” duct cap on the vent and that it would be painted to match the clapboard.

*Mr. Beer moved to **approve** Administrative Approval Items 2 and 3, with the following stipulations on Item 2:*

- 1. The Stockton or Madison window inserts shall be used.*
- 2. Exterior hardware is optional.*

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

Acting-Chair Wyckoff stated that Alternate Heinz Sauk-Schubert would vote on all petitions.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

City Council Representative Trace recused herself from the petition. Mr. Cracknell excused himself from the petition. Both alternates assumed voting seats.

A. Petition of **Argeris and Eloise Karabelas, owners**, for property located at **11 Meeting House Hill Road**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild existing garage roof, add new windows, doors, and trim as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 59 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the March 04, 2020 meeting to the March 11, 2020 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Architect Jennifer Ramsey was present on behalf of the applicant. She reviewed the petition and said that every detail would match the existing home.

Ms. Ruedig said it was a simple design. Mr. Rawling said the new version was a more appropriate treatment of the building and that he didn't have any issues with it.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak, and Acting-Chair Wyckoff closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Ms. Ruedig moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, as presented with the submitted addendum. Mr. Rawling seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the improved garage design would complement and enhance the District's character and be compatible in design with surrounding properties. She said it was a nice and simple renovation that would improve the look of the building as well as the entire property.

The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

City Council Representative Trace resumed her voting seat, Mr. Cracknell returned, and Ms. Doering returned to alternate status.

1. Petition of **Islington Place Condominium Association, owner, and Stephen Iandoli, applicant**, for property located at **369 Islington Street, Unit B**, wherein permission was requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (lower existing, non-functional chimneys) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 144 as Lot 22 and lies within Character District 4- L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Stephen Iandoli was present to speak to the petition. He said the house had three non-functional chimneys and that one was on the verge of collapsing. He said the home also needed a new roof that couldn't be addressed until the chimneys were resolved. He said the height would be reduced to about 2-1/2 feet above the building so that the esthetics would stay the same.

Ms. Ruedig said she didn't have a problem with non-functioning chimneys and thought that bringing the height down for ease of maintenance and getting a new roof was a good compromise. Mr. Rawling agreed and recommended stipulating that the cap details would repeat in the new chimney. Ms. Doering verified that all the chimneys would be the same height. Mr. Ryan suggested that the chimney be two feet from the ridge of the roof. Acting-Chair Wyckoff verified that the bricks would come out about a half-inch.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one rose to speak. Ms. Ruedig said a letter was received from Daniel Hale of 356-358 Islington Street who was opposed to removing the chimney, but she noted that the request wasn't for a removal.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

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

- 1. The cap and corbelling detail shall be replicated on the shorter chimney.*
- 2. The chimney shall be at least 2.5 ft. above the ridge of the roof.*

Ms. Ruedig seconded.

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote, 7-0.

IV. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Jeffrey L. and Dolores P. Ives, owners**, for property located at **44 Gardner Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (remove rear porch and replace with sunroom and expand kitchen bay) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103, Lot 42 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Architect Anne Whitney was present on behalf of the applicant, as was the applicant Jeffrey Ives. Ms. Whitney said there were a few changes, which included replacing the existing rear porch with a smaller one, switching the multi-pane casement windows on the bay with 2/1 windows to bring down the bay from 11 feet to 10 feet, and removing a first-floor window on the east elevation to install a closet. She said the heat pump would be seen mainly from the Wentworth Gardner House but would most likely be on the ground so it wouldn't be noticeable.

Mr. Ryan asked how the gas meter would be moved. Ms. Whitney said it would be wrapped around the corner, where there was also an exterior access door. Ms. Doering said that anyone walking the grounds of the Wentworth Gardner Building would get a view of that elevation, and she felt that the symmetry of the two windows would be lost by eliminating one window. Ms. Ruedig agreed, and it was further discussed.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to **continue** the work session to a future meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **132 Middle Street LLC and 134 Middle Street, LLC, owners**, for property located at **132-134 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (re-pointing brick, roof replacement, add ADA accessible entry, and front entrance renovations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 127 as Lots 11 and 12 and lies within the Character District 4- L1 (CD 4-L1) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Attorney Derek Durbin was present on behalf of the applicant. He introduced the project manager Tim Moulton. Attorney Durbin said the inside was in rough shape and not up to code. He said he wanted to add a staircase in the back as well as an elevator and an ADA entry. He said the roof would be repaired and an ADA lift would be added in the back corner. He also noted that the front steps were dilapidated. He said one window would have to be infilled with brick to match the adjacent one. He reviewed the existing and proposed floor plans.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff asked if the applicant was concerned about infilling the bricks and pointing the building up. Mr. Rawling suggested that it be set back one course. Ms. Ruedig said the applicant would need a good mason to repoint the brick. Mr. Ryan said the applicant would not find a similar brick to match. Mr. Moulton agreed that it would be a challenge to source the brick, but that they could mix and match. Mr. Ryan suggested a wood panel or window, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Moulton said they wanted to rebuild the existing concrete stairway with a timber frame deck that would match the trim and would have a black PVC rail. He said they also wanted to rebuild the little roof to make it match the building better and extend it to the edge of the building so that it covered the lift. Mr. Ryan asked if the masonry openings had curved brick, and Mr. Moulton said they did not. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said that rebuilding the concrete steps would be tough. Mr. Moulton said the stairs on the building's façade were failing and that they would be replaced with cement. Ms. Ruedig said a lot of places used a pre-cast stair with the same profile, molding, and so on. She said the brownstone would not stabilize. Mr. Moulton said they could pull it off by repairing patches on the building. He said he wanted to use granite steps. Most of the Commission agreed that granite steps would be inappropriate and suggested getting the pre-cast stair and possibly dyeing it brown. It was further discussed.

Ms. Trace said she was concerned about replacing the original doors and saw no reason why they couldn't be restored. Ms. Ruedig agreed, noting that the doors were a characteristic piece of the building. Mr. Moulton said the transom above the doors would be kept. Mr. Rawling suggested researching whether there used to be decorative finials at the bottom of the stairs.

Mr. Moulton said they wanted to replace some of the roof with rubber roofing and replace the cap roofs with asphalt, and also replace the slate on the gambrel roof with either shingle or faux slate. He noted that half of the building was slate and half was asphalt, so they wanted to do the front part of the building with all faux slate and the back with asphalt. A fish scale design was discussed. Mr. Moulton said the wood corner boards would be retained on both sides.

Mr. Moulton presented two roof options: the faux slate on the front main part of the building and the asphalt on the back (Option 1), and a higher-end slate-look asphalt (Option 2). He said that Option 2 was their preference because it was uniform and had a great lifetime guarantee. Mr. Rawling said that type of shingle was available in a fish scale pattern. Mr. Rawling suggested that the front sloped mansard roofs have the synthetic slate product as close to a fish scale pattern as possible, which would allow an alternate product on the lower pitched upper sections that would be similar in color and open to considering the lowest-cost material on the back portions of the mansard. Ms. Ruedig said the asphalt choice was a good one for the back but thought that darker colors would be more successful. Mr. Moulton pointed out that Option 2 would be the

material on all the gambrel roofs and Option 1 would be faux slate on the main part of the building, with the back having a slate-colored architectural shingle but not the slate pattern that would match the rest of the back building. Mr. Ryan said it should have a darker cap, and Mr. Rawling said it should be compatible with the colors in the slate.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff summarized that the Commission was willing to see what the applicant came up with on the stairs, that more information was needed on the door entryways, and that some commissioners preferred the heavy asphalt and some wanted the faux slate.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **continue** the work session at the April 1, 2020 meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **GBK Portsmouth, LLC, owner**, for property located at **134 South Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add roof deck) and renovations to an existing structure (update lower façade, entrances, decks, and exterior lighting) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 101 as Lot 64 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Architect Brendan Holben and the applicant Ben Kelly were present. Mr. Holben reviewed the petition, stating that they wanted to put composite siding on the lower ground floor of the three-decker Colonial Revival building as well as add storms, improve the rooftop deck access with an expanded walkout, replace the basement bulkhead, and enhance the overall appearance with light fixtures and so on. He said some windows would be replaced with new glazing.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff asked about the posts going up to the second-floor level of decking. Mr. Holben said it was a combination of framing. The applicant said the siding would be replaced and a different color would be used on the bottom of the building. He said they wanted to add detail to the entry balconies and were considering two different railings on the second and third-floor balconies and deck. Ms. Ruedig said she had no problem with changing the siding on the first floor but thought the side trim board around the windows was hacked away when the vinyl was put on. Mr. Holben said they were trying not to touch the windows. Mr. Rawling said he thought the first-floor windows were original, noting that the upper floors sill had weight to them. It was discussed. Acting-Chair Wyckoff recommended darker storm windows. Mr. Rawling said the rusticated base was a nice touch and suggested continuing the darker color all the way down to the foundation, but in a darker shade. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the foundation brick would be painted. Mr. Holben said they would just paint what was already painted and leave the rest of the foundation as it was.

Acting-Chair Wyckoff asked if the back railings would be painted black. Mr. Holben said the back needed structural work and that the top posts might be replaced with a metal bar. He said there were two railing style options, one that went across the top and one that went across the bottom, with the main difference being a vertical baluster instead of a horizontal one. Ms. Doering said the railings looked too modern. Ms. Trace suggested more distance on the vertical railing because the façade was on South Street. Mr. Sauk-Schubert wasn't sure if the cable railing was appropriate. Mr. Ryan agreed but said he could go vertical. Mr. Rawling said the front of the building should have a more traditional railing design. He suggested angling the sides of the balcony back in toward the corner of the bays to look more anchored to the building. Ms. Ruedig said she preferred the vertical railing because it broke up the horizontal building. She suggested adding a little space to give it some bulk and more of a traditional look.

Mr. Rawling said the cable railings would be fine on the roof deck but suggested giving the stairwell more charm so that it didn't look so austere. He said the housing around the doors and windows could use some architectural character. The lighting choices were discussed. Mr. Kelly said they wanted to get rid of the industrial spotlight and have a single lantern look.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **continue** the work session at the April 1, 2020 meeting.*

At this point, Ms. Ruedig left the meeting and Mr. Sauk-Schubert took a voting seat.

D. Work Session requested by **KWA, LLC, owner**, for property located at **165 Court Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow renovations to an existing structure (renovate store-front with new glazing and new canopy system) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 27 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Architect Brendan Holben was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced the applicant Todd Adelman. Mr. Holben reviewed the petition, noting that the building was defined by a wrap-around entry canopy and had structural problems. He said they wanted to remove the canopy and renovate the building with new glazing and a new canopy system. He reviewed two canopy options. Mr. Rawling said he liked the translucent roof scheme and preferred the unpainted brick base, except without the all-black base. Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he liked the glass canopy but not the idea of having to clean it often. Mr. Ryan said he could support either canopy but didn't want the natural brick painted. Mr. Beer said he could support either canopy. Ms. Doering said she liked Option 1 but could support either option, or some mixing and matching. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said he could support either canopy but preferred Option 2 with the corrugated roof because it was a detail. He said he was against painting the bricks black. Mr.

Holben further discussed a correlated frosted-looking acrylic product. Mr. Ryan said the tiebacks to the building could be more architectural and suggested angling them off.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **continue** the work session to the April 1, 2020 meeting.*

E. Work Session requested by **Bow Street Theatre Trust, owner**, for property located at **125 Bow Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace roof, add insulated cladding on two walls) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 105 as Lot 1F and lies within the Character District 4 (CD 4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts.

WORK SESSION

Architect Tracy Kozak was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced the Bow Street Theater Executive Director Kathleen Cavalaro. Ms. Kozak reviewed the petition, noting that the atrium lobby structure had to be insulated for energy issues. She said they wanted to replace the roof with a standing seam metal one and add insulated cladding on two walls. She said there would be no change to the glazed storefront except to replace the right panel with a solid one. She showed some photos of the existing conditions and products.

Mr. Rawling said a uniformly-colored metal roof would be dull and should have some weathering characteristics like copper. He also suggested something similar to an Italianate design that had metal roof portions painted in alternate striping to look like a tent canopy, which he thought might add interest to the building. Ms. Kozak showed two options for the exterior walls, one with a patina that weathered over time (Option 1) and the other a metal panel system that snapped together in 4-ft widths. She said Option 1 was preferred because the darker color matched better.

Mr. Ryan said the building was one of the last true modern pieces of architecture in town and that wrapping it in a new skin would change its pure quality. Ms. Cavalaro said it was built as a greenhouse, so it was cold in the winter and hot in the summer. Mr. Ryan asked if some of the detailing on the trims could be saved or if another roof form could be chosen to retain the thermal value without totally covering the building. Mr. Beer said he liked the practicality of the design but thought it would be great if the applicant could come up with something to make it look more authentic. Mr. Rawling suggested bringing the roof down and having glass on the edge to reduce the overall mass of the width. Ms. Kozak explained how an all-metal roof would simplify things but said they could find a way to use some translucent or transparent panels.

Mr. Sauk-Schubert said he was okay with what was proposed. Ms. Trace said she'd be sorry to see the glass and asked if there was a material that would have a reflective quality and look like a glass roof, or if glass could be on the side so that the structure didn't look like a massive metal barn-like one. Acting-Chair Wyckoff said he was in support of the project that thought it was

important that the building be more energy efficient. He suggested that the applicant try to find different panels to give it more detail that would look good for the theater. He said the modern glass design was fine and thought the glass elevator would make the building interesting.

Ms. Doering suggested retaining the roof and putting the metal over it so that one could still see it from the inside. She said if the metal roof came down, the course closest to the street would hail back to the 1980s and would be intriguing. Mr. Ryan said it was an opportunity to show some of the theater in the entranceway by opening it up and showing some of the original glazing that everyone remembered.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to **continue** the work session to the April 1, 2020 meeting.*

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Meeting Recording Secretary