

**REGULAR MEETING  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
City Council Chambers**

**PLEASE NOTE:** Due to the length of the Agenda, the meeting has been split. Old Business and Public Hearings #1 through #8 will be heard this evening; **however, Public Hearings #9 and #10 and Work Sessions #A, #B and #C will be heard on the following Wednesday, September 8, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers**

**Site Walk – September 8, 2004 – 6:30 p.m. to 293 Marcy Street**

**Site Walk – September 8, 2004 – 6:45 p.m. to 138 Congress Street (rear Flatbread Pizza)**

7:00 p.m.

**AGENDA**

**SEPTEMBER 1, 2004  
reconvened on  
SEPTEMBER 8, 2004**

**I. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**9) Petition for Cynthia and Lew Harriman, owners,** for property located at 57 South Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (re-roof with asphalt textured shingles with the gable ends of roof to extend 2" further than existing roof to improve rain protection as well as molding added to the gable edges) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 050 and lies within the General Residence and Historic A districts.

**10) Petition for Greenway Management, North, LLC, owner and William Dogan, Architect,** for property located at 79 Daniel Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (a 3-1/2 story masonry structure with commercial on the first floor and residential on the above two floors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 009 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

**Speaking in favor of the petition**

Mr. Bill Dogan, the Architect for the project, stated based on the previous two work sessions and two site walks, we have made adjustments to the plans. We decided not to raise the existing ridge line and maintain the existing ridge line creating a dormer structure at the rear. The rear second floor addition has been cut back from 14' to 8' based on the abutters concerns. The next level is cut back from 8' to 5' and have re-arranged the interior to make the units work. The units would work out to be less square footage than the applicant had intended; however, based on abutters comments, we feel this will work.

Chairman Rice inquired if the addition would go up any higher than existing, Mr. Dogan replied no. We have pulled the addition in from the sides of the building and the roof will be almost flat.

Rick Becksted inquired if the front elevation would change. Mr. Dogan replied no.

Chairman Rice asked if there was any pitch to the roof to the roof in the rear. Mr. Dogan stated that the pitch would stay at the existing ridge 8'9" and at the rear wall it will be 7'6" so there will be a slight pitch.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated this proposal requires new doors in the rear and asked if here cut sheets. Mr. Dogan stated we are proposing Marvin units that have been approved previously by the Commission and are in the members packets.

Ms. Fineberg asked which windows were new and which windows exist? Mr. Dogan illustrated on the plan where the new windows and doors would be placed.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if he masonry wall would be removed. Mr. Dogan replied that we will not remove that wall; however, on the inside of the building the wall will be removed but not on the outside.

Mr. Golumb stated that in between the alley there is a wall with clapboards, and inquired if that would be repaired. Mr. Dogan replied that the plans include to strip the siding over the clapboards and repair the clapboards underneath.

Vice-Chairman Adams inquired if they were proposing to extend the roof out passed the corner board. Mr. Dogan replied that a vertical corner board will be used.

Ms. Fineberg inquired about shall be called the inooculas for the roof aperation and stated it was not in the plans. Mr. Dogan stated that originally and it does indent it was a skylight over a staircase; however, he would like to rebuild the roof correctly.

## **SPEAKING IN OBJECTION TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Tracey Lynch, abutter at 73 Daniel Street. stated that the addition, even though the ridge has been changed, her view has not been improved and it is obstructed. She presented photographs to the Commission showing this. The owner made a comment of how much he paid for the building, but that is no reason to build such a monstrosity She does not understand why something this large has to be constructed since it will de-value her property values and would rather maintain what she has.

Ms. Maryka Ford of 61 Penhallow stated that this addition is too high and destroys the view from her kitchen window and blocks light and air into her unit. It is out of character for the neighborhood and feels it will set a precedent in the area for future request like this coming before the Commission. This is our neighborhood and is not happy with developers coming in and changing the whole appearance. The back area does need to be cleaned up and made a little bit neater looking. She also presented photographs showing the view from her property

Ms. Erika Dodge, an abutter at 175 State Street, stated her concern was that there were no spec sheets on the windows and is concerned about the massing of the addition. This addition is not in-keeping with other buildings built in this area.

Mr. Emilio Maddaloni, a direct abutter, stated that there is no sun on this side of the street and because of he fact that the existing building is high as it exists. He had to replace soffit and fascia board because the wood does rot without any sun. During the winter months the snow and ice just sit there and is concerned about the mass of he structure because it will block air and light.

Mr. George Dodge, an abutter at 175 State Street, stated we all agree that the rear of this building is not in great shape. But the massing of the addition and the scale is just too much for this neighborhood and is out of character since it will be the largest building in the area.

### **Decision of the Commission**

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve as presented; Ms. Grasso seconded for discussion.

Ms. Dika stated that she appreciated how the applicant and the Architect tried to work with our concerns. However, standing on Penhallow Street, the addition is very awkward and out of character for the Historic District and added that she cannot support the motion.

Ms. Grasso stated that she has no problem with the addition until you get to the top floor and it bothers her when standing on Penhallow Street because of the height being bulky and out of character for that area; therefore, she will not support the motion.

Mr. Golumb stated he also appreciated what the architect has done in trying to tie in our comments at the work session. But after taking a look around Penhallow Street, it is out of character for the whole neighborhood and will be the tallest and highest roof. The massing is not in-keeping with the area and will not support the motion.

Mr. Becksted stated he will not support the application and added it does not make any architectural sense.

Ms. Fineberg stated she will not support the motion and agrees with her colleagues about the scale and the massing of the addition and the fact that it is not in-keeping with other buildings in the immediate vicinity. There have been some changes in the final design that address our concerns; however, the roof structure is too large and too tall for the neighbors as well.

Mr. Smith stated he will support the motion because it will clean up the back of the building. He liked the fact that the addition is pulled in on the sides and the roof does resemble a dormer.

Mr. Katz asked the Commissioner's if the third floor addition was the problem. Mr. Becksted stated that was correct.

Chairman Rice stated in this particular case, he feels the same way as all the negatives. He added that he could be supportive, but is very uncomfortable with the dormer addition.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he applauds the applicant and Architect for their efforts; however, he finds the view from Penhallow Street awkward and out of character for the neighborhood. He feels very little of it architecturally significant or compatible with the structures below it as well as removing the masonry wall since it would be a negative thing. He added that he had no issue with the general outline and form of the decks and entry vestibules on the back of the building.. To re-clapboard the gable end would be an improvement.

Chairman Rice asked the applicant if he would be willing to table this application to be brought back in another form at the October 6, 2004 meeting. The applicant agreed to this condition.

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to table the application to the October 6, 2004 meeting; Mr. Golumb seconded and passed 7 - 0 vote.

## II. WORK SESSIONS

**A) Work Session requested by Hal Henry, owner,** for property located on 235-245 Islington Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 045 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. (construct a two-story building with garage underneath on the “panhandle” section of the lot for residential use)

**B) Work Session requested by Paul B. Head, II, option holder, for property owned by Lynne V. Schurman** located on 347 Maplewood Avenue. Said property is located on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 025 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts. (expansion and residential renovations)

**C) Work Session for property owned by Norman Nardello, owner and John Meehan, d/b/a Flatbread Company** for property located at 138 Congress Street to allow a tall brick masonry parapet wall to be constructed on the garage roof to conceal the HVAC unit as stipulated by the Historic District Commission. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126, Lot 010 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

## III. OLD BUSINESS

**1) Amendment to original approval given on January 7, 2004 for the petition of Smith, Minch and Frost, owners and Sumner Davis, Architects,** applicant, for property located at 159-165 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow the windows on the rear elevation be replaced; install three over three and six over six windows at basement level on East, West and South elevations; and, location of gas meters) as plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 46-3 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 1, 2004 meeting to the reconvened meeting on September 8, 2004.

**2) Petition for Christopher Muro, owner,** for property located at 293 Marcy Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (the erection of a vinyl fence between 287 and 293 Marcy Street; and, replace rear deck with modifications. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 047 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 1, 2004 meeting to the reconvened meeting on September 8, 2004.

**3) Work Session/Public Hearing for Charles and Susan Lassen, owners and McHenry Architecture, applicant,** for property located at 34 Salter Street wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a full width one and a half story addition to the front façade of the structure creating a saltbox shape; and, add a granite stoop) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 034-A and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the September 1, 2004 meeting to the reconvened meeting on September 8, 2004.

## IV. ADJOURNMENT