

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

May 6, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Sandra Dika; Vice Chairman Richard Katz; Members John Wyckoff, Tracy Kozak, Elena Maltese; City Council Representative Eric Spear; Alternate Joseph Almeida

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Alternate George Melchior, Planning Board Representative Paige Roberts

ALSO PRESENT: Roger Clum, Assistant Building Inspector

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – April 1, 2009

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Thomas M. Bertrand, owner**, for property located at **43 Sheafe Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 20 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Thomas Bertrand, owner of the property, was present to speak to the application. He stated that he would like to remove all of the storm windows and replace all of the existing windows with Trimline brand aluminum clad windows.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the first floor windows were taller then the other windows. Mr. Bertrand said yes.

Councilor Spear noted that there was a choice of removable or permanent interior grills. He asked Mr. Bertrand which he would be choosing. Mr. Bertrand said that he had chosen the permanent grills.

Ms. Kozak asked if these were replacement windows. Mr. Bertrand replied yes. Ms. Kozak commented that with replacement windows there is always a recessed gap. She asked if that gap would be filled in. Mr. Bertrand said that his contractor indicated that it would not be an issue.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz commented that the Commission is seeing more and more of these replacement windows and he felt they did a good job of retaining the look. He added that the replacement of the 9 over 1 with the 9 over 6 was an improvement.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

2. Petition of **Frank M. and Kiska B. Alexandropoulos, owners, and Charles and Deborah Pesik, applicants**, for property located at **699 Middle Street, Unit 1**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 35 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Charles Pesik and Ms. Deborah Pesik, owners of the property, were present to speak to the application. Mr. Pesik explained that he and his wife are now the owners of Unit 1.

Mr. Pesik provided pictures of the property and showed the Commission where he was proposing to install the fence. He explained that the fence would be 6 feet in height and would be placed on top of the stone wall. It would slope down to 5 feet as it comes to meet the back of the garage, so that the entire fence is level. The fence would allow the Pesiks and the owner of Unit 3 to enjoy some privacy.

Ms. Maltese asked if there was information in the packet concerning the hardware to be used on the gate. Mr. Pesik showed the Commission where that information was in the packet.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Ms. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Kozak stated that it was a very complete application and the fence was an appropriately scaled and detailed fence for its setting.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

3. Petition of **Robert D. and Natalie P. Hassold, owners**, for property located at **15 Mt. Vernon Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace clapboards with composite material on front elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 33 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic A Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Robert Hassold, owner of the property, was present to speak to the application. He stated that he would like to replace all of the cedar siding on his house with hardiplank siding. He explained that every year he has peeling paint and has to repaint.

Chairman Dika asked why the paint was not adhering to the cedar siding. Mr. Hassold thought that the back of the cedar siding was not treated when it was first put on and therefore, it forces the paint off of the siding. He said that he hears that the hardiplank holds the paint very well.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if the wood trim would be replaced as well. Mr. Hassold replied no, just the side walls.

Ms. Kozak asked what type of finish was selected. Mr. Hassold said that it would be the smooth finish. Mr. Almeida wanted to clarify that it did not have the embossed artificial wood grain finish. Mr. Hassold replied no.

Chairman Dika asked if the hardiplank would be pre-primed. Mr. Hassold said no, he was planning to paint it the same color that is existing on the house currently.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the boards would be 4” to the weather. Mr. Hassold said yes.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness the application as presented with the following amendment:

1. That permission is also granted to include the replacement of the clapboards with composite material on the side and rear elevations.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese said that hardiplank is coming into the world of the Historic District Commission and they have to consider the neighborhoods as well as the whole district. She added that they are to encourage the innovation of new technologies and she finds hardiplank to fall into that aspect. She felt it was important for people to be able to maintain their historic homes.

Mr. Wyckoff agreed but mentioned that the Commission did not approve hardiplank on the front of a building on Bow Street because of its location. He said it was not appropriate to have smooth siding on a 200 year old house, which was the case with that application.

Chairman Dika commented that people need to understand that hardiplank will not be approved in every case. She felt this was an appropriate usage of it.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness the application as presented with the following amendment passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote:

1. That permission is also granted to include the replacement of the clapboards with composite material on the side and rear elevations.

4. Petition of **Deborah Phillips, owner**, for property located at **92 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove slate roof, replace with asphalt roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 76 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Daryl Kent of K & S Contracting was present to speak to the application. He stated that he was representing Deborah Phillips, the owner of 92-94 Pleasant Street. He said that they would like to remove the slate from the roof and replace it with architectural asphalt shingles. The roof was leaking and has been patched numerous times over the years. He pointed out that the entire neighborhood has asphalt roofing. The new construction that is going on downtown has asphalt shingles as well. Mr. Kent added that the building has vinyl siding on it.

Chairman Dika asked if the slate was on both sides of the gable. Mr. Kent said it was on both sides of the dormers and the slopes.

Chairman Dika stated that the Commission hates to lose a slate roof but this one did not look like it was in very good condition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked what color had been chosen for the asphalt shingles. Mr. Kent said that the owner had not chosen a color yet. He thought it might be black or they might go to an artificial slate look.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if he had considered any other asphalt shingle that might more closely resemble slate. Mr. Kent said that they chose the 50 year Independence shingle because it was one of the heavier shingles that they had the most luck with. He added that they considered the artificial slate but it was considerably more expensive. Vice Chairman Katz said that he was comfortable with the asphalt shingle but he was just not sure about the Independence line.

Chairman Dika agreed with Vice Chairman Katz and added that she would prefer to see one of the offerings on the first two pages of the brochure. Mr. Kent said that they were proposing the

Landmark Independence line. It had some texture to it. Chairman Dika and Vice Chairman Katz both said that they were okay with it.

Mr. Almeida stated that he was having a hard time this evening losing a lot of authentic materials. He pointed out that the roof shingle on State Street that was recently approved was upsized because of the scale of the building. He felt that it applied to this building as well. Mr. Almeida asked what would be shown to weather. Mr. Kent said it would be roughly 5 ½ to 6 inches.

Ms. Maltese said that she shared the same concern as Mr. Almeida but she did not find the slate roof to be a defining characteristic of the building. She too does not like to lose slate roofs as they are truly a treasure. She would like to make sure that the simulation of slate be proportionate to the size of the building.

Vice Chairman Katz stated that Mr. Almeida was very persuasive and he was rethinking his attitudes with this. He said that there are slate appearing shingles that are available and he did not see why they had to be locked into architectural shingles. He brought up the library, pointing out that you have to look closely to see that the whole building is not slate. He felt it was time to hold out for asphalt shingles that more closely resemble what was up there before.

Ms. Kozak agreed with everyone's comments about slate but she also wanted to put in a plug for wood shakes. They are also a historic roofing material. She pointed out that this building did not have wood shakes but it could have at one time. She felt that the shingle chosen was not trying to replicate slate but instead it was trying to replicate a wood shake. With this particular building a wood shake look would be appropriate.

Chairman Dika asked the age of the building. Mr. Kent did not know but he stated he was willing to bet that under the slate are wood shakes. He said that he was currently doing a house similar to this one and it had wood shakes under the existing slate.

Mr. Almeida asked if the Hatteras shingle was considered because it was a much larger shingle. Mr. Kent replied that it was not considered. They chose the Independence line because it was a more consistent look.

Chairman Dika stated that she felt the Commission was divided on the project. She thought it might be best to postpone the application and have the applicant come back with samples to view.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that on State Street they upgraded the shingle to a 50 year shingle and it was a move well made. He reiterated that the roof on this building was not a defining characteristic of the building. He said it would one thing if they were restoring the building but they are not.

Councilor Spear stated that the Commission does not have purview over color but he felt this came into the materials area of review. He wanted to know what colors the applicant was thinking of using. Mr. Kent said that they could rule out the Weathered Wood, Hunter Green, Hamilton Blue, Cottage Red, and the Burnt Sienna.

Chairman Dika asked if any Commissioner would object to any of the remaining colors. There were no objections raised.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following amendments:

- 1. That the Independence asphalt shingle is used.
- 2. That the color choices of the shingles are limited to Charcoal Black, Colonial Slate, Driftwood, Georgetown Gray, or Weathered Wood.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Spear. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the material was compatible in the area that it was in. He added that it was new technology and he supported it.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for a roll call vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented with the following amendments passed by a 4-3 vote with Ms. Maltese, Mr. Wyckoff, Councilor Spear and Ms. Kozak voting in favor of the motion and Mr. Almeida, Chairman Dika, and Vice Chairman Katz voted in opposition:

:

- 1. That the Independence asphalt shingle is used.
- 2. That the color choices of the shingles are limited to Charcoal Black, Colonial Slate, Driftwood, Georgetown Gray, or Weathered Wood.

5. Petition of **Sheafe Street Properties, Inc., owner**, for property located at **18 Sheafe Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove porch and stairs) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new porch and stairs) and allow relocation of a free standing structure (relocate fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 46 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project was present to speak to the application. She said that they were proposing to rebuild the porch with steps leading into the yard and also into a back alleyway. They would also like to replace the door and relocate a fence in the yard.

Ms. Whitney stated that they would like to use cedar for the building materials. The roof trim would be white azek. She also pointed out that they would be replacing the windows above the bulkhead and bringing them back up to their original height. The windows would be simply trimmed with no crown molding. She added that the existing door would be replaced with a wood door.

Ms. Maltese asked if the detailing above the windows was original to the building. Ms. Whitney said that she did not think so.

Vice Chairman Katz asked if the crown molding treatment existed anywhere else in the building. Ms. Whitney replied no.

Mr. Almeida asked if they considered a brick mold in the masonry opening around the windows. Ms. Whitney said that they could consider it but they were an odd size. She explained that the casing would be sitting inside of the brick opening.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about details for the fence. Ms. Whitney explained that the fence was existing and they would just be moving it back to a new location. There would not be any gates.

Mr. Almeida asked about the closure piece on the south elevation. Ms. Whitney explained in detail how this would be accomplished.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wyckoff. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese stated this was an example of someone improving their property and being respectful of the historic district. She felt the change from the fire door to a wood door was a wonderful improvement.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

6. Petition of Friends Of The Music Hall and 82-86 Congress, LLC, owners, for properties located at 28 Chestnut Street and 82-86 Congress Street, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install lighting) and allow new free standing structures (construct sitting walls with flush mount lighting) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 7 and Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 45 and lie within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Ms. Maltese stated she would be recusing herself from the discussion and vote.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Terrence Parker, representing the applicants, was present to speak to the application. He explained that they met informally last October with the City staff to discuss what the City was looking for in terms of a design. He said that they received valuable input. They also met with the immediate abutters to get their input as well. After that, they presented a design to the City staff and the abutters to get their approval. He pointed out that he would be presenting a design that has received the approval of both the City staff and the abutters.

Mr. Parker said that they tried to design a street that was much safer. They were proposing to change some of the grades to eliminate awkward step downs from the Music Hall. He said they would also like to change the streetscape surfaces both on the sidewalk and the street to get rid of dangerous cross pitches. He added that they were also proposing a lighting scheme as well as granite sitting walls that would help to define the space. New vegetation would also be added.

Mr. Parker showed the Commission two elevations showing different views. He said that the key aspect of this project was the removal of an awkward telephone pole that was on the southwest corner of the parking garage. By removing and put those functions underground, they were able to create a more generous turning radius. He pointed out that school buses would be able to unload on Chestnut Street which would free up Porter Street for restaurant deliveries.

Mr. Parker stated that they were proposing vintage lighting called Park Ridge. He explained that there would be two fixtures on the Congress Street building on Chestnut Street, two on the side of the parking garage, and two on the Porter Street side. He added that they had the permission of the owner of the Kearsarge House to put fixtures on the Chestnut Street side of his building but that was not a part of this application. He also showed the Commission the flush mounted lighting that would be placed in the granite sitting walls. Mr. Parker explained that also part of the application was the mounting of the original Music Hall light fixtures on the Music Hall building. Mr. Almeida asked if they would be mounted in the same location and at the same height that they were originally. Mr. Parker said that was the idea but they will have to explore whether it is feasible.

Mr. Almeida commented that this was one of the most exciting applications that has come before the Commission. He said it was a beautiful presentation, it was crystal clear, and said it would have a huge impact on the area.

Chairman Dika said that she felt that safety was driving the project. Mr. Parker stated that it was the key driver. He said it was very awkward when exiting the Music Hall and this project would remedy that.

Mr. Wyckoff commented on the lifting of the grade to accomplish the project. Mr. Parker said that they have not entered into the engineering phase yet but the grade will have to be addressed.

There was discussion about the paving and its pattern but it was stated that paving was outside of the Commission's purview.

Vice Chairman stated that he was happy to see that the stealth step lighting made it into the application.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Ms. Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Katz.

Ms. Kozak stated that was a sensitive, yet innovative design. She thought it was exciting and was a huge improvement. It used historic materials in a new way and she said she would support it.

Chairman Dika mentioned that a work session was held on this project last month.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

7. Petition of **Peirce Block Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **3 Market Square**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 17 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Donald Rosella, manager of the building, was present to speak to the application. He stated that they received approval last year to replace the windows on the second floor. This is now phase two of the project and was for the third floor. He explained that they were proposing the same windows from the same company and would they be installed by the same contractor, Careno Construction. He added that they were aware of the frame issues.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Vice Chairman Katz made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maltese. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Vice Chairman Katz said that this was one of the easiest applications that they've had. Chairman Dika pointed out that they spent a good deal of time on the previous application so they were familiar with it.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

8. Petition of **Fifty-Five Congress Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, AT&T Mobility Corporation, applicant**, for property located at **55 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new mechanical structures (add three roof top antennas and associated base station equipment cabinets) 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.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. John Coste, representing the applicant, was present to speak to the application. He explained that they were proposing two modifications to the existing facility. The first modification was to add three panel antennas to its existing three panel antennas. They would be identical in size and would mount flush to the existing elevator penthouse and painted to match the existing façade and the existing antennas. He said this was in keeping with the Commission's existing approval in 1998.

Mr. Coste stated that the second modification involved a 5'4" length-wise extension of the frame of the cabinet. He added that there was an existing 7' high fence and the fencing would need to be extended as well. He told the Commission if they preferred that they replace the entire fence so that it would be consistent in color, they were amenable to that.

Vice Chairman Katz said that he spent a lot of time looking for the change in appearance and had a hard time finding it. Ms. Maltese agreed and said that these antennas do not catch your eye. Mr. Clum added that the equipment cabinets are not visible from the street. Ms. Maltese said that the change was minimal.

Mr. Coste commented that they were before the Board of Adjustment and received approval.

Chairman Dika asked if there were any more 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 COMMISSION

Ms. Maltese made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida. Chairman Dika asked for discussion.

Ms. Maltese said that the application was necessary because there was a change but it would never be noticed nor was it a historical feature or a defining characteristic of the building. She added that it was in line with what was already there.

Hearing no other discussion, Chairman Dika called for the vote. The motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented passed by a unanimous (7-0) vote.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work session requested by **Thomas M. Bertrand, owner**, for property located at **43 Sheafe Street**, wherein permission was requested to new construction to an existing structure (construct addition). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 20 and lies with the Central Business B and Historic A Districts.

- Ms. Wendy Welton, architect for the project, and Mr. Thomas Bertrand, owner of the property were present to speak to the application.
- Ms. Welton stated that they would like to put an addition on the back of the house. She said that there was a prior approval for an addition but the measurements did not work. She explained that they would pull the addition back from the setback in order to have windows. They would match all of the trim and windows. The existing door was a wood plank door with a transom and they would like to stick with that theme.
- Mr. Almeida asked if the same window patterns that were approved earlier in the meeting would be used in the addition. Mr. Bertrand replied yes.
- Ms. Welton felt that the addition should match the existing house, a very simple building.
- Ms. Maltese stated that the massing on the lot should be considered. She noted that all of the lots in area make use of the entire lot.
- Ms. Welton said that they anticipated resistance from an abutter.
- Ms. Welton pointed out the close proximity of the addition to the abutter’s property and so hardiplank may be proposed on that side of the structure. On the other sides of the structure, they were thinking about using wood clapboards. Mr. Almeida said he would not have reservations about using just about any type material on the elevation that is so closely situated to the abutter’s property. Maintenance would be an issue.
- Ms. Maltese asked if skylights would be used. Ms. Welton replied yes, there would be two and she showed the Commission where they would be located.
- Chairman Dika asked about the roofing material. Ms. Welton said that they planned on matching the house.

- Ms. Kozak stated that she was struggling with the massing of the roof, particularly with a back ell roof that was larger than the house. Mr. Bertrand said that they had a picture of a house across from Strawberry Banke that was the same style house with the same roof line.
- Mr. Almeida said that he agreed with Ms. Kozak and felt that the new massing was overtaking the house. Ms. Kozak felt there were other ways to address it. She felt it had an impact on the original building. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not see a problem with it. Vice Chairman Katz said that he saw the problem but he did not see a viable solution so he would not oppose the design.
- At this point in the meeting, there was considerable discussion concerning the roof line and several alternatives were discussed.
- A work session/public hearing was recommended for the next meeting.

B. Work session requested by **Dilorenzo Real Estate, LLC and City of Portsmouth, owners, and Poco Diablo, Inc., applicant**, for property located at **33 Bow Street/2 Ceres Street, and 37 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing deck) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (misc. renovations associated with relocation of deck) and new construction to an existing structure (construct second story deck and construct patio at grade level). Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 48 and 49 and lie within the Central Business B, Historic A, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

- Chairman Dika informed the listening public that the Commission held a site walk earlier in the evening.
- Mr. Rob Harbeson of DeStefano Architects and Mr. John Golumb, owner of Poco Diablo, Inc. were present to speak to the application. Mr. Harbeson explained that this project has been before the HDC for numerous work session but not recently. He said that part of the reason for this project was that the City is developing part of the waterfront area so the existing deck for the restaurant has to be moved. He added that not a lot has changed since the last work sessions.
- Mr. Harbeson said that the owner was interested in earning LEED rating and they would introduce some new sustainable materials during the work session.
- Mr. Harbeson walked the Commission through the packet of material. He explained that this would be an outdoor dining area. He noted the built in bench, column locations, and the area with an awning above. There will also be a skylight above. He pointed out where the outdoor bar would be located.
- Page 5 showed the second level of dining. The curved bay windows on this level would be replaced. A relocated condenser and a new condenser would be placed on the right hand side.
- Mr. Harbeson pointed out that the deck railing on the third floor would be replaced. The lattice would be replaced with balusters.
- Mr. Harbeson explained that the awning would be up from April to the end of October and then taken down for the off season. The awning would be canvas.
- On the left hand side of the dining structure there would be a bar enclosure. Mr. Harbeson said that in order to meet the Health Department's requirements, the bar must be completely enclosed when it is not in service. He added that the bar would only be open from April to October. When the bar is closed, either at night or during the winter, a window panel will be pulled down and into place.
- Mr. Wyckoff asked for more details concerning the awning. Mr. Harbeson explained that the awning framing was likely to remain up throughout the winter but the canvas awning would be removed.

- Ms. Kozak asked why not construct a permanent roof. Mr. Harbeson said the owner desired a more open and lighter feel to the space.
- Ms. Maltese asked if the V groove boards would block the skylight. Mr. Harbeson said yes.
- Mr. Wyckoff stated that he thought the roofing area should be more permanent. Mr. Almeida said that he did not have an issue with it being temporary. Ms. Maltese thought it worked with the other decks surrounding it.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked Mr. Harbeson if he was planning another work session. Mr. Harbeson said that he was trying to wrap this project up. Vice Chairman Katz stated that he thought a rendering of what the structure would look like in winter mode would be helpful. He added that he liked the concept and he liked the fabric roof but he could see some of the objections.
- Mr. Almeida commented that he thought the project was wonderful. He admitted that there was some busyness to it but it is a very busy spot. Ms. Maltese agreed.
- Ms. Kozak asked if a southwest elevation drawing could be shown to show another perspective when the canopy is down.
- Vice Chairman Katz recommended a work session/public hearing for the next meeting.
- Mr. Wyckoff reiterated his concern of what the structure will look like in winter. He said that if no one comes out to speak against it he would probably support it but he thought it would look like Salisbury Beach in winter or a circus that is closed. Vice Chairman Katz stated that he found that poignant. Mr. Harbeson said that for them, that was the nature of what this is.
- Mr. Golumb stated that he could see Mr. Wyckoff's point. He said he could have brought to the Commission a structure with a fixed roof. He and his wife did not want a heavy look close to the building.
- Page 16 showed the third level deck wood railing. Mr. Wyckoff thought that a black iron railing would make it look more continuous and bring it all together. Mr. Almeida agreed. Mr. Harbeson said that they could consider that. He explained that they did not own that area so the cost may be a factor with the owners.
- There was considerable discussion concerning the construction of the bar area and the materials for the pull down bar doors.
- Page 18 showed the columns which were now much simpler. They were proposing Trex material for the deck and the railing. Mr. Almeida thought that was an appropriate use of the Trex and azek material as this area would take some serious abuse.
- Vice Chairman Katz asked if the half wall would stay or go during the winter. Mr. Harbeson said it would stay, just the canvas panels would go.
- Mr. Almeida asked to see all of the meter boxes at the next meeting. Mr. Harbeson said that some of that is still under discussion. He added that it was their intention to move the gas meters up into the flat roof area.
- Mr. Almeida asked about lighting schemes. Mr. Harbeson replied that they did not have that yet but they would propose the lighting on a separate application.
- Mr. Harbeson stated that they would consider all of the Commission's comments concerning the railings and the awning. Mr. Clum mentioned that all of the railings would need to be 42" high.
- Mr. Golumb ended the work session by saying that they would let the Planning Department know whether they will go for a work session/public hearing for the next meeting.

In other business, Councilor Spear said that he feared the day might come when someone comes to the Commission proposing solar panels or a green roof. He wondered if anything like that has been proposed to date. Mr. Wyckoff stated yes, on Round Island the Commission approved solar panels.

Vice Chairman Katz mentioned a “green” house on Lawrence Street which was one block away from being in the Historic District. He thinks that this type of arrangement is going to happen in the Historic District.

Mr. Almeida asked if they would be encouraging this sort of thing. Vice Chairman Katz said that it was a problem because they look very industrial. Ms. Maltese said they should take them on a case by case basis. Chairman Dika stated that they need to be ready for it. She also mentioned windmills.

Vice Chairman asked how the Commission can become knowledgeable enough to suggest alternative solutions. It was pointed out that Ms. Kozak was LEED certified.

Mr. Almeida mentioned that he was just back from a vacation in Fredericksburg, Virginia whose architecture, history, and size was very similar to Portsmouth. Seeing that city reminded him of how important it was to take their job seriously. Vice Chairman added that at the same time, they are not the Historic Preservation Commission. He felt their job was to determine how to reconcile the Commission with the needs and wants of the business community and the residential aspects. He did not want to slam the bar down on any innovative architecture that might be applied in a sensitive manner.

Mr. Wyckoff commented that in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, they have to have electric candles in all of the windows downtown and they have to be lit all year round.

Chairman Dika stated that there is a balancing act that has to occur and that balancing act is responsibility for the economic viability of these older neighborhoods.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:00 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on June 10, 2009.