

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

Site Walk – November 29, 2003 – Saturday, 9:30 a.m. to 2 Bow Street

7:00 p.m.

DECEMBER 3, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Members Rick Becksted, Ellen Fineberg, John Golomb, City Council Representative Joanne Grasso; Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts; and, Alternates. Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS

A) Work Session/Public Hearing for Petition for Jon W. Sobel, owner, for property located at 49 Sheafe Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing wood single pane storm/double hung six over six and nine over six windows with insulated divided light vinyl six over six and nine over six windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 021 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the November 12, 2003 meeting to the December 3, 2003 meeting.

At the request of the owner, Mr. Becksted made a motion to table the application to the April 7, 2004 meeting; Mr. Golomb seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1) Petition for Eric Weinrieb, owner, for property located at 1 Jackson Hill Street wherein permission is requested to allow a new free-standing structure (6' high fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 as Lot 030 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Weinrieb, the owner of the property, stated he had been before the Board previously for approval to construct a shed on his property and it was granted. He stated he would now like to install a 6' high fence between units A & B for privacy; however, we would now like to withdraw the portion of the fence that is between the driveways and have an L-shaped fence that will be neighbor friendly.

Mr. Weinrieb stated that the Commission members should have a photograph of the fence that he is planning to construct and use in their packets.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION

Attorney John Lyons, representing the abutter in unit A stated that his client supports the application as amended since the fence between the driveways will be removed. The plan will create an L-shaped fence that will provide some privacy for the owner and the abutter in the two condominium units. This has turned out to be a good idea for both the owner and abutter since there were many unresolved issues on this property and the parties are now discussing their problems.

Chairman Rice asked if fence would be custom made? Mr. Weinrieb replied that it would be.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve the application as amended; Ms. Grasso seconded and all approved with a 7 – 0 vote.



At this time, Chairman Rice discussed the letter received from Attorney Brad Lown of 439 Middle Street for an application to replace a slate roof with asphalt shingles. He found that the five members who were present for the meeting to be very thoughtful, respectful and philosophical about an important issue – the preservation of historic homes with slate roofs. He added that he found Vice-Chairman Adams to be forthright, creative and seemed to genuinely care about getting us a decision, one way or the other, right away, since our office roof is great need of repair. We received approval with a 5 – 1 vote with one vote in the negative, which he respected because the Commission member voting in the negative explained his position and conducted himself well.

2) Petition for William F. Hopkins, owner, for property located at 57 Marcy Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace three (3) windows on the first floor with twelve over twelve aluminum clad windows with simulated divided lights as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 002 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. William Hopkins, the owner of the property, stated he did not realize that he was required to seek Historic District Commission approval for the windows. He only wanted to change three windows on the bottom floor of the building. He added that he tried to match what was there and feels that he did with the Pozzi windows that the Commission members had a manufacturer’s catalogue in their packets. However, after changing two windows, a Commission member noticed that he never had approval from the Historic District Commission; therefore, the project came to a halt.

Mr. Hopkins stated the windows will have simulated divided light and be twelve over twelve. Most windows of this size have a full screen but because of problems in the past, we are requesting that only a half screen be used. He added that he did not feel this window would be a problem. The cost of most windows are \$300.00 each; however, the windows that he is using are \$1,050.00 because of their size. The grids will be affixed permanently.

Mr. Becksted asked if there would be any changes that may occur to the trim around the window

Ms. Fineberg asked if the windows installed have glued on divided lights? Mr. Hopkins replied that was correct and that they are maintenance free.

Chairman Rice stated that when you walk by the building and look very carefully, you can see that the 3" sill is missing at the bottom of the window.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he feels it is totally inappropriate with the loss of the 3" sills, the 2-1/2" beaded header, and it is a big mistake.

Mr. Hopkins stated that a large sill could be put in; however, it is very difficult to find them.

Mr. Becksted stated there are a number of side modifications that can be done.

Chairman Rice feels the application should be tabled to a work session at the next scheduled meeting on January 7, 2004. He feels that if the application is voted on now it could leave the applicant aggrieved.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to table the application to the January 7, 2004 meeting for a work session to discuss other options; Mr. Becksted seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.



3) Petition for Brina Lampert, owner, and Ed Moriarty, applicant, for property located at 202 Islington Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing signage on the top of front windows to raise front window from 72" to 103") as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 021 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Moriarty, the electric contractor for the project, stated the applicant has changed the application. They do not want to raise the windows; they have installed a glass door on the side of the building to replace an existing window

Mr. Clum stated that approval for the exhaust system is no longer needed because the application for mechanicals are exempt since they meet the criteria required by the Ordinance. As far as the window being removed on the side of the building and a door installed, he felt it was not an issue because the door became a second means of egress; however, the glass door was added later.

Chairman Rice inquired about the internally illuminated sign on the building that just has to be plugged in and, the glass door that has already been installed will also require approval.

Chairman Rice feels the application should be tabled until something is done about the internally lit sign; we need a cut sheet on the door; Vice-Chairman stated "so moved" and all agreed with a 7 - 0 vote.

.....

4) Petition for Haymarket Square, LLC, owner, and Jonathan M. Flagg, applicant, for property located at 93 Middle Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove teller window, remove overhang and night depository, replace two windows and add two windows to match existing; and move sign to below window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116, Plan 017 and lies within Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Jonathan Flagg stated he wanted to restore the building to the way it was originally. We want to remove the teller window, the overhang and night depository; replace two windows and add two windows to match existing; and, the sign will be moved to below the window. He added that when the existing brick is removed, we will re-use it.

Mr. Becksted asked if the windows are going to be the same materials, etc. as the existing? Mr. Flagg replied the windows will be vinyl with the divisions within the window themselves.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated there is more to just have this building restored. He also asked if the drive-up window would remain. Mr. Flagg replied that they thought of giving advice thru the drive-up window.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to accept the application as presented; Ms. Grasso seconded.

The motion passed with a 7 – vote.

.....

5) Petition for Ann Breazeale, owner, for property located at 183 Gates Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (installation of chimney cap to protect thermocrete chimney liners) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 005 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Ann Breazeale, the owner of the property, stated she would like to close her chimney because of wildlife that come down the chimney and raised havoc in her home. She stated she would like to have a Bishop cap; however, her chimney is too large. There is always the

Blue Stone slab, but she feels it will make the chimney very conspicuous. She presented photographs of other homes that had the caps on them for the Commission members to review.

Chairman Rice stated that traditionally, the Commission frowns on metal caps on chimneys in the Historic District and feels the blue stone slab is the better choice.

Ms. Grasso stated she liked the cap that Ms. Breazeale picked for her chimney cap and painted black to be inconspicuous and added that in the Photograph "E" shows the Blue Stone Cap to be much too large.

Ms. Fineberg stated she prefers the Blue Stone cap. Ms. Fineberg stated that she did not like the metal because they do rust.

Mr. Katz stated if the material were stainless steel or copper, there would be no problem with rust.

Mr. Breazeale stated the openings in her chimney are quite large and will have to place four bricks at each corner creating a lot of mass.

Mr. Becksted suggested that the holes could be carved out the chimney at the four corners setting the bricks inside and therefore, the top of the chimney would not be so high.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the masonry Bluestone cap on the chimney similar to photograph "E" presented at the meeting; Mr. Becksted seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.



6) Petition for Norman Nardello, owner, and W. D. Flierl, architect, for property located at 140 Congress Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing double aluminum entry door with a single aluminum door with side lights to meet building, fire and ADA codes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126, Los 010 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Nardello, the owner of the building, stated the same material will be used, but we want one door that will be able to access wheelchairs and the handicapped to the building. The hairdressing business on the first floor will be moved to the second floor and this will be a lot easier for the clients that come to the shop. There will be an elevator to take them upstairs.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve as presented; Ms. Grasso seconded and all approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....

7) Petition for 2 Bow Street, LLC, owner, and McHenry Architecture, applicant, for property located at 2 Bow Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (restaurant hood ductwork to extend from 1st to 3rd floor and above roof eave per code requirements on the exterior of the building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 023 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Chairman Rice stated there was a site walk on Saturday morning early to go over the project with the architect giving the Commission a chance to see what is going on.

Mr. Steve McHenry, the architect for the project, stated that the Commission members who were present for the site walk could see that the ductwork would not overhang over anyone's property, but only the owner's property. He added that it was impossible to actually show on a plan the ductwork going up the rear of the building which is actually why the site walk was so important.

Mr. McHenry added that it is virtually impossible to market this space since a restaurant cannot function without the proper makeup. The ductwork will be placed between the spiral staircase and the building; therefore, no one would burn themselves.

Chairman Rice stated he would prefer to see ductwork on the interior of the building rather than the exterior; however, in the way this particular ductwork is done, it could be removed without destroying the building.

Mr. Golomb stated this is a unique approach to the ductwork.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented; Mr. Golomb seconded. The motion passed with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....

8) Petition for Fred Lowell, owner, and McHenry Architecture, applicant, for property located at 62 Deer Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add two 6/6 Brosco wood double-hung windows with authentic divided lights on right façade of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 027 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Steve McHenry, the architect for the project, stated that as the building evolved inside, changes were necessary. We found that the proposed new window on the first floor would be withdrawn since it much more different from the window on the second level. At this time, the interior design of the home had also changed creating this modification.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve the application as amended with the proposed new six over six window on the first floor in the middle of the structure on the proposed right side elevation be withdrawn; Ms. Grasso seconded. The motion passed with a 7 – 0 vote.



9) Petition for Pamela and Bruce Boley, owners, for property located at 88 Newcastle Avenue wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing windows with Norco simulated divided light vinyl clad windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 030 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Ms. Boley, an owner of the property sated she would like to replace all the windows in the home with Norco six over one windows with permanently affixed grids to the glass on the exterior. There will be no change to the style or the size.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Becksted made a motion to approve the application as presented; Ms. Fineberg seconded. Mr. Becksted stated he was familiar with this brand window and added the company does meet all the concerns of the Commission.

The motion passed with a 7 – 0 vote.



10) Petition for Joseph and Jennifer Almeida, owners, for property located at 33 Blossom Street wherein permission is requested to allow the demolition of an existing garage and to allow a new free-standing structure (construction of a one and half story two car garage) as per plans on file in Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 002 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Almeida, the owner of the property, stated he was going to re-use the existing footprint of the garage. The house was built in 1790, and in 1978, vinyl siding was put on and he would now like to take it off. Mr. Almeida stated he did not know what was underneath the siding without removing everything.

Chairman Rice stated we should review the garage. Mr. Almeida reviewed his plans with the Commission and added he was trying to make the garage look like a barn.

Mr. Becksted asked about the garage doors and the skylights on the second floor of the garage and if the skylights could be located on the rear side of the garage. Mr. Almeida stated where he is proposing the skylights on the front of the garage because it does get an incredible amount of sunlight. The skylights are a desire for sunlight.

Chairman Rice stated that Plan #4 looks as though the garage is attached to the house. Mr. Almeida replied that was not the case, it is just very close.

Ms. Fineberg stated in the plan the rear door is shown open when that door is closed is there another window. Mr. Almeida replied there was not another window just clapboards.

Ms. Grasso suggested that the dormer be in the front of the garage and skylights in the rear. Mr. Almeida replied this would be too much mass for the neighbors property.

Ms. Kathleen Beauchamp stated that Mr. Almeida had discussed his plans with her and she is supporting the application whole heartedly and whatever he decides is OK with her.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application; Ms. Fineberg seconded. Vice-Chairman Adams stated he did a cursory review of the side and was very concerned that the garage was too close to the adjacent property. The garage is a reasonable size in the drawing. Having some difficulty with the skylights; however, there is no issue.

Mr. Becksted seconded Vice-Chairman Adams thoughts and added that other than the skylights he really had no objection. The skylights do not relate to anything on the site.

Ms. Grasso stated she agreed.

Mr. Katz stated that considering the location of the house and the garage, the only way it could be less visible was if it was not in the HDC district. He wondered why the guidelines of the HDC pamphlet do not say "good luck in receiving approval for a skylight". Sometimes the Commission gives approval for a skylight and sometimes they do not give approval.

Chairman Rice stated he was having no problem with the skylights in this case because the garage is detached and it is a dead end street.

Ms. Grasso stated we do not have a rule.

Mr. Becksted stated he usually does not vote for skylights; however, there have been times when he does vote them – skylights are taken on a case by case basis.

At this time Chairman Rice gave the applicant a chance to withdraw the part of the application for skylights and Mr. Almeida can take the garage down as soon as possible and work with the Commission on the skylights.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to table the application to a work session/public hearing at the next scheduled meeting on January 7, 2004; Mr. Golomb seconded. The motion passed with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....

III. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by Carol and Barry Shore, owners, and Robert Rodier, architect, for property located at 91 South Street. (Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 046 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. (construct a 14' x 18' 1-1/2 story addition onto an existing exterior deck footprint; add a 5' x 10' one story addition at rear; and revise roof configuration of existing garage.

- Mr. Rodier, the architect for the project presented a model showing exactly what the owner's were proposing to add on or to remove from their home;
- Existing deck will be removed;
- The reason the window is not centered in the rear is because of the design of the interior;
- A new entryway will be constructed from the garage to the court yard;
- The new dormer will go through the eave line;
- Commission members feel there is too much glass with the windows being double mulled and is not appropriate;
- Mr. Rodier stated that there is a very small view from the home of the beautiful garden in the rear as it exists now;
- The focus of the renovations is for the gardens to be more visible from the house and there is no interaction the way it exists now;
- The Commission has some concern with fenestration and did not want to get into a debate at this time with anyone.
- The Commission was concerned about the Johnson Court elevation; however, they liked the proposed new garage and raising the pitch of the roof.
- Mr. Rodier and the Shore's will return for another work session on January 7, 2004.

.....

B) Work Session requested by DeStefano Architects for property owned by Parade Mall and located at 195 Hanover Street (corner of High Street and Hanover Street). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 001 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. (construct a 116,000 s.f mixed use building for hotel, residential and retail uses).

- Lisa DeStefano, the architect for the project, stated the proposed site is one acre in area at the Parade Mall on the upper corner of Hanover and High Streets and run down the incline to where Fleet Street is located across the street;
- A site plan was presented showing existing parking for "The Hill" and the Parade Mall;
- The proposed structure will be a hotel entity having approximately 120 rooms; retail space and condominiums and will be a mixed use building;
- Looking to create street space and open space;
- Would like to the Commission to address the massing of materials for the site;
- The existing parking, where the structure will be located, will be dispersed to other parts of the lot once we know where we stand with the zoning requirements;
- There will be some services at the hotel for customers; however, most of the clients will shop and eat at other locations in the downtown area that will create good energy for the community.
- A recent completion of this hotel was visited up in Portland, Maine and the only way to describe it was "spectacular" and asked the Commission members to take time to visit it;
- The Commission felt the houses on "The Hill" will look like a zoo and something will be needed to mass and anchor the corner of High and Hanover Streets;
- The Commission felt that no matter what is put into the corner it will seem huge;
- The Commission felt that something else should be used rather than "red brick" for the building and not be a carbon copy other buildings in town;
- The Commission is concerned about the scale of the building and that it may be too high for this particular corner;
- Karen Logan, the owner of The Mermaid Restaurant located in the same parking lot, asked if the building could be smaller and perhaps sit the building in reverse of what is being planned;
- Mr. Almeida, who owns property on High Street, stated that many neighbors are excited about the proposal and added there is a need for a building at this location;
- Mr. John Grossman, representing the Advocates, stated there was a wonderful article in the Boston Globe on "Why does Boston always have to be red brick".

.....

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:15 p.m., the motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to adjourn the meeting and meet at the next scheduled meeting on January 7, 2004 in the City Council Chambers.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Long
Secretary

/jml