

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

7:00 p.m.

**FEBRUARY 2, 2005
RECONVENED ON
FEBRUARY 9, 2005**

MEMBEERS PRESENT: Chairman, John Rice, Vice-Chairman, David Adams, John Golumb, Ellen Fineberg, Joanne Grasso and, alternates, Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Rick Becksted and Ken Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

.....
I. WORK SESSIONS

A) Work Session requested by McHenry Architecture for property owned by Daniel McKenna for property located at 74 Congress Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 043 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. (demolish existing structure and replace with a three-story mixed-use building).

- Mr. Steve McHenry stated this was his second work session for this property;
- A site walk should be scheduled because it is difficult to access the building;
- He presented an enlarged photo of the building;
- There is evidence of a very small crawl space in the basement of the building
- A thorough investigation is being planned to determine what the date of the trim is and the balusters that look to be the late 1870's;
- It is a very old site;
- The foundation is concrete with board forms;
- Working on the premise to demolish the building;
- Presented three different models showing how the building would fit in comfortably with the area;
- Different materials and designs will be explored;
- We are proposing a three-story structure with an eave overhang;
- The first rendering was a brick building;
- The second rendering has a different layout with a shallow opening for the doors;
- The third rendering shows command of the roofline;
- There is a balcony on this level;
- Research has been done on different materials such as a brick material or it could be red brick or a grey brick or terra cotta or clapboard; or synthetic plastic system and creates a more residential feel;
- The project is still in the beginning stages;

- Mr. Golumb stated there was some talk of cementitious clapboarding and would like some discussion on this material;
- Mr. McHenry stated they were proposing a three-story building;
- Mr. Golumb stated he liked the first two designs more than the 3rd design. He feels he would like red brick since the town is basically red brick rather than clapboards;
- Mr. McHenry stated his client in this case is up for any suggestions;
- Vice-Chairman Adams inquired about the spandrel underneath the windows and added that he preferred the first and second models;
- Mr. Katz stated he feels the first two examples he was drawn to and feel it bridges the gap between two different architectural styles and looks like it belongs there;
- Ms. Dika stated she feels a site walk would be a good idea before demolishing the building on probably a Saturday morning on Saturday, February 26, 2005 at 9:30 a.m..

.....

B) Work Session requested by DeStefano Architects for property owned by Middle Street Baptist Church, for property located at 16 Court Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 002 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts. (addition of elevator tower at rear of building).

- Ms. DeStefano introduced the members involved in the upgrading of the building;
- We investigated adding an elevator on the rear of the building;
- The elevator will make a good 80% of the building accessible;
- Ms. DeStefano went through the plans with the Commission members page by page;
- The rear of the building shows a bay being added onto and not doing anything to disrupt the bay windows;
- A wish for everyone was to make every floor handicap accessible;
- We have been working on this plan for more than a year now;
- The brick in the front will be built to the roof of the overhang as well as a gutter and downspout will be added;
- On the right side of the building there will be no windows and the banding will be carried around the roof parapet;
- This application calls for a Site Walk on February 26th at 10:15 a.m.;
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked that any historical items taken off the building be identified and listed in a memo

.....

C) Work Session requested by Robert Rodier, Architect for property owned by Rachel Connell and Bruce McEldowney located at 434 Marcy Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 041 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts. (construct a shed dormer at rear of roof between the two existing chimneys).

- Mr. Rodier, the Architect for the project, stated this house is very small and it is only 18' wide. The owners of the home are in the process of adopting a baby and need additional room. We were hoping to add a dormer between the two

chimneys. A dormer is needed to make the floor plan work and we would like some feedback before we go any further.

- Ms. Dika stated the shed dormer on the rear of the house did not displease her that much, but was kind of surprised that the dormer runs from one chimney to another. Mr. Rodier replied that that this is needed to get the additional head room that we need;
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated the linkages to the chimney are difficult and have very little use. He is concerned about the pitch of the roof. He added he would be pleased if there was another option.
- Ms. Fineberg stated the chimneys are not seen from the street; therefore, the dormer will not be seen either. She would like to see more details for it to work together;
- Mr. Katz was concerned that the dormer was tucked in between the two chimneys and feels it is a fairly innovative approach to obtain the space that is needed. Personally he has no problem with the plan;
- Chairman Rice stated he also felt that it was a good plan; however, he would like to see another option and added that he felt an ell could be used;
- Mr. Rodier stated there are wonderful pocket gardens in the rear of the property and does not want to see the gardens destroyed;
- The house was built in 1801;
- The Commission members all agreed the models were very helpful.



D) Work Session requested by Sumner Davis Architects for property owned by Smith, Minch & Frost located at 159-165 State Street. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 046-3 and lies within the Central Business B district and Historic A districts. (install a metal fence in front yard)

- Kelly Davis would like to install a metal fence powder coated on the front façade of the building and presented a plan of the fence (style #1) and presented a design that the owners would like to use to give the front yard some privacy and hide the existing meters;
- There will be a landscaping plan available.
- The setup will be similar to the fence on the Smith Barney Building downtown;
- John Golumb inquired about the fence located next door and feels the fence is too thin because of the mass of the building;
- The fence is custom made; therefore we will balance the fence with the property next door since they are both very, very similar;
- There will be a gate with hinges on it.
- Ms. Dika inquired about the windows;
- Mr. Davis replied that they were waiting for the window people to get back to them.



II. OLD BUSINESS

1) Petition for Barbara Theodore, owner, and Olde Port Properties, applicant, for property located at 27 Bow Street, Unit #C wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations (replace all existing windows and awnings on the Bow Street façade) as per plan [redacted] property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot [redacted] and the Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the February 2, 2005 meeting to the reconvened meeting February 9, 2005.

2) Work Session/Public Hearing for Melissa Bicchieri, owner and Sonny Iannacone, applicant, for property located at 206 Northwest Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovation to an existing structure (replace all existing windows; replace roof shingles; and, to construct two front dormers) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 122 as Lot 006 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the February 2, 2005 meeting to the reconvened meeting on February 9, 2005.

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to take the application off the table and was seconded and approved with a 7 --0 vote.

Chairman Rice opened the Work Session

Mr. Iannacone presented a plan for dormers that would have the same window size as the windows below on the first floor.

Chairman Rice asked to see the dormers on how they relate to the roof and asked if the measurements were the same as previously presented except that there will be two dormers rather than three.

Mr. Katz stated he feels the dormers are within the historical period of this house. This approach has historic flair and minimal damage will be done to the house and has no problem with the proposed plan.

Ms. Fineberg stated she will vote against this application; however, she does not have a solution on how to rectify the situation. The dormers on the Middle Street building are not original. She has not seen anything that is really historical for this dormer and that it is real modern and added that she feels the building did not exist prior 1970.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that the property on Middle Street was built in 1885. There is some historic precedent being set. It is not a fancy house and he is having a problem with cutting through the roofline. This house has the appearance of a middle 1800's house and is a plain house. He added that he is not sure that he would approve this application. The two dormers being proposed will not do the house any good.

Mr. Katz asked for suggestions as to what the applicant can do with this project. He added that if something was being proposed for the back of the building, it might be a different story and at this point he did not have any suggestions.

Chairman Rice stated the drawings are not to scale.

Mr. Ianconne asked the Commission if they were totally against the dormers and if they were familiar with eyebrow dormers.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he felt it would be a wrong move to have this type of dormer on this house.

Ms. Fineberg stated the house is small and felt that the dormers should be reduced in size and made smaller.

Mr. Ianconne asked if a 4'6" window could be used rather than a 5' window.

Mr. Katz stated that an architectural rendering will show perspective and should be submitted and would be money well spent.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he agreed.

Mr. Golumb stated he felt the windows look awkward on Middle Street and they will look awkward on this house.

Ms. Dika stated she walked around the house and a shed dormer on the back of the house would be much more acceptable and would give the light that is needed. She then suggested that the applicant go to an Architect and sit down with them and explain exactly what you are trying to do.

Chairman Rice agreed with Ms. Dika and added the roof has a modest pitch and is having a problem with the dormers. To approve something like this is not preserving architectural heritage and would be approving a contemporary design just to get light in. He then gave an example of an application where the owners of "Old City Hall" wanted to dormer the building just to have a water view; however, the Commission felt that the roof on that building could not accept a dormer.

Chairman Rice suggested the applicant come up with another solution as far as the dormers are concerned or do the expansion on the back and abandon the current plan.

Vice-Chairman Adams suggested that this application be dropped and that a new proposal would be in order.

.....

3) Petition for 426 Middle Street, LLC, owner and Barbara MacKusick, applicant, for property located at 426 Middle Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing windows with Harvey Majesty windows with permanently affixed grids on both the inside and outside) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 045 and lies

within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the February 2, 2005 meeting to the reconvened meeting on February 9, 2005.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to take the application off the table; Mr. Golumb seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

The contractor for the project presented a sample of the window that is being proposed. It will be wood aluminum on the outside and will fit into the existing opening. The original wooden sills will remain and all the work will be done on the inside.

Chairman Rice stated he did look at the sills and they are in terrible condition.

Chairman Rice stated that usually we ask the applicant to use wood for the corner boards, fascia, and window framing; however, if the wood is repaired in kind, approval from this Commission is not needed and added that he is having a problem with the aluminum shininess.

Mr. Katz stated that the Commission has approved vinyl windows on numerous occasions.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated he felt the mullions were too wide and he is troubled by the loss of the width of the window because the original windows are in scale with the building. He is also concerned about the windows not being square. There are different sizes of windows in the house. We do not have any dimensions and does not want to promote this kind of application.

Chairman Rice suggested a compromise could be made to allow the sash presented be used in the rear and the front windows be replaced in kind and he feels that overt character would not be lost.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the big picture window in the front and suggested more detail or to explore other options.

Mr. Clum stated that this window was approved by the Commission at 67 Mark Street, but it is off the beaten path and could be reviewed at a Site Walk.

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to table the application to allow for drawings and sketches be presented showing dimensions and to show how the windows would fit into the window space. He feels a work session/public hearing should be scheduled at the next meeting on March 2, 2005 and was seconded and approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

The contractor stated that narrower mullions could be used; however, on the model presented, the thicker mullions have been used.



4) Work Session/Public Hearing for Strawberry Banke, Inc., owner, and DeStefano Architects, applicant, for property located on Marcy Street (Dunaway Store) wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to existing structure (remove

two windows on side façade and the addition of one roof top mechanical unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 007 and lies within the Museum Residential Office and Historic A districts. This application was tabled at the February 2, 2005 meeting to the reconvened meeting on February 9, 2005.

Mr. Golumb made a motion to take the application off the table; Ms. Fineberg seconded and was approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

Chairman Rice opened the Work Session

Ms. DeStefano introduced the members from Strawberry Banke to the Commission members. She stated there are two screening options and one is a shed dormer and other is a chimney mass of sorts for the mechanical unit. Page 5A is a different view looking down Marcy Street and shows the original view. Page 5B shows a shed dormer to project out of surround and has the unit with a screen or louver on the backside with cementitious clapboarding. Page 5C shows the unit surrounded by a brick base. Pages 6 and 7 are the same as previously proposed. On Page 7B shows the previous screen option. Appendix I shows the shed dormer enlarged to technically see how things work. However, we do have issues with snow, ice damage, rain and etc. and will result in a more challenging project. The unit itself is 6'3" high.

Ms. Dika stated that if the unit were smaller than 4', approval would not be required by the Commission.

Chairman Rice stated on the drawing that shows the dormer, are there other drawings showing this. Ms. DeStefano replied that was correct.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission members if they preferred wood to brick or brick to wood. Ms. Fineberg replied she liked the wood as well as Chairman Rice and Ms. Dika.

Mr. Katz feels that both screening efforts are strange and is getting close to a wood frame where stainless steel pipes are in a chimney. He feels all the screening does in draw attention to it.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked how much of the unit could be buried into the roof. Ms. DeStefano replied that this could not be done with this unit because of the curves and getting the ventilation out.

Ms. Dika feels the roof has a graceful slant, but the roof should be ripped off and a whole new roof should be designed to disguise the ventilation unit. Ms. DeStefano replied that if the roof is changed, the unit would have to be sunk in 6' and this would not work.

Ms. Dika stated she would like to see a mock-up of the unit on the roof just to see how large it would be.

Mr. Golumb feels that a restaurant would be awesome at this location and asked to see on the plan where the kitchen would be located. Ms. DeStefano illustrated on the plan where the kitchen would be located.

Chairman Rice asked if the Public Hearing should be opened.

Ms. Fineberg asked if it would be helpful to have a mock-up on the roof and a site walk be scheduled. She made a motion to table the application until a mock-up could be constructed.

Ms. DeStefano stated there would be head issues involved in this application if the unit were dropped into the roof.

Mr. Dodge, a concerned citizen stated he feels that there are other solutions for this ventilator and gave a brief example to the Commission members.

Chairman Rice stated that we all care about the museum and suggested there are two site walks on February 26, 2005 and we could schedule a site walk also for that date.

Ms. DeStefano stated she would prefer that a site walk to be scheduled for Saturday morning at 10:45 a.m. on February 26th to the museum and we will erect a mock-up of the unit to be viewed by the Commission.

Mr. Golumb stated he would like to take a walk inside to see how the unit will be viewed.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to table the application to the March 2nd meeting for a work session/public hearing and a site walk to the property to view the mock-up of the unit and was seconded and approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting of January 5, 2005; Ms. Fineberg seconded and all approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

.....

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Fineberg made a motion to adjourn and was seconded and approved with a 7 – 0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Long
Secretary

/jml