

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

**7:00 p.m.**

**April 5, 2006**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman John Rice, Vice-Chairman David Adams, Members, Ellen Fineberg, Richard Katz, John Golumb and Alternates Sandra Dika and John Wyckoff and City Council Representative Ned Raynolds

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** N/A

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

-----  
Chairman Rice called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**I. OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairman Rice explained the split Agenda with Work Sessions E through G being heard next Wednesday, April 12, 2006.

Ms. Fineberg objected to the meeting next week with it being the first night of Passover.

Chairman Rice asked for a motion to postpone the meeting to the following Wednesday, April 19, 2006.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to postpone the meeting and it was seconded by Ms. Dika.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a unanimous vote.

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Petition of **B.V. Sawtelle Properties, LLP, owner** and **William L. Pingree, applicant** for property located at **401 Islington Street** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (add stockade fence approximately 75' by 7' high along property line to match existing deck enclosure fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 34 and lies within the Mixed Residential Business B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

William Pingree, of New Castle, New Hampshire, co-owner, spoke in favor of the petition. He noted the packet and indicated that they wanted to put a fence along the existing chain link fence. They would like to keep it as simple as possible. He pointed out a picture in the packet of a stockade type fence they would like to use and said he was open to any suggestions they might have.

Chairman Rice stated that they could see by looking at the pictures why they would want to put up a fence. His concern was that fencing was fairly new to the Historic District and believed the City would like fences with character so some members of the Commission may have problems with a stockade fence.

Mr. Wyckoff asked Mr. Pingree if the deck fence was a board fence with a board top cut square across the top.

Mr. Pingree said it was actually scalloped. He said that one of the things that came up was once they got an approval they would re-fence the deck so the fencing would all match. He said they were also considering using the stockade fence but customizing it with a cap rail so it wasn't so thick. He stated that he was looking for guidance on the fence.

Vice-Chairman Adams said he felt it would be nice to pick up the line of the fence and run it along the whole length of the side to the area of the current fencing around the deck.

Mr. Pingree said that the deck fence was 21/2 feet higher than a normal fence would be. He stated that if they got permission to do it they would run the fence to the deck and go up to the level of the deck and run the fence along the sides.

Vice-Chairman Adams felt that the picketed stockade type fence seems to be a little bit backyard. He stated that the abutting property has a plain board cap fence with a smooth line to it, it does not have an eye-catching top. He said he was puzzled as to why it was 7' high. He suggested that at the end toward Islington Street it could be tapered down at the end of the fence giving someone an opportunity to see there was a parking lot there.

Ms. Dika said that was her concern also. She felt this was a safety issue.

Vice-Chairman Adams said it also gives it a lighter look.

Chairman Rice stated in the interest of moving it along does someone want to make a suggestion to avoid a Work Session.

Mr. Pingree believed that the fence part was only 6' high and the posts were about 8'. He stated that it was a very good suggestion to have a curve or a slant on the front part of the fence so that you can see a car backing out better.

Mr. Raynolds was also concerned about the stockade fence and liked the idea of the flat board fence on top. He asked who owns the chain link fence.

Mr. Pingree did not know who owns the chain link fence and stated that they were going to put their fence parallel to it.

Ms. Dika asked if Mr. Pingree had spoken to the abutter about this.

Mr. Pingree stated he had not. He felt he did not have good cooperation with the neighbor so he had no say with what was going on with the chain link fence.

Ms. Dika asked Mr. Pingree if he would do the flat board fence with a cap that tapered down.

Mr. Pingree said that would be fine and asked if he would get additional approval to incorporate it into the deck fence.

Chairman Rice stated that it could be rolled into this application. He noted that on the table now was a flat board fence with a cap and tapered at the end.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the Commission could specify how high the fence would be.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that the applicant's proposal indicated a 6 foot high fence and he thought it was 7 feet.

Mr. Pingree said the application says 7 feet but he took the average of the fence height and the post height.

Chairman Rice asked Roger Clum if there were regulations as to the height of fences.

Mr. Clum answered that it was a State regulation that anything over 5 feet was a spite fence but the neighbor would have to prove it in court that the fence was erected in spite. He said it had never been challenged in Portsmouth.

Mr. Pingree said that he applied for a 6 foot fence tapered down to 4 feet.

Chairman Rice said they could approve it and let the State do what it wants to do.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

## **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve a fence with the addition of new fencing along the sides and the end of the current deck and make an amendment to his application to have it be a board fence with a smooth board cap with 6 foot posts tapering down toward Islington Street to a height no more than 4 feet.

Ms. Dika seconded the motion made by Mr. Adams.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a unanimous vote.

---

2. Petition of **Armando Martarelli, owner** for property located at **10 Commercial Alley** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add 2 small awnings and one large retractable awning over windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106, Lot 10 and lies within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION**

Jessie Aikman from Back Channel Canvas speaking in favor of the petition. She explained that Mr. Martarelli was hoping to open a café and have a small retractable awning over the entryway with a larger retractable awning in the center and another small retractable awning to the right over the residence entry. They were aware that Mr. Sylverstein wanted to expand his building next door and they wanted to make sure everything could retract out of the way.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if they proposed to make changes to the lighting that was there.

Ms. Aikman indicated that she did not know what they were going to be about that. Anything she would do would be up over the lighting.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked Ms. Aikman if the retractable awning was similar to the models she commonly used.

Ms. Aikman stated that they would be.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the two door awnings had side panels.

Ms. Aikman said that they do and it was shown in the drawings.

Ms. Aikman said she brought color samples and showed the Commission. She stated that the applicant was proposing a dark tan color with very dark brown lettering, which would say 10 Commercial Alley.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented and it was seconded by Mr. Katz.

Vice-Chairman Adams had a question for Roger Clum regarding the signage on it. He asked if this would cause a problem.

Mr. Clum said they would just need a sign permit to have the signage.

Vice-Chairman Adams verified that it would have nothing to do with their approval of the awning even though it is shown with that signage.

Mr. Clum said that was correct.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a unanimous vote.

3. Petition of **Ben and Andrea St. Jean, owners**, for property located at **54 Humphreys Court** wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure and a new free standing structure to replace it with additions to front of 23" and side 6' as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 46 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

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

Roe Cole spoke in favor of the petition. He stated that the applicants had gone before the Board of Adjustment a number of times and were approved for the setbacks of the garage. He felt they were functional plans. He noted the specifications with true divided light windows, custom wood garage door from an overhead door company, which would be a true front door along, and exterior wood entry door.

Ms. Fineberg asked about drawing A-5 trying to make sense of left side which shows sliders.

Mr. Cole indicated that it was an old rendering that got in his packet. He said those sliders were no longer there. He stated that originally they were going to gain access to the outside but nixed that idea and that elevation still showed that.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what the existing reference was in the specifications of the siding bevel 6 ¼ inch to match existing.

Mr. Cole said it was the exposure of the existing house.

Mr. Wyckoff thought the house was shingled.

Mr. Cole said no it was all flat board.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the house was an early 20<sup>th</sup> century house. He stated he was having trouble with the A-3 drawing. He didn't like that the peak was so off centered.

Mr. Cole said he chose this because he could not pull the garage door toward the center and he was trying not to shed any more water on the neighbor's property than he was already shedding because it was very close to the setback.

Mr. Wyckoff felt that a hip roof would be more appropriate for this older style home rather than the saltbox style with the gable end facing the home and the peak facing the garage door. He felt that a false rig should be placed at the same 12 x 12 pitch coming down at an equal portion then a corner board coming down so then the saltbox portion of this would not have a pronounced projecting eave. So it would look like it was added as an addition to the original garage rather than finishing the way that it is.

Mr. Cole said he was happy to hear any suggestions and he stated they were trying to get the wind gusts through the piece board and he agreed they could make it look more like that period.

Mr. Wyckoff referenced other buildings around the site and stated that it was a difficult site with all the different styles of garages in that area.

Chairman Rice asked what Mr. Wyckoff was suggesting to do so that the peak of the roof would be centered over the garage door and be able to maintain the 12 over 12 pitch on the left side.

Mr. Wyckoff answered that the right side would have a false rake coming down projecting out to whatever the left side was then the 35 ½ would go over that.

Vice-Chairman Adams felt that an asymmetric nature of the garage would work better and he believed it would not have an effect on the footprint, the jog in the rear or the location of the door. It would just be a small 12 over 12 pitch as you look at it.

Mr. Cole agreed that it would look better.

Chairman Rice stated the stipulations to be an amendment to the application so that the peak of the roof would be centered on the garage door but the current pitches would be maintained.

Vice-Chairman Adams said that the 12 over 12 pitch would be maintained but the 5 ½ over 12 pitch will have to be adjusted to get up to a 6 ½ pitch.

Ms. Fineberg asked what material the garage doors would be made out of.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that it was in the handouts.

Chairman Rice commended the applicant for submitting additional information.

Ms. Fineberg felt that the style of the first door seemed impervious for this structure.

Ms. Dika thought it did also.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that on his site visit of the house there was an angled bay on that side and the lower panel was in decorative panels not of the same nature but of the same spirit of the garage doors so he felt it was not uncharacteristic.

Chairman Rice asked if there was anyone else that wished to speak to, for or against the amended application.

Counselor Harold Whitehouse of 58 Humphreys Court stated that he was the direct abutter of the applicant and said he supports the project. He stated he supported the Historic Commission's amendment and thought it should go forward. He stated that the project has been scaled down twice.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

## **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Clum read how he amended the application to move the peak so as to be centered on the garage door, maintaining the 12 over 12 pitch on the left roof slope.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that it should also include a symmetrical false corner board.

Mr. Wyckoff said it should include the height on the right hand side.

Mr. Clum asked what Vice-Chairman Adams meant by the symmetrical false corner board and if it was between the door and the window.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated that it should be between the door and the window. He stated that there would be a false raking board and false corner board defining the garage shape.

Mr. Clum asked why Vice-Chairman Adams called the raking board false.

Vice-Chairman Adams explained that if there was an actual one the roof would get nailed to a defining one. He asked the applicant to do another elevation and give it to the Planning Department.

Mr. Wyckoff said that the eave corner boards looked to be projecting out on the drawings.

Vice-Chairman Adams said it looked to be flat boards.

Mr. Cole stated that the overhangs on the eaves were projected 3 inches but not on the gable end.

Mr. Wyckoff felt it would be more appropriate if it projected on the gable end instead of having the flat gable boards.

Mr. Katz said that the 5 ½ pitch would change and be close to the 12.

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to table this application to a work session/public hearing for the next hearing on April 19, 2006 and it was seconded by John Golumb.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion to table passed by a unanimous vote.

---

4. Petition of **Christopher Murch, owner** for property located at **292 South Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to existing structure (replacement of existing French doors and replacement of second story windows on back of house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111, Lot 9 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

#### **SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE PETITION**

Christopher Murch, owner, spoke on behalf of the petition. He apologized for starting this restoration project without realizing he needed a permit to do so.

Chairman Rice asked if he replaced in kind or made any changes.

Mr. Murch stated he replaced in kind with the exception of the mutton style. The additional mutton style windows were a symmetric 6 over 6 and they will be replacing them with a prairie style with divided light.

Chairman Rice asked if it was a permanent divided light.

Mr. Murch stated that it was a permanent divided light.

Chairman Rice asked if he had added the skylights in there recently.

Mr. Murch said no he did not. He had replaced them prior to this petition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the photograph they had was before he did the work.

Mr. Murch said it was; that is what it looked like before they bought the house.

Chairman Rice asked if there were any comments.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

## **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Katz made a motion to approve this application as presented and it was seconded by Mr. Raynolds.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a unanimous vote.

---

5. Petition of **Jamer Realty, Inc., owner**, for property located at **80 Hanover Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (fenced-in deck with awning, retaining wall and planting bed) and exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate entry door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 2-1 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

## **SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE PETITION**

Rob Harbison, of DeStefano Architecture, speaking on behalf of this petition. He stated that the first sheets of the packet were showing the location of the site. The application is for a raised patio area, renovations to the entryway and a fence along the far exterior of the building which would be temporary structures taken down in the winter months. The second page shows a photo from the corner of Hanover and Fleet Streets. On the right of the sheet it showed the proposed fence and raised patio. The third sheet was a plan of the proposed changes. The right of the sheet showed the retaining wall and a small planting bed along with the patio area. The bottom right hand corner of the plan showed the 2 by 2 aluminum posts that will support the awning above and the bar. On the left of the plan was an existing entry door which was going to change but be identical to the existing. He stated that on the left they would be adding a new entry door and a planting bed in front of what was now Shalimar. On sheet 4 the photo shows the existing entry and on the right is the proposed entry with a



new door and the fence. Sheet 5 and 6 show the fence posts with a concrete pier to allow the fence to be removed during the winter months. The fence was going to be 4' by 6' with an open lattice. The 15' length of the retaining wall is the maximum and as you approach the entry way it decreases to 0. The right hand side shows the elevation of the fence and retaining wall. Sheet 6 shows an elevation of the proposed bar and awning. The bar has raised wood panels on it with oak plywood and 2 stainless steel shelves with an acrylic fiber heavy weight awning above. The side elevation shows the cabinetry associated with the bar. The last 3 sheets are the shop drawings of the awning with posts and the last sheet is the retaining wall and concrete walk.

Chairman Rice asked if the bar area disappears in the winter.

Mr. Harbison stated that anything associated with the bar will be put away in the winter months.

Ms. Fineberg assumed the base of the fence and the little wall would remain.

Mr. Harbison stated that the little wall stays along with the raised patio, concrete walk and planting bed.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the sleeves stick up above the height of the wall.

Mr. Harbison said that it is not their intention for the sleeves to stick up above the height of the wall.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the awning had a side to it.

Mr. Harbison stated that the awning has two sides to it.

Ms. Fineberg asked if the valance moves or is rigid.

Mr. Harbison stated that it moves.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked Mr. Murch to convince him it was not a plastic awning.

Mr. Harbison stated he would pass around a sample of the awning fabric.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked Chairman Rice about his interest in the seasonal nature of the bar and they could describe it as temporary by taking it down once every 7 years.

Chairman Rice's concern was that there would be an unsightly superstructure out there in January and agreed that there should be some time for it to be up there.

Mr. Harbison stated that it was not in the interest of the owner to have it up during the winter because it blocks the entry to his property. He said if the board wanted to specify months it would be up that was acceptable to him.

Ms. Fineberg stated that it could come down on November 1<sup>st</sup> and then back up April 1<sup>st</sup> if that sounded reasonable.

Mr. Harbison said they would accept that.

Chairman Rice stated that if Mr. Harbison felt it was arbitrary the Commission had stipulated this with other applications.

Ms. Dika said that the applicant could ask for an amendment of the dates if he was not happy with them.

Vice-Chairman Adams felt that all the Commission was interested in was that it was not left out to look abandoned.

Chairman Rice stated that down the road they may want to add a new brick walk go in instead of a concrete one.

Ms. Fineberg felt this would help dress up this building.

Mr. Katz wanted reassurance that the retaining wall extended in front of Shalimar.

Mr. Harbison stated that it would.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to approve this application as presented with the stipulation that the temporary structures be taken down by November 1<sup>st</sup> and re-assembled on April 1<sup>st</sup> and Mr. Golumb seconded the motion.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a unanimous vote.

---

6. Petition of **Marcy Street Investments, owner and Win Rhoades, applicant** for property located at **359 Marcy Street** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (enlarge and replace existing front windows, add shutters and replace sign). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 26 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

### **SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE PETITION**

David Witham speaking on behalf of Win Rhodes. He stated that they were there last month at a work session. He felt that sheet 2-f worked better even though the Commission liked Scheme g at the work session. Scheme f showed the window trim on the second floor and the support for the roof structure as well. They were proposing 2 double hung windows on the first level with more commercial style picture windows rather than traditional style. The trim details were noted on the detail sheet. The same trim that is on the doors will be used on the windows. There is a 5" overhang on the door which will also be kept on the windows which would give a 10" separation and that determined the width of the panes. There are 3 windows on the second floor which would have wooden shutters.

Chairman Rice asked if anything new was being added to the side of the building. He asked if the Commission still had an issue with Scheme f and liked Scheme g.

Ms. Dika decided she liked Scheme f better.

Mr. Golumb was having trouble with the trim. He felt that it was heavy.

Mr. Witham said that the older photographs that he used as an example had narrower trim and the new drawings lost that pattern and he liked the old ones with the wide sign across the front.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why Scheme g had separate roofs.

Mr. Witham stated that he wanted a consistent overhang with the door.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the band on Scheme f ran straight across.

Mr. Witham said it steps back from the window.

Vice-Chairman Adams explained that the hood of the door projects more than the hood of the window.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if he would be replacing any of the crown moldings on the door.

Mr. Witham stated he was not but he would be tying into that.

Vice-Chairman Adams stated it was probably just a gutter mold anyway. He agreed with the prior work session comments of it having an appearance of being heavy. He liked Scheme f and felt that the wider casings were inappropriate however render a solidity to the projecting windows.

Mr. Katz stated that as long as the treatment was historically appropriate he would have no problem accepting Scheme f.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

## **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve Scheme f of the application as presented which was seconded by Ms. Dika.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a unanimous vote.

---

7. Petition of **Mitchell Manin and Joyce Believue, owners** for property located at **296 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows and remove storm windows). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109, Lot 19-6 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE PETITION**

Joyce Believue, owner, spoke on behalf of the application. She stated they would like to replace the existing windows in their condominium at 296 Pleasant Street which were ancient. Some of them dated back to the original structure which was built in 1828. They would like to replace the sash windows with thermal pane with true divided light. In the specifications they provided, the exterior is currently black so there would be a black thermal covering on the outside of the window.

Chairman Rice asked if the size of the lights of glass match the lights that are currently there.

Ms. Believue stated that they would be the same as they were currently with the 6 over 6 proportioned in the same manner.

Chairman Rice stated that he would not like to see the panes on her unit smaller than the other units.

Ms. Believue stated that they wanted them the same also.

Mr. Katz stated that this was a sash replacement not a window replacement.

Mr. Wyckoff stated they did look smaller though.

Vice-Chairman Adams said that these would be nearly identical. This was a much lighter more sash related approach.

Mr. Wyckoff asked how it worked with the condominium association where they are a unit that would be different.

Ms. Believue explained that she had already discussed it with the association and everyone was fine with it and other unit owners were interested in doing the exact same thing.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if she was just changing her unit and did not know which one was hers. He noted that on the rear of the building there was a small 4 over 4 set of sash.

Ms. Believue stated that she was just changing her unit and there was a small 4 over 4 sash which would be replaced by the same.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if she was going to change the size of that window or leave it in the fore shortened condition it was in now.

Ms. Believue said she would be leaving it in the same size. She didn't think it was shorter.

Vice-Chairman Adams said that it had a blocking at the top and a blocking at the bottom. He thought the window had been made shorter by about 14" over the years.

Ms. Believue said that he was right.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if she intended to change the side lights of the front door.

Ms. Believue stated she did not.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if she was going to change the cellar sash unit.

Ms. Believue stated she would not be changing it.

Vice-Chairman Adams verified that all the sashes would be changed to 4 over 4 and 6 over 6 as they were currently.

Ms. Believue stated they would all be changed the same.

Vice-Chairman Adams asked if there would be any changes to the casings, sills or windows other than the removal of the storm windows.

Ms. Believue stated they would just be doing repair work.

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

Seeing no one rise, the Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Vice-Chairman Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented with the addition of a blanket approval for all the other windows in the building to be replaced with the same pattern and manufacturer, getting whatever building permits necessary and allowing all the other units to have a previously approved replacement window. This will allow everyone to make plans and know what kind of window to use which will be matching and streamline the process for the other residence.

The motion with the amendment was seconded by Ms. Fineberg.

Chairman Rice asked for all those in favor and the motion passed by a unanimous vote.

---

### **III. WORK SESSIONS**

A) Work Session requested by **Dilorenzo Real Estate, LLC, owner** for property located at **33 Bow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace existing solarium at the roof with a new structure) and to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (Renovate existing wood frame addition at north elevation) Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106, as Lot 48 and lies within the Central Business A, Downtown Overlay, and Historic A Districts. *This work session was tabled at the March 1, 2006 meeting.*

- Steve McHenry from McHenry Architecture spoke on behalf of the application. He stated that they did have one work session on this project. The information from that work session was included in this packet as well. He stated that the first several pages were of the existing conditions so he would not go over them again. Page 4 and 5 were existing conditions with straight on elevation views that were also included in the last packet. He would like to review the areas of agreement from the last time and areas that were changed in this latest version. Pages 6, 7 and 8 were options A and B and page 8 showed the rear additions with the curved balcony which was acceptable to the

Commission. The general massing of the one story addition with the hip roof to replace the solarium which was there now had the Commission's general support. He stated that they changed the configuration, the alignment and the type which were on the rear elevation to the Commission's satisfaction with a few exceptions. It was generally agreed by the Commission that the use of brick on the top addition was not the path to take. There was some question on the rear addition which was now wood framed as to whether it would be appropriate in the brick treatment shown in Option B or some other treatment. He said he brought an example of the thin brick material that he was researching because it was real brick material but would be applied differently. He was concerned with trying to add too much weight to the top floor to be in compliance with seismic regulations by code. He stated that they have had structural engineers looking at it to see what it would carry and they highly recommend the thin brick system. He stated that it was agreed at the prior meeting that they would keep the heavy white band at the eave line as a break between the old building and the new. It was discussed at the last meeting of whether it would be possible to replicate the brick type and mortar joint configuration of the old building. He stated that in his research so far it was possible to get a water stuck brick that was cut thin and applied and mentioned that it was far more expensive. He felt that it would not be possible to match the brick that exists now. He stated that if they were able to match it, it would be so time consuming that it would not be worth it. He felt that if they could not really match it there would be some break between the old and the new. They did not want to confuse the visual of the building by adding something new that was so like the old. He felt the history of the building gets lost when you add too much that replicates the old. He referenced option C and noted what they changed for the Commission's consideration. On Page 9 the chimney location and eave line runs continually which was suggested. Page 10 shows different views of the rear elevation. The biggest balcony with the bow curve on it was too wide so they brought in the balcony on either side about a foot. The support of the balcony was too heavy and not consistent with the other balconies seen on Ceres Street so they changed it to show ornamental support brackets for that balcony shape. There was concern for the balconette above but he felt this treatment was not uncommon and the owner liked it a lot so they kept it in there for the Commission's review. They did however change the window muntin pattern to be consistent with the other windows on the rear of the building. On the prior plans there was a different treatment for that balcony only. He stated that those were the general issues that were up from last time. He noted option C to show a broad approach to changing the rear elevation addition to some other siding instead of brick such as clapboard wood siding. He explained that they were leaning this way because he did not have a lot of faith in the thin brick system that extended 4 stories on a highly exposed façade. He felt it was a highly exposed façade that would be taking a real beating. He explained that a real brick treatment would take a new foundation and extend the side beyond what was there now or they would have to do an entire replacement of the new addition. He noted that there was a wood clapboard building on the left so there was some precedence for doing this.

- Ms. Dika felt she liked the clapboard better. She was concerned with using something that would weather over time. She preferred to go with something tried and true.
- Mr. McHenry stated that they would be butting up against the brick where there are uneven treatments so it would not match properly by putting in brick.
- Ms. Fineberg was concerned about the thin brick going on the top which did not tie in to anything else on the building. She felt it might look odd as being the only brick that was different.
- Mr. McHenry felt that it was 2 generations of changes to the building that aren't consistent. He believed that was something you see in the evolution of old buildings.
- Mr. Golumb said the alternative might be a clapboard top.
- Mr. McHenry thought that would be a real jarring solution.

- Ms. Fineberg felt it would not be appropriate for this type of roof and thought a different type of finish for the top may work.
- Mr. McHenry asked if she meant a different shape of roof.
- Ms. Fineberg said yes; but she did not want to open a can of worms. She felt they were at the early stages.
- Mr. McHenry said that one of the discussions last time was why they were using a hip roof and they did look at a gable end treatment only it became a 6 story structure at that end and it looked like it was going to tip over. The hip roof allowed them to keep the eave line low with a low pitch so it doesn't look too tall in perspective with the other buildings and allows a flat paved place in the middle where they can recess mechanical equipment from view. He noted the photo on the second page which showed a large piece of mechanical equipment jutting out onto the sidewalk.
- Ms. Fineberg stated she appreciated that and stated she did like the moving chimney but she was still concerned about the brick facing on the top and clapboards on the back.
- Chairman Rice felt that if they went with clapboard on the top it would give it a tenement type of look, when they had a formal presentation that anchored the corner and it would create a nice gateway to Ceres Street. He was concerned with all the glass in the back of the building when it was brick but when it becomes clapboard he liked it better. He had trouble with the balconette.
- Mr. McHenry said it was working from the inside out. They added what they could to the rear addition. It was where they put the plumbing because they didn't want to interfere with the old building. The outside was determined by the rooms and what they wanted on the inside.
- Mr. Wyckoff said there was no trim around the windows, no casings or corner boards to speak of but when they were using clapboard siding they would have to consider corner boards.
- Mr. Golumb asked where the fire escape was going.
- Mr. McHenry said they would be taking it out.
- Mr. Golumb asked what he was doing for egress.
- Mr. McHenry said it was one residence from the second floor up so they were not required to have a second egress.
- Vice-Chairman Adams felt that the mass of the additional to the top was so much like the building and it requires it to be of a consistent material with the rest of the building while they were understanding the applicant's explanation of the materials and recognized that it is not going to be more of the existing masonry work. He would like to see an elevation up Penhallow Street so he can see it in scale with the buildings on either end so they could see it as a gateway to Ceres Street and see if it works. He was hoping something besides clapboard could be found for the back. He felt it looked hap- hazard when it is just an addition of the building that is covered.
- Mr. McHenry believed that the bands of trim would break it up along with using trim around it with a rustic base. He could not imagine using a different type of material such as metal or stucco.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if real cement stucco would work.
- Mr. Katz thought that the clapboard attached to masonry would look like a tenement style addition.
- Mr. McHenry said this was not a new problem.
- Chairman Rice thought the banding made it look nice but it wouldn't be seen on someone's clapboard wall.
- Mr. Katz asked what about the idea of stucco.
- Mr. Wyckoff said wood would have things growing on it after 10 years as opposed to ethos.
- Vice-Chairman Adams did not think ethos would work in this pedestrian zone.
- Ms. Dika was concerned about something going up there that could be easily maintained. She believed the quality of the workmanship was important so she was concerned about something that could not hold up to aging.

- Mr. Katz stated that there were 4 stories and clapboard does not lend itself to solidity where brick, stone and stucco do.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he liked the brackets under the balcony.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said that he was supportive of what was being done and felt it would be a benefit but would like to see a solid material.

B) Work Session requested by **Perry Silverstein Revocable Trust 2001, owner** for property located at **10 Commercial Alley** and **Perry Silverstein and Kristin Magnus, owners** for property located at **Penhallow Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (addition extending into adjacent vacant lot). Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 9 and 10 and lie within the Central Business B, Downtown Overlay, and Historic A Districts. *This work session was tabled at the March 1, 2006 meeting.*

- A motion to take this off the table was made by John Golumb and seconded by Richard Katz and all were in favor.
- Tony Fallon, architect, for Perry Sylverstein, owner, spoke in favor of the application. He noted drawings on the computer and pointed out different buildings. He stated that the location was on Commercial Alley and they would be making an addition to the coffee shop. Page 2 shows the coffee shop on the right side of the building and noted the proposed building. He pointed out the parking and where Penhallow Street was. He noted that on page 20 it showed a section of the new building looking down Commercial Alley which cuts into the existing building and noted the French doors into the addition of the coffee shop. He stated that the section was through the existing building with a coffee shop on the first floor, an office on the second and a residence on the third. Mr. Fallon noted that on the right there was a roof topped area with a deck that has been discussed at prior work sessions. He stated that there would be a similar deck on the other end of the roof area.
- Mr. Golumb asked if he could start with a different page.
- Chairman Rice asked where they were on the picture.
- Mr. Golumb could not see where they were filling in or going out.
- Mr. Fallon said they were standing in the alleyway looking toward Penhallow, however, stated he would reference another picture. The cover sheet described it best. He noted the existing on the lower right and then pointed out the proposed.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the existing building had a shed roof on it.
- Mr. Fallon stated that it did.
- Mr. Fallon pointed out the proposed new building on Penhallow Street.
- Chairman Rice said that the roof looked odd.
- Mr. Fallon said that it was a simple shed roof but it was a combination of filling the open area on the property and the roof.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if it had any right angles at all.
- Mr. Fallon said only from the eave up to the top of the roof. He referenced the back corner where there was a right angle and that was it.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if proposing a shed roof was causing difficulties. He said that they do not have a lot to go by for historical material. He asked if the shed roof was just going to take off on a non-square building.
- Mr. Fallon said that the shed roof was the most practical thing to do and it was something simple and was in keeping with the rest of the area.
- Mr. Wyckoff thought the shed roof was too large and he did not like the skylights.



- Mr. Fallon said they were trying to keep with what was in the neighborhood. There was a concept of it being a loft overhead. He showed different views of the proposed addition on the computer.
- Ms. Dika said it was helping her visualize it.
- Mr. Katz was trying to figure the extreme roof angle in the lower right. He thought none of the other 3 seemed as extreme as that one.
- Mr. Fallon said they were looking at the rhombus.
- Mr. Katz asked who would see this.
- Mr. Fallon said no one. It was what you would see from above. He explained the plans to the Commission.
- Chairman Rice thought there would be some detail issues on the end of the building with balconies.
- Mr. Fallon said there was a lot of details that needed to be worked out and are subject to change.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if there would be windows on the left-hand side.
- Mr. Fallon said the ridge rises as it goes back.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked why there was nothing on the first floor facing Penhallow Street.
- Mr. Fallon said that was going to be parking and retail.
- Chairman Rice asked if you would see the roof if you were standing on Commercial Alley.
- Mr. Fallon said you would not see it. He noted where the addition was going to be put on the coffee shop with a couple of display windows and a marquis above it with 5 sign lights and a single entryway in between and brick between the display windows and the door. He referenced the box bay and a proposed railing on top of the box bay and the swinging French doors. The windows were going to be the Anderson 400 Series with white vinyl cladding two inches back from the masonry with granite heads and granite sills. The roof is made with architectural shingled asphalt.
- Mr. Katz asked what the roof pitches were.
- Mr. Fallon said 5 and 12 were the proposed. The existing one is 6.8 and 12.
- Mr. Katz asked if most of that roof would disappear.
- Mr. Fallon said that it would.
- Mr. Wyckoff said it looked like it would pitch a lot of water onto the storefront.
- Mr. Sylverstein said there was a copper gutter running across the front.
- Mr. Wyckoff said that copper gutter would freeze up and have icicles hanging from it. He felt there was no building that had this much of a roof, but this probably had nothing to do with this Commission.
- Chairman Rice asked if there were comments on the massing.
- Mr. Katz said he was not against the concept but would like to see it a little further along.
- Ms. Fineberg said they had 2 choices, they could make something of that and have him accentuate that or add something to the side of the building which was facing Penhallow Street which was really the façade.
- Vice-Chairman Adams suggested having some recessed filled in windows to give some shadow balance.
- Mr. Fallon thought the cars in the parking area would be right up to the front and Mr. Sylverstein had mentioned a period gate which could be used as an appliques to create balance.
- Vice-Chairman Adams felt it went up too many floors and down too many floors which looks heavy and inappropriate.
- Mr. Golumb felt that it looks like the addition should be in the rear.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said the side that faces Commercial Alley had an appropriate 3 story façade and felt it was a wonderful addition adding to the street. He felt the Commission would like to see

another front on the building than what they were proposing. It was not what the Commission typically accepted as the front of a commercial building.

- Mr. Golumb said that there was a fence hiding the storefront currently and he felt that it needs something there.
- Chairman Rice said that the asphalt space for cars was driving the architecture which made it not people friendly.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said going with the shed gable end with the file of doors and windows had great drama to it. He said he could see the value in the shed but there needed to be something less or more with the balconies and such.
- Mr. Sylverstein said that the balcony he proposed was his idea and he thought they were similar to prior ones approved by the Historic Commission.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said that the reason that type of balcony was approved was because he thought something was going to be built on the lot in front of it so it would not be seen.
- Ms. Dika asked Mr. Sylverstein what the interior space was going to be on that end of the building.
- Mr. Sylverstein said the first floor would be retail, the second would be office and the third would be an apartment.
- Chairman Rice said that he had enough suggestions from the Commission to come back for another work session.
- Mr. Fallon said they were trying to fit with the other buildings.
- Chairman Rice said they agreed with him.
- Mr. Katz said that the box bay might bring in a lot of objections. It was adding some interest where it was not necessary.

C) Work Session requested by **March Twenty Two, LLC, owner** for property located at **58 State Street** wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (4-story, mixed use). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts. *This work session was tabled at the March 1, 2006 meeting.*

- A motion to take this off the table was made by Vice-Chairman Adams and was seconded by Mr. Golumb and all were in favor.
- Jen Ramsey spoke on behalf of the application. She said she would just focus on the end details because a lot of it was presented at the last work session. The request from the Commission last month was that they needed to have 3 perspectives and also needed to make the dormers smaller. The smaller dormers were shown on the first page. Page 2 was a perspective from the previous meeting however they have added awnings and accentuated the firewalls and added some chimneys. Page 3 is another view of the property from State Street which shows the smaller dormers as requested and they were pushed back.
- Chairman Rice stated he liked them pushed back.
- Ms. Ramsey said that these dormers would be similar in size to the ones on the Warner House.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the dormer sash was the same size as the third floor sash.
- Ms. Ramsey said yes the same window. The State Street elevation shows the only change to the awnings which were dashed in. There were awnings over the door and the two double hung as well as over the residential access and also over the two double hung and a fourth awning over the picture window and entry door. There were four awnings across the front of the building. The side elevation is going to be similar to what already exists with a single opening which looks like it has recessed brick and a pitch that will stay the same along with an addition off the back which was a previously approved portion from 2 years ago. She stated they were going to use a closed shutter

detail on the back side. The back elevation was a point of discussion last month. The back elevation showed the entire back of the building and showed what was seen from the Court Street side. She also brought the 449 Court Street package so they could go through and see what was approved. She showed a picture of what the elevation would look like when it was complete. Page 6 was a perspective view of the building from Court Street showing the various buildings around it. She also had a plan which included a section to show how the decks beyond step. She noted the infill building and the area beyond the rebuilt 58 State Street with its clapboard addition with the stepping decks.

- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the new building was deeper than the reconstructed building.
- Ms. Ramsey stated that the new building is no deeper than it currently exists and then the infill piece is slightly deeper.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if that was why you could see a different height in the ridge line.
- Ms. Ramsey said exactly because they were keeping the 8/12 pitch. Page 8 was the last crucial sheet showing the shed dormer, keeping it small and blowing in insulation. The width of the dormers are 3' 10 1/2" which was keeping it minimal. She referenced the side view from the deck at 46 Court Street and explained that they were doing a similar recessed brick to imitate that a window was there and it got infilled and a taller rail system to maintain the neighbors privacy as well.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked that the awning windows were removed from the store front.
- Ms. Ramsey mentioned they did remove the upper transoms but maintained them over the doors to retain window head height across. The awnings will detour seeing them.
- Mr. Wyckoff said the back of the new building was much simpler than it was.
- Ms. Fineberg asked what the windows on the ground floor were going to be.
- Ms. Ramsey stated they were going to be a closed shutter detail and there was parking below.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked Ms. Ramsey to walk through the storefront conditions on sheet 4. He noted that there was a band installed for signage made of some sort of synthetic material which will be flashed into the brick above. He said that below that were windows linked to it in a recessed masonry opening.
- Ms. Ramsey stated that was correct with awnings in front of them.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the awnings were retractable.
- Ms. Ramsey said this was something she was going to ask the Commission.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said that they do not like the arch topped ones.
- Ms. Ramsey said these would be simple and made of canvas.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said they like the shed pitch with a little dressing valance at the bottom and having some semblance of being flexible. Small ones have sides to them but crank out large ones do not.
- Ms. Ramsey said these awnings could be without sides and retractable and they will bring a sample with them next time.
- Mr. Wyckoff felt the Simpson wood entry door on the store front which was a two panel door was inappropriate. Usually there was a two panel door with a light above.
- Ms. Ramsey said that would be the perspective she would be bring in with a small lower panel and a taller glass panel above.
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated that the sashes on the front were different than anywhere else on the building but the width was the same.
- Ms. Ramsey said the widths were the same, they were just taller.
- Vice-Chairman Adams said they were keyed vertically.
- Ms. Ramsey said that essentially they were.

- Vice-Chairman Adams asked how the squished together pieces would work.
  - Ms. Ramsey said there would be stud pockets so they would have 3 ½ inches between of trim.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams asked how far back from the masonry walls they would be setting.
  - Ms. Ramsey indicated they would be about 4” back with a little brick sill piece. She asked Vice-Chairman Adams if they would like them to be recessed a little more.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams said there was a strong tradition for heavy wood sills which was actually a sub sill with a window sill set on top of it.
  - Ms. Ramsey said that there would also be flower boxes in front of them as well.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams said that flower boxes were out of the Historic Commission purview.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams asked if the masonry walls were below that.
  - Ms. Ramsey said yes there were walls below that.
  - Chairman Rice asked if they would be seeing a mock up of the brick.
  - Ms. Ramsey said she would be bringing in a sample of the brick and canvas for the awnings at the next month’s meeting.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams asked if there was any projection of the sign band.
  - Ms. Ramsey said there was not and there was a detail of that on page 5. There would be a 3” projection.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams asked if she was proposing to have brick behind it.
  - Ms. Ramsey said it depends on how the building was constructed and they further developed the drawings.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams said she was proposing a vinyl clad window and asked if they would consider aluminum-clad windows.
  - Ms. Ramsey said they were using the same Eagle windows they used for the 449 Court Street building and they did like the window and how it looked. It was a previously approved window.
  - Vice-Chairman Adams asked Ms. Ramsey to consider what Eagle window could do in an aluminum clad window.
- D) Work Session requested by **Jackie Thompson, owner** for property located at **139c South Street** wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (addition of master suite above existing sunroom and entry canopy for front door). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110, Lot 7 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.
- Rob Harbison from DeStefano Architects with Jackie Thompson, owner, speaking in favor of the application. He stated that the residence was part of a small condominium association near South Mill Pond. They were basically putting a small addition primarily on the second floor to add a master suite and expand an existing bedroom. He stated they were not changing the total number of bedrooms, however, they were adding a ¾ bath and a small entry canopy. The first sheet was a locus plan showing the site to the right of South Mill Pond. The first couple of sheets showed the condominium association from South Street. The next sheet showed the residence and located the area of the entry canopy and second floor addition they are proposing. The fourth sheet showed a different view from the direction of South Mill Pond back towards the residence. The addition they were proposing was on the second floor above the sunroom. The following photograph to the right showed the location of the small storage closet on the first floor of the backside. The back side slopes up steeply to a fence.
  - Ms. Dika asked if it was a recently sold stand alone condominium.

- Mr. Harbison stated it was. Page 5 showed the neighboring condominium buildings looking out towards South Street. The next sheet showed the residence looking back from South Street. He noted that the addition was not really visible from South Street.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked how far it was from South Street.
- Mr. Harbison said he did not know how many feet it was from South Street. He stated that it was the furthest back and around 100' from the pond. Page 7 showed a photo of the existing residence and a perspective of the entry canopy over the front door and the addition of the master bedroom to the second floor and to the right of the sunroom on the first level he noted the stairs up to the deck were gone and there was a solid wall where the storage closet would exist. Page 8 shows the front elevation before and after. He stated that the deck and trim associated with it would be removed and there would be a new entry canopy over the door and they would be adding trim to the front windows, bays and sliders matching the existing clapboard siding, trim and windows. Page 9 showed a small Juliet balcony off the end elevation. The stairs to the deck and the existing deck were being taken out along with the existing window and door on the second floor.
- Vice-Chairman Adams asked if that was the space they were capturing.
- Mr. Harbison said it was. He stated they would be bringing a band across at the change between the first and second floor to solve the problem of the top set of sliders being off center from the two lower sliders.
- Vice-Chairman Adams felt that this would not be acceptable to the Commission.
- Mr. Harbison said the last sheet shows the back elevation, the proposed dormer and the new balcony on the left side matching clapboard, windows and aligning ridge.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked how old the building was.
- Mr. Harbison stated that it was built in 1985. He stated that this project was approved by the condominium association.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were going to put trim on the original windows in the back.
- Mr. Harbison said they had not planned on putting window casings on but were going to dress up the end they were doing the new work on and the front elevation.
- Chairman Rice stated that on page 8 there was a non traditional way to adding the dormer to the roof that matches what was there.
- Vice-Chairman Adams found a balance in that. He stated that the new canopy over the entry way has a balancing feeling to it also.
- Mr. Wyckoff felt it was not balanced with the element below.
- Ms. Dika asked Vice-Chairman Adams about breaking the roof line.
- Vice-Chairman Adams stated that the heavy element that eliminates the roof edge was already there.
- Mr. Golumb stated he had an issue with the dormer breaking the ridge line.
- Ms. Fineberg felt that it was too narrow so it stood out.
- Mr. Harbison said they were trying to match the eave of the existing dormer which posed a difficult problem because they needed to get height for the window and if they did not break the lower roof line and move the eave up it would not match the existing dormer.
- Ms. Fineberg understood there was no easy solution to this.
- Mr. Katz stated that breaking the eave line is forgotten. He felt it was not appropriate to use that for this house because it would cause grief on the inside and that does drive some of these things.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked if it would effect the inside if they moved it over a foot and centered the slider. He also stated that they liked to see the corner board come down from the original structure but asked if it should be there now.

- Mr. Harbison explained that the reason the corner board was there was because there was a very slight change in the depth between the face of the existing building and the sunroom below. There is about an 8" difference. He stated that they would center the window.
  - Ms. Fineberg was concerned about the sliders on the front of the building.
  - Chairman Rice stated that they were already existing.
  - The Commission discussed the existing stairs and sliders which were added and not brought before the Historic Commission.
  - Chairman Rice asked if the windows on page 10 needed to be in casement.
  - Mr. Harbison said they all matched the existing.
- 

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairman Rice asked Roger Clum if the City was going to pay for the members of the Historic Commission to go to the Northeast Regional Preservation Leadership meeting and could he look into it.

Ms. Fineberg said that if you looked at the program Tuesday morning was the only day that pertained to them and asked if they could only go that day.

---

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:05 PM, a motion was made and seconded that the meeting be adjourned to the reconvened meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Corless  
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the August 2, 2006 Historic District Commission meeting.