

**MEETING OF THE  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
ONE JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**CONFERENCE ROOM "A"**

**7:00 p.m.**

**April 4, 2007  
to be reconvened April 11, 2007**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Sandra Dika, Vice-Chairman John Golumb; David Adams, Ellen Fineberg; Planning Board Representative Jerry Hejtmanek; and Alternates John Wyckoff and Elena Maltese

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** City Council Representative Edward Raynolds, Richard Katz

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

-----  
Chairman Dika introduced Ms. Elena Maltese, the newly appointed alternate to the Commission.

Chairman Dika also stated that a site walk was held prior to the meeting at 68 State Street.

**I. OLD BUSINESS**

A) Approval of minutes – March 7, 2007

It was moved, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes as presented.

B) Petition of **Fifty-Five Congress Street Condominium Association, owner, and Jim and Mary Weisheit, applicants**, for property located at **55 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (attach valance to exterior windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 9 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was approved at the March 14, 2007 meeting pending final approval of the valance design.)*

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Because the applicant was not present to speak to the petition, Mr. Adams made a motion to table the application to the end of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. The motion passed unanimously.

The applicant arrived during the public hearing of 7 Islington Street, LLC. At the conclusion of that public hearing, Vice Chairman Golumb made a motion to remove the application from the tabled status. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Jim Weisheit, the applicant, spoke to the petition. He stated that he has modified his original valance design to now include a straight edge valance with less signage on it. He said that the valance would be made of the same material and would be the same color. Mr. Weisheit also pointed out that he was planning to have the words Portsmouth Spa and Hair Care and Day Spa on the valance.

Chairman Dika asked if there were anymore questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

## **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as amended with the new valance design and signage. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golumb. The motion passed by a 6-1 vote with Mr. Wyckoff voting in opposition.

## **II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Petition of **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **7 Islington Street** and **40 Bridge Street** (to be consolidated), wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove northernmost wing of main structure and remove garage building at 7 Islington Street, remove existing building at 40 Bridge Street) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new 3-4 story mixed use building at 40 Bridge Street) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lots 51 and 52 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

## **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Steve McHenry of McHenry Architecture spoke to the application. He stated that this application was before them once again after being rejected. He pointed out that modifications have been made and that those modifications received favorable responses at last month's work session.

Mr. McHenry walked the Commission page by page through the proposal packet. The packet included context photos, removal elevations, perspective views, site plans, streetscape elevations, other elevations, profiles, floor plans, manufacturer cut sheets, and a material summary. He reminded the Commission that this proposal does not include the Tanner Street property as originally proposed.

Mr. McHenry pointed out that this was a difficult site and context to work with. He felt that this infill project responded well to the neighborhood that surrounds it. He said that the property was in the Central Business B district and abuts the Mixed Residential Office district. He said that the building was designed to fit into the area and not designed to draw attention to itself. It is a context building and meant to respond to a 19<sup>th</sup> century residential approach to housing.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. McHenry to review the modifications that were made to the original proposal. Mr. McHenry replied that the elevator has changed; the front doors have changed as well as the footprint in the rear of the building.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the doors would be custom, solid wood doors. Mr. McHenry replied yes. Mr. Wyckoff asked about the finish material around the relocated elevator tower. Mr. McHenry replied that it would be finished with a cementitious panel and a cement board trim. Mr. Adams asked if it was Mr. McHenry's intention to put louvered doors on the rear of the elevator tower.

Vice Chairman Golumb stated that he felt the changes made in the design have made a huge difference. He said that it was a very handsome building. He felt that the changes have addressed the monolithic nature of the building that was an issue before. He thought it was very respectful of the neighborhood. Vice Chairman Golumb asked if the mechanical units would be set back from the roof line. Mr. McHenry replied yes, that page 23 of the plans showed that. Vice Chairman Golumb asked if you would be able to see the units from various vantage points. Mr. McHenry replied that he did not think so since they sit on a 9" curb.

Mr. Adams asked how the shingled portions of the front angled surfaces will close. Mr. McHenry pointed out page 11. He said that the thought was to stagger the joints as they go down. He said that it was their hope to have the corners woven so it looked like a continuous surface. Mr. Wyckoff interjected that in order to weave shingles; the shingles have to be beveled. He did not think one was to cut hardi shingles. Mr. McHenry said that it was doable.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the back of the building. He said that the design shows a garage door. He asked if their plan was to cut off Tanner Street completely for access to the site. Mr. McHenry replied that they do not know what will happen with the Tanner Street lot. He said that the garage door was designed to be a workable gate but at the present time, they did not have an answer to that question.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the top floor doors that showed solid glass. She said that there were no divisions in them. She wondered if there were other options. Mr. McHenry replied that he had gone back and forth on it. He said that there are ways to create customized patterns to go into those doors. He felt that those doors are located on the short end elevations and the rear elevations. The front elevation doors are set back and so he felt it was an unnecessary barrier.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone had any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the petition.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Mr. Martin Burns of 288 Hanover Street spoke against the application. He stated that most of his property is on Tanner Street. He said that he was against the project because he felt it was too large and did not fit on Bridge Street. He stated that the buildings that are proposed to be either renovated or demolished are historic and should remain for that reason. He acknowledged that there has been a lot of effort and work on the project. Mr. Burns said that although there are big

buildings in the area like the Keefe House and the old library, they are not built right to the street like the proposed building would be.

Mr. John Conway, of 37 Tanner Street spoke next. He spoke in opposition to the project. He felt that it was a large structure and would tower over the houses behind it. He wondered where the parking for the condominium units would be. He felt that because there was a gate in the back of the property that led him to believe that there are plans for the Tanner Street property in the future. He also expressed concern about where the garbage receptacles would be placed.

Mr. Richard Maxfield of 53 Tanner Street spoke against the application. He felt that the size and scale was not appropriate for the lot. He pointed out that there was no green space. He did not think it fit historically or architecturally with the neighborhood. He thanked the Commission for considering the neighborhood in their decision.

Ms. Rebecca Conway of 37 Tanner Street stated that she had spoken at the previous meetings and continues to have the same concerns. She said that she had a concern that this size building will set a standard for the possibility of other buildings of that size being erected in the area. She felt she would be losing her privacy with the residential decks that would be facing her house. Ms. Conway also stated that she was concerned about possible increased traffic on Tanner Street. She wondered where people would park. Chairman Dika mentioned that the Commission does not deal with parking.

Attorney Paul McEachern, representing 7 Islington Street, LLC spoke in favor of the petition. He noted that this project has been before the Commission for one year. He stated that he was convinced that the Historic District Commission cannot look at buildings beyond the District lines. He reminded the Commission that an applicant could build a 60 foot structure on the Harbor Lights lot without having to come before the Commission. He felt that this proposal was an asset to the community.

Chairman Dika said that she felt that Attorney McEachern's comments about a 60 foot building sounded like a threat. Mr. McEachern responded that it was not intended to be a threat.

Chairman Dika asked if anyone else wished to speak to the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

## **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. Chairman Dika asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that with all of the work sessions that have been held, he felt that the applicant has addressed all of the items that were issues, specifically the mass of the building and the elevator tower. He said he felt the design was appropriate for the Central Business zone. He added that unfortunately, Tanner Street abuts the Central Business zone.

Mr. Hejtmanek stated that as the Planning Board representative, he was aware that the zoning ordinance allows a 60 foot building in that area. He felt the applicant has compromised significantly by reducing the size of the building. He also stated that although he was sympathetic to the residents on Tanner Street, he felt the Commission should not be considering the impacts of the project on Tanner Street because it is outside the Historic District.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a 6-1 vote with Mr. Adams voting in opposition.

\*\*\*\*\*

2. Petition of **68 State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **68 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove one story building) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new four and five story boutique hotel with covered parking and second floor roof deck) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 13 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

Chairman Dika stated that she would be recusing herself from this application.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Jen Ramsey, of Somma and architect for the project, spoke to the application. She mentioned that a site walk was held prior to the meeting.

Mr. Clum asked Ms. Ramsey if this project required any Board of Adjustment approvals with regard to open space and vehicles backing into the street. Ms. Ramsey's response was no.

Ms. Ramsey said that their proposal was for a five story building on State Street and a four story building on the Court Street side.

Ms. Ramsey began by explaining the State Street side. She said it would be a heavy granite storefront separated by a series of granite pilasters with wood frame storefront windows in between. There are two doors at grade on the State Street elevations. She said that the building would be brick and they have chosen the Old Port blend called red range. She added that this side of the building would have a snow guard on it with a series of dormers that run along the roof line. The windows would have awnings on them. The roof would be gambrel style with architectural asphalt shingles. She pointed out that the elevator override might be visible from the municipal parking lot. She said that the building height is 50 feet tall from the average grade.

The Court Street portion of the building will be clapboards. There is one door at grade level. She pointed out that the carriage style garage door was basically for aesthetics and would eventually be used to house a transformer. One the second floor there would be a wooden window bay that is centered over the carriage door. The windows have shutters on them but no awnings. She stated that they would be using the historic 3 1/2" corner boards. There are brick chimneys with the structure and a firewall to the right side.

Ms. Ramsey said that the interior courtyard elevation is on the second floor of the structure. She pointed out that the right side of the structure shows what looks like windows with closed shutters details to dress that side up a bit. The row of windows on the third story have awnings on them to dress up the inside courtyard. Above that are shed dormers.

Ms. Ramsey stated that they would be eliminating the proposed covered parking from the application. She added that there would be some balconettes on the fourth floor.

Mr. Adams asked how the granite would be joined up. Ms. Ramsey said that was a detail they would have to develop but it would be sections of stone going up.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out that they are doing a closed shutter detail to imply a window where they cannot have openings. She also showed the Juliette balcony that is one foot off of the face of the building.

Ms. Ramsey explained that the elevator override would extend 2 feet, 10 inches above the ridge line of the roof. She said they would be capping it in some simple eave trim.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out that the window and door schedules were included in the packet. She said the windows would be Eagle clad aluminum windows with divided light and the doors would be of solid wood construction.

She also pointed out that page 12 was a context elevation showing the proposed building in context with another building on the street, the Matthew Marsh house. She said the eave line of the proposed building was slightly lower than the eave line of the Marsh house.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out that they also submitted spec sheets on snow guards. She also showed samples of brick and granite. As for the roof, the color had not been chosen yet but she thought it would be shades of brown.

Ms. Ramsey submitted a letter from all of the abutters of the property stating that they were in favor of the project. She also said that a Strawberry Banke representative had been present to speak but had to leave for another commitment.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if there were questions for the applicant.

Mr. Wyckoff asked why such a wide window was chosen that was out of character with the traditional windows. Ms. Ramsey replied that they were looking for variety on the elevation. She also said that the large windows reflect something that is happening in the plan beyond relating to the guest room layout.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he had a concern with door surrounds that are built with shallow material. He felt that it was a little shallow. He said that because of its location on Court Street, it should be appropriately sized. Ms. Ramsey replied that she could make it 5”.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if there were current streetscapes to review. Ms. Ramsey replied that they did not have time to revise the rendering but she said that she could submit it for final approval.

Mr. Clum stated that if the Commission wishes to approve something, then the Commission needs to see it. He suggested that they postpone the application until a streetscape is submitted. Mr. Adams pointed out that they have seen the streetscape, it was just not in this packet. Mr. Clum also suggested that the Commission could approve the application with the stipulation that a streetscape be submitted.

Ms. Ramsey pointed out the changes from the previous streetscape – heavier banding, more glass at the base, shutters were removed for awnings, and changes to the dormers. She added that they have brought the overall height down by 1 foot, 10 inches.

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to table the application until the next meeting, April 11, for submittal of a final rendering of all of the changes. Mr. Wyckoff added that he would like the applicant to rework the door surround on the Court Street side. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Mr. Clum reminded that there was a tabling motion on the floor.

Ms. Fineberg withdrew her tabling motion until after the public had a chance to speak. Mr. Wyckoff withdrew his second.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application.

### **SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION**

Mr. Jerry Stallbach, general manager of The Rosa Restaurant for the past 20 years spoke in favor of the application. He said that over the last 20 years he has seen great improvement on State Street, Market Street, and Court Street. He felt that this project could only enhance his business and visibility. He added that The Rosa has been there for 80 years and he hoped that with this project, they can stay another 80 years.

Mr. Dick Duchard, of the Portsmouth Advocates, also spoke in favor of the application. He said that he was impressed with the design and thought it was attractive. He felt that it fit into the character of that part of the City.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if anyone else from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he declared the public hearing closed.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Ms. Fineberg made a motion to table the application until the April 11, 2007 so that final renderings of the streetscape that accurately reflect the current changes, and the revision of the entry door can be submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

3. Petition of **J.H. Sanders 1986 Revocable Trust, owner, and Pickering Marine Corporation, applicant**, for property located at **30 Walden Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing dock and retaining wall, replace with new dock and retaining wall with rip rap) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 101 as Lot 18 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Glenn Normandeau of Pickering Marine Corporation and Mr. Jim Sanders, owner of the property spoke to the petition. Mr. Normandeau stated that the dock and retaining wall were deteriorating. He said that they have gotten approval from other boards and have since found out that they needed approval from the Historic District Commission. He pointed out that in the packet that was submitted, there was a location map, a tax map, a set of photos showing the existing condition of the dock and retaining wall, and views of the existing, with the plan view of the proposed plan. Mr. Normandeau said that they would like to remove the retaining wall and replace it with rip rap. He said he was proposing a typical timber pier 30 feet in length with an aluminum gangway. He said that the retaining wall is 5 feet high and so the rip rap may be about an 8 foot slope back of rock. Mr. Normandeau pointed out that the wetlands bureau is not fond of retaining walls and prefers rock.

Chairman Dika asked Mr. Normandeau to explain rip rap. Mr. Normandeau replied that rip rap is rock on a slope. He explained that they would be taking out the retaining wall; the ground would be sloped back at a 1 to 1 slope with a trench at the toe. They will place a filter fabric in it that will retain all of the fines behind the rock. He said the slope would be covered with stone and the toe stones would be covered up so that the first rows of rocks are below grade so that the rock does not slide down over time.

Chairman Dika asked if there were environmental reasons why this was a superior option. Mr. Normandeau replied yes, that it does not reflect wave energy like vertical walls do, it gives nice little gaps for sea life to hide in, and it is a better substrate for seaweed and algae to grow on.

Mr. Adams asked if they would drive piles and wondered if there were hard bottoms there. Mr. Normandeau did not see a problem with that. He said that the piles would be cross braced. Mr. Adams asked if they would be pulling back the lawn to make the slope. Mr. Normandeau replied yes.

Ms. Fineberg asked about the existing fence and if it would remain. Mr. Normandeau replied probably not.



Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

4. Petition of **Catherine Stone Revocable Living Trust, owner**, for property located at **160 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace window with larger window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 9 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Catherine Stone stated that she would like to replace a window in her kitchen. She said that the change would let more light into the room, it would be easier to open, and it would match the existing windows on the adjacent porch wall.

Mr. Adams asked if the side casings and sills would be similar to the other windows. Ms. Stone replied yes. Mr. Adams asked if it would be centered on the wall. Ms. Stone replied it would be centered where the existing window was now.

Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

5. Petition of **Jeannette E. Hopkins Trust, owner**, for property located at **39 Pray Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (one story rear addition attached to existing ell and kitchen bay, window changes to ell and bay) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 38 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project, spoke to the petition. She pointed out that they had a work session last month. The project consisted of adding a one story addition onto the back of the house, between the existing ell and a kitchen bay. The addition will have a hip roof that will tie into both of the bay and the ell. She said that she was proposing to use a Marvin fiberglass window with simulated divided light. She added that they would be reusing the existing six panel door on the courtyard elevation. Also on the courtyard elevation, there will be two windows and a skylight. Ms. Whitney said that on the rear elevation, the existing windows would be replaced with two casement windows of the same size. They plan to keep one of the skylights as well. On the kitchen bay side, they will moving the existing windows closer together. She added that the clapboards, corner boards, and roofing material would all remain the same as the existing house.

Ms. Fineberg was curious about the single second story window on the rear of the house. Ms. Whitney felt one that one of the reasons it was a lone window was because there are massive chimney fireplaces on both sides of it.

Chairman Dika asked if the date of the house was known. Ms. Whitney replied that she did not know what it was.

Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fineberg. Chairman Dika asked if there was discussion.

Mr. Adams commented that he recognized that this addition was a tough fit. He did not feel that the addition would bring irreparable harm to the historic district. He just felt it was an odd way of going about it but he understood the applicant’s requirements and the close proximity to the neighboring house.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

6. Petition of **Nicholas R. Aeschliman Trust, owner**, for property located at **314 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace window with new door, steps, and landing, new fence at right front yard, relocate and enclose existing HVAC condenser, enclose rear trash receptacle) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 6 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project, and Lee Aeschliman, owner, spoke to the application. Ms. Whitney stated that on the Middle Street elevation, there are proposing a door in place of the window that is currently there. The door she was proposing would be an eight light Simpson fir door. Ms. Whitney stated that the door would not be a full three foot door as she was trying to work with the window opening. She pointed out that she had to offset the steps in order to avoid having to go for a variance because it would be in the 10 foot setback. She added that the area would be finished off with a fence that would create a small courtyard. Ms. Whitney also pointed out that an AC condenser currently sits below the window so they plan to relocate the condenser to the rear of the building. They will build two equal sized enclosures, one to house the condenser and the other to house the trash receptacles. She concluded by saying that the fence would be a continuation of the neighbor’s fence.

Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had any questions for Ms. Whitney.

Vice Chairman Golumb asked if the fence would be flush to the ground like the other fence. Ms. Whitney replied that she likes to leave a couple inches from the ground to allow for the weather.

Mr. Hejtmanek asked if the new door was visible from the street. Ms. Whitney replied yes. Mr. Hejtmanek asked if she thought the Board of Adjustment would not grant her a variance. Ms. Whitney replied that they probably would have, it was just a judgment call on her part. She felt it was a minor issue. Chairman Dika asked that if the Commission found that part of the application objectionable, would she be willing to go to the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Whitney replied yes.

Vice Chairman Golumb stated that it was more appropriate to have the fence flush with the ground. Ms. Whitney replied that she was agreeable to that.

Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Vice Chairman Golumb made a motion to approve the application as presented with the stipulation that the fence be flush to the ground when installed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

- 7. Petition of **Michael Stasiuk, owner**, for property located at **41 Dearborn Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove all windows, eliminate three windows, replace with new windows) as per plans on file in the

Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 140 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Mr. Michael Stasiuk, owner of the property, spoke to the application. He stated that the house is an income property for him. He said that he has lived next door to the house for twenty one years. He added that his elderly parents would be moving into the house. The windows changes are an upgrade for them. Mr. Stasiuk pointed out that some windows would be eliminated to accommodate a bathroom.

Mr. Stasiuk walked through the plans with Commission as to where the new windows would be located and where the three windows would be eliminated.

Mr. Stasiuk told the Commission that the original structure of the house was a 1790 chart house that was moved from Raynes Avenue in the early 1900's. He said that he believes that there have been five additions. As a result, only about one third of the structure was historic.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the picture window that would be a new construction window. He reminded Mr. Stasiuk that this window would require casings around it and also a window sill underneath it.

Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hejtmanek. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

\*\*\*\*\*

8. Petition of **Kathryn C. Saunders, owner**, for property located at **140 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install two new windows and door on first floor, new window on second floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 26 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic A Districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Ms. Kathryn Saunders, owner of the property, spoke to the application. She stated that she purchased the house in February. When she was renovating inside she found a door opening. She pointed out that the concrete steps and a small hip roof remain on the outside of the structure. Ms. Saunders said that she would like to restore that area to its original design as well as add two windows on the lower floor and one window on the upper floor of that elevation.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what was behind the little slender window on the first floor. Ms. Saunders replied that it was an area that led down to the cellar and as a result, the width of that window was constrained.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the casings for the door come down from what was left of the brackets of the small hip roof. He pointed out that the brackets could be repaired at some point. Ms. Saunders said she would like to have them repaired in the future.

Mr. Adams said she may want to install the door in such a way that it can be utilized with the siding removed and then cobble a new face on it in the interim period. He asked if the door would swing out. Ms. Saunders replied no, that that was a mistake on the plans. It would be a door that swings in.

Ms. Fineberg asked if anyone had concerns about the two additional windows on the first floor looking too busy. Mr. Adams agreed that it had a sense of busyness. He said that even though the house has a front entry, the side door seems to be celebrating the side entry by having those windows.

Chairman Dika asked if the Commission had any more questions. Hearing none, she asked if anyone from the public wished to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, she declared the public hearing closed.

### **DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Golomb. Chairman Dika asked if there was discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated that she commended the homeowner for coming forward with the plan to preserve what was originally there.

The motion to approve the application as presented passed by a unanimous vote.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:25 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good  
HDC Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission Meeting on May 2, 2007.