

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

7:00 p.m.

June 1, 2005

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman John Rice, Vice Chairman David Adams, City Council Representative, Joanne Grasso, Members, Ellen Fineberg and, Alternates, Richard Katz and Sandra Dika

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** John Golumb and Ken Smith

**ALSO PRESENT:** Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

---

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Vice Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the April 13, 2005, May 4, 2005 and May 11, 2005 minutes and Ms. Dika seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion to approve the April 13, 2005, May 4, 2005 and May 11, 2005 minutes and the motion passed with a 6-0 vote.

---

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**1. Petition for Joseph and Jennifer Almeida, owners** for property located at 33 Blossom Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (remove vinyl siding and replace with clapboard, replacement of windows and doors, add granite steps to front entry and installation of a chimney cap) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Joseph Almeida spoke on behalf of the petition and provided cut sheets for the shutters to the Commission. He stated that he wanted to remove the existing vinyl off the house and restore the clapboards underneath. He would replace any deteriorated clapboard with kind. He noted that the shutters would be operable and he would like to replace the roof with like material and add a chimney cap since the chimney currently is completely open to the weather.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any questions from the Commission.

Ms. Dika asked about the chimney cap if it had four flues.

Mr. Almeida said that he would consult a mason for the exact measurements.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the

petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve the petition as presented and Ms. Fineberg seconded.

Councilor Grasso asked if they need to come back for the dimensions on the chimney cap.

Roger Clum stated if the Commission leaves it open it would be open to interpretation.

Councilor Grasso asked if that was the way it was presented.

Chairman Rice asked if it would three or four.

Ms. Dika did not think it looked proportionate.

Vice Chairman Adams stated it would be tough to get four vaulted caps on the chimney and would figure that out when the mason inspected the chimney. He thought there would probably be two.

Vice Chairman Adams said to trust the mason.

Councilor Grasso asked if they could limit him to three.

Ms. Dika asked if they could approve it and have the mason run it by Vice Chairman Adams for final review.

Ms. Dika amended the motion to add that Vice Chairman Adams will give the final approval on the final figuration of the bishop cap onsite.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion and the motion passed with a 6–0 vote.

---

**2. Petition for Mark Moses, owner** for property located at 426 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (install 4 Velux wood hinged roof windows, 30<sup>5/8</sup>" x 55") as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 14 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Mark Moses spoke on behalf of the petition. He stated that he wanted to install four roof windows on the rear of the building. He said that he would have the rear roof resingled in order to match the front which was completed several years ago. He wanted to install the windows on the third floor because that space is essentially an attic for file storage with no electricity and poor ventilation. He stated that his reasoning for four was due to a stairway in the center of the room and a door on either side and then a filing area in between. In addition, he reiterated that the sizes selected for the

roof windows match the sizes of the other existing windows on the building and pointed out other buildings on State Street that had roof windows/skylights.

Chairman Rice noted the Commission's theory about skylights and asked the applicant if the skylights would be smaller in width and area than the windows below as well as aligned with the other windows.

Mr. Moses answered that they would be and would line up.

Councilor Grasso asked about the windows' position.

Mr. Moses answered that the windows would be lined up with the other windows.

Chairman Rice asked if the outside edges of the outside skylights would line up with the chimneys.

Mr. Moses answered yes.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Katz moved to approve as presented and Ms. Dika seconded.

Mr. Katz thought that with the number of additions added over time, he didn't think the roof windows would be seen and therefore they would have a minimal impact.

Vice Chairman Adams agreed but he stated further that it was a heavier approach to the one part of the building that had not been altered.

Councilor Grasso thought the skylights were a little bit larger than they needed to be.

Chairman Rice asked the applicant if he could go down a size.

Mr. Moses stated that was the smallest size on the cut sheet.

Vice Chairman Adams asked if there was a particular reason for the chosen hinged skylights.

Mr. Moses answered so there would be access to the roof and a possible fire exit if needed.

Chairman Rice stated to the Commission that if they thought the skylights were too large then they could approve a smaller size when provided cut sheets.

Ms. Fineberg thought two skylights would be better than four.

Chairman Rice suggested that the Commission approve the proposed skylights but only two and that they be placed on the interior of the chimney, same size.

Mr. Moses answered that was fine.

Ms. Fineberg moved to amend the motion to only two skylights installed on the interiors of the chimneys, in the center of the roof as illustrated in the submitted drawing. Mr. Katz seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission for all those in favor and the motion passed with a 4-2 vote with Vice Chairman Adams and Councilor Grasso voting in the opposition.

---

**3. Petition for Esther Kennedy, owner** for property located at 41 Pickering Ave. wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (install french doors at rear of house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 25 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Esther Kennedy spoke on behalf of the petition. She handed out additional material to the Commission. She pointed out to the Commission that all of her neighbors have either sliding glass doors or french doors on the rear of their houses and hers would not be seen from the street.

Chairman Rice asked how many lights would be chosen for the proposed french doors.

Ms. Kennedy said they would look exactly as the door in the cut sheet. She also mentioned that the addition on her house had a door previously that was closed-up and they just want to put it back in.

Ms. Dika asked what type of siding was on the house.

Ms. Kennedy said vinyl.

Ms. Dika asked if there was a deck to be installed due to the large step down to the outside.

Ms. Kennedy replied that she would fill in that area with dirt and do landscaping around the door with stepping stones.

Councilor Grasso asked how wide the doors would be.

Ms. Kennedy stated about 12 inches or so.

Ms. Dika thought the door was too wide for the area due to the position of the existing windows.

Vice Chairman Adams agreed and stated that it did seem crowded. He noted that the rear of the house was very plain and he thought the windows and the door would compete with each other. He thought the doors could be narrower but not so narrow that you would have to open both doors in order to get through.

Ms. Dika asked if she would be opposed to a glass door.

Ms. Kennedy answered no.

Mr. Katz remarked that the doors were too large and recommended a 4 foot nominal set of french doors.

Ms. Kennedy said that was fine.

Vice Chairman Adams asked that she match the casings and trim on the windows when she installs the doors.

Ms. Kennedy stated ok.

Dick Durcharf of 99 Gates Street spoke in favor of Ms. Kennedy's petition and encouraged the Commission to further allow the applicant to improve her property.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

#### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve as presented with the amendment that the original proposed size be changed to 4 foot nominal french doors. Ms. Dika seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion and the motion passed with a 6-0 vote.

---

**4. Petition for Deer Street Associates, owner** for property located at 165 Deer Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (addition of a new covered entry and porte cochere and window replacement) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 17 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

#### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Julie MacDonald of DeStefano Architecture spoke on behalf of the petition. She brought a representative from the bank to answer any questions that the Commission may have had about the bank. She handed out additional materials and went over the same. The first sheet showed the existing conditions and the second depicted the elevations and the proposed. She indicated that hardiplank boards would be used for the dormer. She stated they were trying to tie in the dormer into the rest of the building. Sheet three depicted the northwest elevation. She indicated they would be using cedar with a solid stain for the boxes out front and they would be installing new railings. They also plan to replace the existing awning with a more substantial one. She then explained the cut sheets (eagle aluminum clad windows, an anodized clad front door, etc.).

Chairman Rice said that she did a very nice job on the presentation.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve the petition as presented and Councilor Grasso seconded.

Vice Chairman Adams commended the applicant for her easy to read drawings and a job well done.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion and the motion passed with a 6–0 vote.

---

**5. Petition for Whalesback Light, owner** for property located at 96 State Street wherein permission is requested to allow modifications to an existing approval (amend previously approved spiral staircase with mini JOMY retractable ladder) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 52 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Dennis Mackenrow of DeStefano Architecture spoke on behalf of the petition. He stated that they were previously before the Commission in December when the spiral staircase was approved but it was determined that the roof structure would have to be beefed up to carry the load and the owner opted to go another route. He went over the plans submitted to the Commission and explained the proposed. He stated that the ladder would remain in a closed position about 99% of the time. He reiterated to the Commission that they want the ladder to remain invisible from the street and directed the Commission to the drawings depicting the same.

Chairman Rice stated he couldn't see anything on the drawings.

Mr. Mackenrow stated that was what they were aiming for, to blend the ladder into the building. He stated that it is an anodized aluminum and they could paint it any color to match.

Ms. Fineberg asked how it would be bolted to the building.

Mr. Mackenrow stated it would be adhered with stainless steel fasteners.

Ms. Fineberg asked if it would go into the brick or the mortar.

Mr. Mackenrow stated wherever structurally is best.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Ms. Dika moved to approve as presented and Councilor Grasso seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion and the motion passed with a 6-0 vote.

---

**6. Petition for Deirdre and Tom Hammer, owners** for property located at 115 Court Street wherein permission is requested to erect a new free standing structure (install fencing and downspouts) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 23 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Tom Hammer spoke on behalf of the petition. He stated that they want to reinstall the fence they had removed. His intention was to install a fence on two sides of the house. He said that Mr. Clum had informed him that he needed to have the downspouts reviewed by the Commission in addition to his fence request since they removed the downspouts to paint and had reinstalled them with Copper downspouts. He further stated that they would like gaps in between the boards and the fence would be erected on the property line.

Chairman Rice asked if the slats would be one by six and wondered what material would be used for the fencing.

Mr. Hammer answered yes and pine.

Chairman Rice asked what the fencing area dimension was.

Mr. Hammer answered as on the sheets provided.

Chairman Rice asked the Commission if everyone understood what they plan to do.

Mr. Hammer stated that there would be fencing on only one side and the other side will have the framing exposed. He further stated that the finished side would face the street.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve as presented with the addition of a flat board cap on the fence of 6 1/2 inch dimension; Councilor Grasso seconded.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion and the motion passed with a 6-0 vote.

---

---

7. **Petition for Nina Shore, owner and Bob Maranhas, applicant** for property located at 18 Mt. Vernon Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (redesign roof, add shed dormer to the rear with windows, add patio door and a deck to the rear) as per plans on file with the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 27 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A districts.

#### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Bob Maranhas spoke on behalf of the owner and petition. He said they want to redesign the roof in order to create more living space and he went over the drawings. He reiterated that the roof would extend with the same pitch. They want to install a shed dormer on the right side and the windows would be changed to two over two in order to match the other existing windows. He also pointed out that they would add a patio door to left, rear side of the house, a 6-ft Anderson door and a small deck.

Vice Chairman Adams asked what they would do with the chimneys.

Mr. Maranhas stated he would build them according to code and use like brick.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone in the public that wished to speak to, for or against the petition.

Seeing no one rise, the public hearing was closed.

#### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

Vice Chairman Adams moved to approve as presented and Ms. Dika seconded.

Vice Chairman Adams commended the applicant on a job well done and asked that he ensure the clapboards and trim match up.

Chairman Rice asked the commission for all those in favor. The Commission then voted on the motion and the motion passed with a 6-0 vote.

---

### **III. WORK SESSIONS**

**A) Work Session for Paul J. Carney, owner** for property located at 54 Rogers Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations and perform new construction on an existing building (addition to the rear of existing house to convert from a two story to a three story, add shed dormers at roof level, add new front landing, add a second floor to existing garage/barn/carriage house and remove the existing aluminum siding and replace with clapboards). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 44 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

- Glen Johnstone, Architect and Paul J. Carney, Owner presented the drawings
- Mr. Johnstone pointed out to the Commission that the plans were grouped together by elevations (i.e. front, side, rear, etc.)
- He reiterated what was discussed at the prior meeting (i.e. changing the carriage house to



simplify the roof lines, etc.)

- They have made it a more simplified roof structure
- He noted other comments made about the carriage house and they incorporated those suggestions (i.e. addition of window, barn doors)
- Vice Chairman Adams pointed out that they had kept the eaves edge of the garage building down from the edge of the house and asked if there was any loss of usefulness on the second floor
- Mr. Johnstone replied no and stated that he had raised the original location from where it was originally before
- He went over the dormers on the roof level
- He noted before they had two shed dormers and he gave a multitude of options and styles for the Commission to choose from
- He further pointed out that the gridding of the windows had been simplified to open it up a little bit
- Each drawing was a bunch of different sets grouped together; in the upper corner of each drawing was a letter with a number indicating each version
- He gave a couple variations of the balconies
- He also noted that the front entry with the porch was ok with the Commission at the prior meeting so that portion of the design had not changed
- He went over the driveway side elevation and showed the carriage house's new profile which was raised up and more simplified compared to the original
- He pointed out the cross gable at the front edge which lined up with the balcony and the windows below and a shed dormer coming off the back of it
- Chairman Rice made the comment that he had never seen so many options for one place before
- The Commission agreed and seemed very pleased with all of the choices and the overall effort
- Chairman Rice asked the owner what options he desired best
- Vice Chairman Adams thought everything done was a very useful exercise and that it gave the Commission an opportunity to choose
- Mr. Katz asked how they resolved the question of the A-symmetrical dormers from the front
- Mr. Johnstone stated that in any of the options depicted in the drawings they all satisfied the ability to get up the stairway because he kept out to the front edge
- He further stated that the only option that impeded what was done on the third floor was the option with the two separate dormers and indicated that was not their desired choice
- Chairman Rice asked of H, H2 and I, I2 of the drawings, which one the owner would prefer the Commission go with
- Mr. Johnstone answered the shed dormer, H2
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission how they felt about that option
- Ms. Dika preferred H2
- Chairman Rice agreed
- Ms. Fineberg thought everything was totally regular about the house and liked option I
- Mr. Johnstone pointed out that if option H was chosen, then the combinations of C, E, G would tie into that
- Chairman Rice asked what the Commission thought
- Vice Chairman Adams remarked that C had a smaller mass to it
- Chairman Rice asked what he thought about the balcony
- Vice Chairman Adams stated he didn't feel it would be a mistake

- Mr. Katz stated that the second floor could be guiding the lily a little bit since it was not very utilitarian
- He did like the third floor, he thought it was a good use of space and would not be obtrusive
- He thought there was a little too much on the second floor but liked the option C2 as opposed to option C
- Vice Chairman Adams liked C2, he thought it was orderly and tidy
- Chairman Rice reiterated that the Commission was leaning towards the C2 option
- Councilor Grasso liked either C or C2
- Ms. Fineberg preferred option I
- Vice Chairman Adams asked why
- Ms. Fineberg thought given the balance on everything else on the property that it would be nice to see the dormers reflect the balance the same way
- Vice Chairman Adams pointed out what was discussed earlier when reviewing the I design
- Ms. Fineberg said she missed that and got confused and asked if both dormers would look the same from the front of the house
- Mr. Johnstone answered yes
- Vice Chairman Adams asked if they would need to change the chimney
- Mr. Johnstone stated that they would take it down and replace it
- Vice Chairman Adams asked if they would replicate the pattern of the brick work and use a similar kind of brick
- Mr. Johnstone said yes
- Vice Chairman Adams commented on the door on the rear of the building that the owner would only be able to see and stated that the Commission would probably agree that the door should match the front door for consistency
- Ms. Fineberg thought the all of the doors should have divided lights
- Mr. Johnstone explained the choices
- Ms. Fineberg thought the balcony on the second floor looked fine if the option F was chosen
- Mr. Katz thought the massing looked fine both with and without and was on board
- Vice Chairman Adams asked for a couple of perspectives from the street viewing the proposed balcony; render it to help the Commission visualize the impact
- The Commission thought the presentation and options were wonderful and recommended a public hearing

---

**B) Work Session for Michael and Claudette Barker, owners** for property located at 5 Hancock Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations and perform new construction on an existing building (remove existing roof and addition of second story with gable roof, add two story addition at right side and extensive exterior renovations). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 86 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

- Anne Whitney of Anne Whitney Architecture presented the petition on behalf of the owners
- She gave handouts to the Commission to aid the presentation
- Vice Chairman Adams asked when the house was originally built
- Peter Michaud of SPNEA answered 1934
- He further stated that the rear of the house was built in the 50's, the garage in the 60's and the house had been moved to the current location from two other prior
- Ms. Whitney resumed presenting the plans

- She stated that the second photo was of the existing house
- She said that they propose to take the roof off of the existing structure and to expand the house over the existing foundation to make the house two and half stories
- They wanted to add a connector on the rear and take the remaining foundation space and turn it into a porch
- The third sheet depicted an overview of the areas of construction
- The two story addition would be set back from the existing house
- She noted all of the windows would be redone as the center of the house would be shifting
- The addition on the left would be 16 x 20
- Essentially, adding 9 feet in height with a 9-12 pitch
- They would cut through the connector and the roof line would continue across
- The bay on the kitchen side would come out 2 feet on the rear
- There would be three dormers on the front of the house and three traditional dormers on the rear with three skylights and a small porch as a means of access to the back yard
- She also noted a front entry porch with columns
- She pointed out to the Commission the other houses on Hancock Street and their size in comparison to the house in its current condition
- She said that the owners want their house to be more in keeping with the scale of the other houses in the neighborhood
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission about the scale
- Ms. Dika stated that historically it was a small cottage and it would be a very different, large building if the proposed was approved
- Vice Chairman Adams thought the building currently was not representative of a sears cottage; not the typical façade
- He also thought there would be a loss if the proposed was allowed
- Mr. Katz didn't agree
- Ms. Fineberg wanted to take a look at the house
- Chairman Rice stated there might be a conflict with Article 10 with what was proposed
- He asked the Commission how they felt about the loss of all of the character of the cape and totally changing the look and façade of the house
- Ms. Dika thought what was proposed was very attractive
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission about the massing and the front façade
- Vice Chairman Adams was concerned about the design, he felt it was very awkward
- He thought it may look too tall
- Ms. Whitney noted that she tried to keep the detail to a minimum
- Vice Chairman Adams was concerned with the extension of the gables
- He thought that some of the houses that they were modeling after did not have such an overhang
- He thought the roof pitch mimicked a too federal type of a design
- He was worried about the scale of some of the elements of the design
- Chairman Rice wondered about the skylights and whether the introduction was too contemporary of a solution and suggested dormers
- Ms. Dika pointed out that they would be visible from Gates Street
- Ms. Whitney and the owners said they could lose the skylights
- Chairman Rice recommended a site walk in July and then a public hearing
- He stated that it would boil down to whether the Commission would feel comfortable with the

demolition and total change to the character of the historical cape

---

**C) Work Session for HarborCorp, LLC, owner** for property located on Russell St., Deer St., and Maplewood Avenue wherein permission is requested to erect a new free standing structure (to review preliminary proposals to construct a 200 room hotel with 20,000 ± sq. ft. conference facility and 680 ± car parking garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plans 119 as Lot 001, Plan 118, Lot 28, Plan 124, Lot 12 and Plan 125, Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic A districts.

- Steve Griswold, Nancy Ludwig and Don Peterson presented the project
- Mr. Griswold noted from the last meeting that there was a suggestion to double load one of the corridors which they did and as such, the hotel room count has increased to a total of 207 and 21 condos
- Ms. Ludwig noted that they intend to have a rooftop garden accessible from the third floor
- She further stated there was a 6<sup>th</sup> floor added which allotted for a program area
- They single loaded the upper floor; a narrow band 30 ft wide
- No change along the upper part of Russell Street and the elevation of the garage at Deer Street and Maplewood Avenue has not changed
- They sought a different treatment for the view and presented four options for the configuration and elevation views of the rear/railroad side of the parking garage due to the angled plains, inclines of the parking garage slope
- Vice Chairman Adams asked if any of the options affected the functionality of the garage
- Ms. Ludwig replied no, that it was a fix for the sloped façade
- Vice Chairman Adams asked if any option cost more than the other
- Ms. Ludwig answered yes and no, the metal would be more than the masonry
- Chairman Rice asked which one she preferred
- Ms. Ludwig liked option two, she thought there was enough masonry on the building and incorporating some of the metal on the rear would be a better transition
- Ms. Dika and Councilor Grasso like option 4
- Councilor Grasso asked Ms. Ludwig to explain option 4
- Vice Chairman Adams liked option 3; he didn't like the metal panels on the other options
- Ms. Fineberg wanted a longer perspective so that she could see the building as a whole from the rear
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission how they felt about the extra room treatments and the garage façade
- Ms. Fineberg asked if they would have to go before the ZBA for a height variance
- Ms. Ludwig and Mr. Griswold answered yes
- Councilor Grasso asked where the mechanicals would go
- Ms. Ludwig stated that the mechanical system for the exhibit hall would go against the parking garage somewhere on the roof, so they won't be visible
- Chairman Rice reiterated that they would ultimately be approving something that needed a height variance and asked the Commission how they felt about that
- He asked if it would be higher than the existing hotel
- Mr. Griswold answered yes
- Councilor Grasso thought the impact was normal and minimal for the sixth floor
- Ms. Fineberg asked what type of material they proposed to use for the upper level of the sixth floor

- Ms. Ludwig said currently they were proposing it to be metal with a lot of windows
- Mr. Katz commented on the options for the garage, the Green Street elevation, he stated that he was leaning toward option three due to using a traditional material in a non-traditional way and since it's a transitional design, he thought option three was best suited
- Ms. Fineberg thought it might wind up looking like a factory
- Mr. Katz said there was nothing wrong with that, factories are part and parcel of the New England experience
- Councilor Tom Ferrini spoke (recused himself from the Planning Board) and pointed out to the HDC that in the current master plan for the northern tier, the pedestrian traffic is very important to that area and asked if there was a way to cut through the building for people to be able to walk through onto the other side; he felt like the northern tier was sealed off due to the project
- Chairman Rice urged the commission to review the northern tier study
- Mr. Griswold noted to the Commission that in the northern tier study the current proposal would be the proposal alternative A; the only change was that Russell Street would not close or be relocated
- Chairman Rice suggested a walk through, an access point for pedestrian traffic
- Ms. Ludwig noted that the level issues would make a walk through very difficult to achieve
- Mr. Griswold noted that there would be retail in the lower spaces that would create pedestrian traffic
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission if there were any other comments or questions
- Vice Chairman Adams made the comment that he hated the octagonal end of the building and was opposed to 6 floors; he would not support a six floor, it would act like a wall
- He thought it was too large for the city

---

**D) Work Session for Marilyn P. Rath, owner and Gretchen Porter, applicant** for property located at 112 Penhallow Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations and perform new construction on an existing building (build 2<sup>nd</sup> story on rear half of building attached to the existing 2<sup>nd</sup> story front half of the building). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 20 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

- John Rummler, the architect on project spoke for the applicant, Gretchen Porter
- He went over the plans for the project
- The first sheet was the existing conditions of 112 Penhallow Street (Portsmouth Fabric)
- It is a two-story brick building with little modification for over 26 years
- North side elevation on first sheet
- He indicated that the rear of the building was a built-up flat roof in disarray
- They proposed to wrap the cornice at the height of the existing building on the front and carry one of the two options for the fenestration
- The first depicted three windows which matched the existing below
- The rear windows were exactly the same as the existing windows where the building steps
- The rear elevation would stay the same
- The side elevation would eliminate one window
- Vice Chairman Adams noted the windows were narrower
- Mr. Rummler noted that it would be an advantage not only by gaining 475 additional sq. feet but a fully compliant means of egress to the second floor
- The front entry is currently too narrow and not proper clearance

- They want to fix the front door and provide a new opening for a door to swing out into the existing alleyway
- Vice Chairman Adams asked what requirements they would need for the door
- Mr. Rummler answered that it would be very simple, a granite sill and match the existing detail on the building
- Chairman Rice asked what the owner would prefer for the windows
- Ms. Porter answered that she would prefer the narrower windows, same style as the existing on the front
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission their take on the owner's preference
- Mr. Katz replied that he thought it was a logical progression
- Councilor Grasso asked what the purpose for the second floor would be
- Ms. Porter answered a classroom
- Vice Chairman Adams asked about the roof surface (i.e. parfait, railings, etc.)
- Mr. Rummler answered no, just a flat roof
- Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else from the Commission that wished to comment
- He then asked the public the same
- Ms. Porter's neighbors commented on the proposed project and pointed out to the Commission that the back of 112 Penhallow is a full length second story and the proposed second story would block the three windows' views
- Mr. Katz asked Mr. Clum if it was a code issue
- Mr. Clum stated no, the City Attorney informed him that the City does not grant any sort of views and the building code talks about means of egress and escape and further states that bedrooms must have one window for matters of egress and escape; therefore, there is no issue with code
- Ms. Fineberg thought it would be helpful if they came back with some perspectives to depict the buildings next to it in relation to the proposed
- Mr. Rummler stated that they would not be changing the height of the building in comparison to the other buildings on the street
- Chairman Rice stated that the Commission has had its hands cuffed with similar projects and that the State of NH would not support them if they protected someone's view
- Vice Chairman Adams said he would speak with the City Attorney
- Chairman Rice stated the Commission was all set with the design
- Vice Chairman Adams agreed and said that everything's contingent on the materials

---

**E) Work Session for David Perrault, owner** for property located at 300 Court Street wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing building (add decks and windows to rear of existing structure). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 12 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

- Nancy Gregor, new owner of property and Steven McHenry, architect on the project
- A previous application before the HDC on the same property for decks, windows and doors on the rear of the building
- They were there to request the same
- He went over the plans provided to the Commission
- The first page was a cover sheet of a photo of the Langdon House garden, two views
- The house now is two stories inside a one story volume

- The work stopped on the rear
- He went over the plans submitted for the same back in 2001
- The Commission denied the design back in 2001 and compared it to what they were proposing currently
- They proposed two sets of glass doors and windows with two decks, one smaller than the other, with a screen below the first deck
- He also provided a perspective to the Commission to demonstrate the side view and impact of the deck
- He noted to the Commission that it was the owner's intention to remain tastefully inkeeping with the building's architecture and not to do something that would impose visible hardship on the Langdon gardens
- Councilor Grasso asked how far out from the building would the decks go
- Mr. McHenry noted that there were dimensions listed on the floor plans and that the curved portion of the deck would be about 9 feet off the building
- Councilor Grasso asked from the deck to the property line
- Mr. McHenry answered about 17.6 off the corner, he noted that the property slants
- Vice Chairman Adams pointed out that in the drawings provided the balconies were particularly articulated
- Mr. McHenry thought the simpler the better
- Vice Chairman Adams asked Mr. McHenry how they would hold it up
- Mr. McHenry replied it will basically be cantilevered with some brackets in the corners
- Chairman Rice asked the Commission how they felt about the overall design
- Mr. McHenry pointed out that the owner did prefer if there were to be a stair that it went off the side off the building from the first floor deckline
- Vice Chairman Adams made the comment that the whole thing seems practical
- Peter Michaud, of SPNEA, stated that everything was much better than what has been before the Commission on the proposed property but he was still concerned about the view from the garden whether it would be looking up the deck's nose in a sense
- Mr. McHenry thought it was a conservative approach and the view would not be obtrusive or awkward

---

#### IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:45 p.m. a motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed with a 6-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina V. Staples  
HDC Secretary