

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

**March 6, 2013
to be reconvened on March 13, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak; Members John Wyckoff, City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Richard Katz, George Melchior

ALSO PRESENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of minutes – November 7, 2012

Councilor Kennedy moved to approve the November 7, 2012 HDC minutes as presented. Mr. Wyckoff seconded, and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Petition of **Jane A. Nisbet Revocable Trust, Jane A. Nisbet, trustee and owner**, for property located at **139 South Street, Unit E**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (replace fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 7 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jane Nisbet said the existing fence was on the patio, on top of a large stone wall. She said the fence was rusted, in pieces, and needed to be replaced. She said the neighbors had a fence approved within the last year, and she wanted to match it except increase the height by one foot to obstruct the view from next door.

Chairman Almeida asked if it was an exact match as what was approved a year ago except for the height, and Ms. Nisbet said it was.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No further discussion was added and Chairman Almeida closed public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff moved to grant a Certificate of Approval for the request as presented Councilor Kennedy seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff said it was an extension of an already approved fence, and was therefore appropriate.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

2. Petition of **Josh R. Gagnon and Nicole S. Bandera, owners**, for property located at **152-154 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove solarium, decks), and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition, construct decks) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows, doors, siding, and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 65 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Mr. Roe Cole, project builder for the owner said the solarium and decks that were built on the back of the duplex in the early 1980's had since failed. He said the owner hired architect Lucy Gorham to design a new façade for the back to replace the solarium. He said it would be a two phase project, working on the back first, then replacing the windows with Marvin windows and replacing the siding.

Mr. Wyckoff said he felt swamped by the application with an addition and changes to the windows on the back of the building, and felt it should be a work session. Chairman Almeida and Councilor Kennedy agreed there were a lot of changes. Mr. Cole said the work was not on the front facade, but on the back side of the house, and would not be seen from the street. Mr. Gladhill also agreed, and asked if the changes to the back would match the front, and if asphalt shingles on the front would also be replaced. Mr. Cole said they would leave the front asphalt roof shingles, and only replace the back with a copper roof, and put a single seam roof on the shed where the solarium was. Vice Chair Kozak said the application was complete and she was fine with moving forward. Mr. Rawling said there were some design issues, but he thought he could work with the application. Chairman Almeida agreed, and said they could move into a work session if it were too much.

Mr. Cole presented architect, Lucy Gorham's drawings, showing that they were staying close to the same footprint, with only a slight bump out at the shed and deck. He said the new solarium would have an office bump out.

Vice Chair Kozak asked what the material was underneath the clapboards and deck. Mr. Cole said it was a brick foundation. The solarium was built off a brick façade, and they were removing the glass portion of the solarium. The decks would be mahogany and on Sonotubes and enclosed with a tight grid, two-by-two square mahogany lattice work. Mr. Wyckoff asked what the foundation on the side of the addition would be, and Mr. Cole said it would be Sonotubes with a brick face and lattice trim like the deck.

Councilor Kennedy asked about the privacy wall. Mr. Cole said it would be made of six-foot slatted solid mahogany boards to keep their deck from facing the neighbor's deck. Chairman Almeida said they needed to see more detailing, and asked if the railing turned the corner, and what it would look like on the top. Mr. Cole said it would be 1" x 6" clear coated stain mahogany with caps. Mr. Rawling said that would not be in keeping with the character of the house, and it would stick out. Mr. Cole asked if they would prefer it painted, and Mr. Rawling said it would be more traditional. Mr. Cole said the home owner would have no problem painting it. Mr. Cole said he didn't see the point of an expensive wood on the decking if they were going to cover it up with paint, though he said he was not a big fan of pressure treated wood. Councilor Kennedy noted a rail missing on the tenant's side. Mr. Coe said it was a mistake in the drawing, but it would be the same as the owners' side.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if the hip roof was a continuation of the shed roof. Mr. Cole said currently the solarium roof was an all glass shed roof, so they are incorporating the shed roof of the addition into the hip roof. Mr. Cole said they would duplicate the details of the main house.

Councilor Kennedy said there was a lot going on with the windows on the back addition. Mr. Cole reviewed the windows, and French doors coming from the owners' unit onto the decking, saying the owners wanted to keep as much light as they had with the solarium.

Mr. Wyckoff asked about the window trim, and Mr. Cole said they would replicate the rest of the house as well with historic sill nosing and shingle band. Ms. Ruedig if they were original windows and asked what condition they were in. Mr. Cole said there were some original and some replacement windows, but they were in poor condition with panes falling out and in need of replacement. He said there was no insulation in the walls, but the interior was pristine with Indian shutters that still functioned so they didn't want to disturb the inside trim. They were installing the windows from the inside with a small trim strip, replacing the exterior casings, sills, shingle band, and then the house would be sided with 3/8" foam insulation board. Mr. Wyckoff asked how they were going to fit in a replacement window with the Indian shutters. Mr. Cole said a Marvin representative helped them figure out how to replace them from the inside. He showed the detail on page A7 of the submitted plans. Mr. Gladhill asked if the windows were in keeping with the time period of the main house or with the additions that were added later. Mr. Cole said the existing windows were a mix of originals and replacements, and they wanted the replacements to be in keeping with the period style of the main house.

Mr. Rawling said he was comfortable with the plan except he thought the factory mulled gang windows were a modern interpretation that was uncharacteristic of the main house, and would prefer seeing a stud pocket in between. Mr. Cole said they could shrink the windows with a stud

pocket and piece of molding in between. Chairman Almeida said he did not like shrinking the window because it would change the pane size. He said it would be a better solution to take a window out. Mr. Cole said he thought they might be able to add a stud pocket and keep the windows the same size. Mr. Cole said they were also trying to do away with the triple windows where the solarium foundation was, and where the office would be. The Commissioners all agreed.

Councilor Kennedy asked if they would be doing any work with the doors, and Mr. Cole said all the doors would stay. Mr. Wyckoff said the Azek shingled band was like any molding he had ever seen except as a replica of a Colonial casing on the inside of doors in the 1970's or 1980's. Mr. Cole said the molding would be routed to replicate what was already there.

Mr. Wyckoff said it appeared that the side of the building had an original clapboard exterior with original details, crowned windows and molding which was standard for an old building. He said those were things they were usually interested in preserving on a historic house. He said phase two involved peeling all the siding off, replacing with foam insulation, Azek 5/4 trim to fit the replacement windows. Chairman Almeida said Mr. Wyckoff made some important points. He said the applicant was going to replicate the original windows because the window casing was up against the frame and had no sheathing behind it. Mr. Cole said they were trying to get some insulation in the walls without disturbing the Indian shutters, while keeping the same look.

Vice Chair Kozak said she was not as concerned with replacing windows on the back, but thought the original windows on the existing house facing South Street should be restored. Mr. Cole said they were proposing to use an aluminum cladding exterior Marvin storm window with narrow mullions to replicate the time period of the original house to reduce maintenance.

Councilor Kennedy said she needed better representations of the overall project. Chairman Almeida said they lost the wooden shake roof on the house last year and they were talking about making significant changes to a very historic building. He said they had many stipulations where details were lacking and he thought the applicant would benefit from a work session. The other commissioners agreed, and said they should also do a site walk.

Owner, Mr. Josh Gagnon, asked if they could break the construction up into two phases with removal of the solarium and decks first, and then having a site walk and work session to address the windows and the front façade in a second phase. Mr. Rawling said they should have drawings of existing and the proposed conditions for comparison. The commissioners agreed that they had no problem with the first phase.

Mr. Cole reviewed the first phase that would involve the removal of the solarium and decking, construction of two new decks, a bump out with the office addition, residing above the old solarium, and three new windows.

Chairman Almeida asked about the roofing and if the edge conditions would be rolled at the edge. Mr. Cole said it would be a standing seam roof because of a shallow pitch. It would be bronze in color, and rolled into the drip edge.

Councilor Kennedy asked if there would be skylights, and Mr. Cole said there would be four skylights. Chairman Almeida asked what would be the color of the metal on the skylights. Mr. Cole said it would be dark bronze like the roofing. Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were centered, and Mr. Cole said they were not. Mr. Wyckoff said they usually like to see skylights coincide with windows above and below. Mr. Cole said they could center them on the windows below. Chairman Almeida said they still hadn't settled on the windows. Mr. Cole said they could separate the windows with a 1-2" stud pockets. Mr. Rawling said he was satisfied with that solution.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be gutters and Mr. Cole said there were no plans for gutters.

Chairman Almeida asked about the walking surface of the deck material. Mr. Cole asked if they would have any problem with mahogany for the decking material and painting the vertical railings and privacy fence. The commissioners said that would be fine.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No further discussion was added and Chairman Almeida closed public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to approve Phase One of the project as detailed by the presenter with the following stipulations as read by Mr. Cracknell:

- 1) That a 2" x 2" square, painted wood lattice pattern will be located under the proposed deck and will be trimmed/paneled.*
- 2) That the 6' privacy fence shall have 1" x 6" overlapping painted wood boards and trim boards.*
- 3) That all vertical deck elements shall be painted to match the existing house.*
- 4) That the Azek shingle band on the windows, molding, and trim shall be milled to match the existing trim.*
- 5) That the deck surface and stair treads will be mahogany.*
- 7) That all ganged windows will be modified by adding a stud pocket.*
- 8) That the triple mulled window option will not be used.*
- 9) That all work related to Phase II (pertaining to the modifications to the c.1790 structure) shall not be included in this approval.*

The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Kozak.

Vice Chair Kozak said the addition was a huge improvement over what was there.

Chairman Almeida called for the vote and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

A site walk was scheduled for Saturday, and a work session for the second construction phase was scheduled for April.

3. Petition of **WSK Goddard, Limited Partnership, owner,** and **Deanna Pellegrino, applicant,** for property located at **214 State Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 67 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Deanna Pellegrino said they would like to replace a fiberglass door with a three quarter glass, wood grained fiberglass panel door.

Chairman Almeida asked if it was her intention to paint it a dark color. Ms. Pellegrino said she would prefer black, but she could do a dark green. Mr. Gladhill asked if she would paint it, and Ms. Pellegrino said it could come in those colors. Chairman Almeida said color usually wasn't in their purview, but they didn't want to see white faux wood grain or plastic materials.

Mr. Wyckoff said there were true divided light commercial windows with small panes on the building, and he wondered why they didn't choose a true divided light door instead of a single pane. Ms. Pellegrino said they chose it for more visibility and in keeping with other retail shops. Chairman Almeida said when he considered having glass, he found it was impossible to replicate it in a fiberglass door and it looked better without. Mr. Wyckoff said a wooden door with true divided lights would be better if they wanted windows, but this was a different situation considering she was asking to replace fiberglass with fiberglass. Mr. Rawling expressed concern with setting a design precedence with solid doors replacing glass doors. He said it was a major change to the historic character of a building, but he was prepared to go along with glass because it was an entrance to a commercial space; however, he had a strong bias to it being a wood door. Ms. Pellegrino agreed and said she thought the landlord would be okay with a wood door also.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No further discussion was added and Chairman Almeida closed public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Kennedy moved to grant a Certificate of Approval with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the proposed door would be a solid wood door.*

Mr. Wyckoff seconded.

Councilor Kennedy said going from fiberglass to wood would enhance the historic architectural character.

Chairman Almeida called for the vote and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

4. **(Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of Worth Development Condominium Association, owner, and David Takis, applicant,** for property located at **103 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install awning over outdoor seating area) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6-106 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

WORK SESSION

Ms. Jessie Aikman of Back Channel Canvas presented a sample of the material, new drawings and reviewed the changes recommended from the last work session. Chairman Almeida asked if it was still a seasonal component, and Ms. Aikman said it was.

Mr. Rawling said he was relieved to see an increase in the height. He asked about the roof lights. Ms. Aikman had a sample of the clear panels in the awning. Ms. Aikman said it would allow light to come through for the diners.

Chairman Almeida asked if they could continue with the white piping like the existing awning. Councilor Kennedy and Mr. Wyckoff agreed it would be appropriate. Ms. Aikman said that would be no problem.

Chairman Almeida said they were going over their property boundary which was not in the HDC purview, and they would need to work with the Planning Department on that.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if there would be a railing around the sides and if there would be an entrance built in. Owner, Mr. David Takis said the fence was already there, but he was going to buy a new fence of similar style but thicker gauge. It would come down in the winter. Ms. Aikman said the frame work would also come down in the winter. Chairman Almeida said the existing fence was not part of the application, and asked if there would be a change. Mr. Takis said they would replace it in kind. Mr. Wyckoff asked about access, and Mr. Takis said there would be a six foot opening.

Chairman Almeida asked if there would be any sides, and Ms. Almeida said the sides would be rolled up and not seen when they were not employed, but would be contained inside the fence during inclement weather. Mr. Rawling asked if the sides would be clear, and Ms. Aikman said they would up to the fence where it would be a fabric skirt, allowing it to roll up tighter and neater.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Ms. Jessie Aikman of Back Channel Canvas on behalf of David Takis, owner of the District Restaurant made a formal presentation for a seasonable awning over the patio area for outdoor dining. She said the structure would be taken down in fall and the existing structure would go back up. Ms. Aikman said it would be black in color with white piping with two 4' x 10' skylight panels. She said it would have The District signage on the Market Square end.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No further discussion was added and Chairman Almeida closed public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Councilor Kennedy moved to grant a Certificate of Approval for the request as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) *That white piping will be used on the top and bottom of the valance.*
- 2) *That the awning shall be in use between the dates of April 1 and October 30 only.*

Mr. Rawling seconded.

Councilor Kennedy said the design was compatible with surrounding properties. She said she liked the increase in height, and liked that could be rolled up.

Mr. Gladhill said he was not in favor of it last month, but squaring the design helped. He said he did not believe it not set precedence.

Mr. Wyckoff he did not support it earlier either, and he was concerned that it be removed after the outdoor dining season, but the changes made it more appropriate and he would support it.

Chairman Almeida called for the vote and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

5. Petition of **General Porter Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **32 Livermore Street**, wherein permission is requested for amendment to a previously approved design (install lattice privacy screen) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 20 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Request to Postpone

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to postpone the application to the April 3, 2013 meeting.

6. Petition of **GSM Realty Trust, William Creighton, trustee and owner**, and **299 Vaughan Street, LLC, applicant**, for property located at **299 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing building) and allow a new free standing structure (install perimeter fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 10 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Tim Levine with Old Harbor LLC, representing 299 Vaughan Street, LLC and the City of Portsmouth came before the Commission with a request to demolish two existing structures to create a parking lot, but they withdrew their request to install fencing because the Technical Advisory Committee asked that they replace it with landscaping which they did.

A discussion ensued regarding the age of the former lumber building on the site. Councilor Kennedy said it appeared the building was built in 1890 and Mr. Levine said it was formerly Littlefield Lumber but was badly damaged by fire, and currently, the roof was falling in.

Mr. Rawling said he understood the need for parking, but it was a prime site for redevelopment, and thought there should be a time limit for using it as a parking lot. Mr. Levine said the investors did not want a parking lot forever and it was intended as a temporary facility. He said he hoped to bring them something interesting and worthy, but at this time they did not have a project. Chairman Almeida agreed that a parking lot was not the best use for the lot, but until there was another use the application was for a parking lot. Mr. Wyckoff said they had never set a time on anything, and they had to examine the buildings. The wooden building was 100 years old and did not appear to be worth preserving, and the cement block building had no historical context and was just sitting there so he didn't see any problem with its demolition.

Mr. Gladhill said he understood they were looking at buildings without historical value, but he thought they should still do a site walk as they always had for demolition projects. He said they should keep in mind that other lots in the north end were demolished but it took a long time before they were developed so there was no guarantee that this lot would be developed any time soon. Ms. Ruedig said it did not have a long history, but it still had a history and agreed that they should still do a site walk. Mr. Wyckoff said he had done business with Littlefield Lumber and didn't know if they could get to the back section of the building, because there were sink holes and a lot of the site was constructed over old wharfs and it was dangerous. He said he didn't think it was worthy of a site walk.

Mr. Gladhill said they knew Port Walk Phase Three was going to be developed, and that the parking lot was for a limited time, but the duration of this parking lot was still an unknown. Chairman Almeida asked if they could stipulate that cars could no longer be parked there after five years if they put a time frame of 5 years. He said they needed to be clear about their criteria and make a decision about the demolition.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No further discussion was added and Chairman Almeida closed public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Vice Chair Kozak made a motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the request as presented. Mr. Wyckoff seconded.

Vice Chair Kozak said the old warehouses were a part of what was Portsmouth in that area at one time, but this was not a style that enhanced the district. In reviewing their criteria for the Historic District she determined they would not be losing anything because they were not consistent or compatible with the surrounding buildings, they had no historic or architectural value, and they provided no innovative technologies.

Mr. Gladhill said even though the buildings may not be aesthetically pleasing, they usually ask for photographic documentation for historical purposes. Mr. Wyckoff and Vice Chair Kozak agreed. Mr. Gladhill said they should request a photo history of the 1890 building with the interior and four external views of the lot.

Vice Chair Kozak withdrew and restated the motion to grant a Certificate of Approval for the request as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the fence will not be included in the proposed project.*
- 2) That a photographic inventory of external facades shall be submitted to the Planning Department.*

Chairman Almeida called for the vote and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

7. Petition of **Michael B. Myers and Stephanie G. Taylor, owners**, for property located at **700 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 29 and lies within General Residence A and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Property owner, Michael Myers, passed out additional information regarding the proposed railing system. He said he wanted to take down the back porch and replace it with a porch with a roof structure that would be similar to what was original to a house. He said the existing porch was quite unsightly.

Mr. Rawling said he thought it would be a nice enhancement, but he had a problem with the treatment of the column capitals on the porch and would have liked to see something different. Mr. Myers said they were trying to match the existing side porch. Mr. Rawling said he didn't see the similarities. Mr. Myers said the drawing didn't match it well, but the verbiage on page 6 did say it would match. Mr. Wyckoff asked if the post would match, and Mr. Myers said the posts would be 6"x6" with a PVC sleeve and wouldn't match exactly. Chairman Almeida said there was a huge amount of detail being replicated, however.

Ms. Ruedig asked if the rest of the porch was wood. Mr. Myers said the hand rail and decking would be composite to look like wood. Ms. Ruedig – asked about the trim, and Mr. Myers asked if they would be opposed to plastic since it was up high. Mr. Wyckoff said he not opposed to it if it was well crafted, but thought it would be difficult to do small details with Azek.

Chairman Almeida asked if it would it painted, and Mr. Myers said it would. Chairman Almeida said there was no such thing as maintenance free so it would look better painted.

Councilor Kennedy asked if he had a special program for the sketches, and Mr. Myers said he used Sketch Up Pro program with the help of a friend.

Vice Chair Kozak asked if it would be a rubber roof with a standing seam, and Mr. Myers said he would use a rubber roof. Chairman Almeida asked if a drip edge would be employed, and Mr. Meyers said it would wrap behind the trim and be out of view.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No further discussion was added and Chairman Almeida closed public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff moved to grant a Certificate of Approval for the request as presented. Vice Chair Kozak seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a very visible porch and the new porch would be appropriate for the style of the house and good for the neighborhood.

Chairman Almeida called for the vote and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

8. Petition of **Strawberry Banke, Inc., owner**, for property located at **14 Hancock Street (Visitors Center)** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition, construct patio, replace misc. doors and windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7 and lies in the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Vice Chair Kozak recused herself from the discussion and vote.

Mr. Larry Yerdon, President and CEO of Strawberry Banke introduced Mr. Bruce Dicker of JSA Architects, who was the architect for the original building and these renovations.

Mr. Dicker said they were proposing to pull the shed portion around both sides about 13 feet out on the left side and 8 feet on the right side. The change would allow them to increase storage,

extend bathrooms, add a prep kitchen and café, and expand the orientation space. All details would match existing and it would be a 1,000 square foot addition.

Mr. Dicker said that it would make more sense to extend the right side from 8 feet to 9 feet for the bathrooms and storage. He said they would also like to move the double doors two feet out to accommodate the dishwasher and sinks.

Councilor Kennedy asked if there any vents or HVAC equipment. Mr. Dicker said there were no exhaust hoods, HVAC or vents, but there would be a vent pipe through the roof.

Mr. Rawling asked how deliveries and waste would be handled. Mr. Yerdon said deliveries would come through a gate to the back of the building, though the dining area before they open at 10 a.m. and after closing. He said for waste there was a large dumpster at the back of the building where waste would be hauled out at the end of the day.

Chairman Almeida asked if all material would match, and Mr. Dicker said all material would match the existing building.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No further discussion was added and Chairman Almeida closed public hearing.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. Wyckoff moved to grant a Certificate of Approval for the request as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the addition shown on Page A1.01 will be extended to 9' and the double doors will be moved out 2'.*

Councilor Kennedy seconded.

Mr. Wyckoff said it was a continuation of a newly constructed historic building and was appropriate.

Chairman Almeida called for the vote and the motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Petition of **Patricia Bogardus Living Trust, owner, Patricia and Robert W. Bogardus, trustees and owners**, for property located at **26 Park Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish one story addition and garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story garage with connector). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 44 and lies within General Residence A and Historic Districts.

Ms. Anne Whitney, architect for the project returned for a second work session to review their proposal to construct an addition setback from the front elevation, remove the shutters from the main house, and replace the existing asbestos siding with wood clapboards. Mr. Wyckoff asked if there had been any exploratory removal of the siding, and Ms. Whitney said no. She said they would keep it if it was still good, but she didn't expect it to be. Mr. Wyckoff said he realized the building was probably older than it appeared, even going back as far as the Civil War period, and they should look out for details. Ms. Whitney said even though it was an old structure, it wasn't very high style.

Ms. Whitney said they originally wanted to remove the inset front entrance that was a water trap, but the Commission objected so she reestablished the entry. Mr. Wyckoff said recessed doors typically had panels on the side, but Ms. Whitney said it had been ripped out. Ms. Whitney said the 18" setback was covered over by a storm door for a long time, and they wanted to reclaim that space for the front room. Mr. Wyckoff said he still thought that was an important detail on the house. Mr. Rawling also thought the front entry was important. Ms. Whitney said she did a lot of historic work, but it wasn't a renovation project and they had to consider the context and location. Chairman Almeida said he understood what Commissioner Wyckoff brought up that there would have been panels on the side, but he was appreciative that she was keeping a door there and he didn't have a problem with the door being flush with the exterior facade considering it would fit in context with the neighboring homes. Ms. Whitney said there wasn't a lot that was original, but the existing door looked old and had side lights that matched the transom light above, but she didn't see how she could match it without having a custom door built, and it wouldn't look right brought out to the front. She said the new door would be painted fir with four panels and side lights to matching the surrounding details.

Councilor Kennedy said she wanted to make sure they considered the importance of the era in which the house was built, and the surrounding homes. Chairman Almeida said he understood the significance, but he was considering the location. Mr. Wyckoff said there was a three story Federal house that was a former statesman's home on Woodbury Avenue by the traffic circle, and they used the same arguments that it wasn't in a historic area and now it was replaced with single story public housing. He said the same argument could be used regarding the Cutts mansion that was surrounded by gas stations near the Route 1 By-Pass, and if there was anything they could do to save in this little house, they should. Chairman Almeida said this house was not a mansion or a former governor's house; it was a tiny house that had to be considered in context and location. Ms. Whitney said they still took it fairly seriously and they were putting the effort into matching details.

Ms. Whitney said they would reside and replace windows, and bring them up a bit. Councilor Kennedy asked if there were original and Ms. Whitney said there were some, but they were in poor shape. She said they were considering Pella windows, and were trying to match everything and would recreate the trim.

Ms. Whitney said they would probably take the chimney down because the use of gas appliances in the chimney and the attic was a wreck, but they would probably replace it with wood and a brick veneer. Mr. Rawling said he wouldn't support a fake wood chimney. Ms. Whitney

explained how it would be built, and that it would work for a little fireplace. Vice Chair Kozak said they have approved this type of chimney several times. Chairman Almeida said it had been approved several times, but several commissioners objected so they would be playing the odds.

Ms. Whitney said they got rid of the porch proposal and would be using that footprint for living space instead. She said they got approval from the Board of Adjustment the previous week. Ms. Whitney reviewed the connector addition and the 18' x 28' two-story garage which would be a 1/2 story lower than the main building because of the grading. She said there would be internal stairs up to the connector from the garage.

Mr. Wyckoff asked if they were maxed out on their lot coverage and wondered why the garage was setback. Ms. Whitney said the house was only 3 1/2 feet off the property line and she was trying to create parking space and space at the back of the house. Ms. Ruedig said she thought the garage bulked up the tiny house. Councilor Kennedy asked Ms. Whitney to walk them through the rear elevation. Mr. Rawling suggested they bring the surface trim board down to reduce the volume of the continuous wall. Mr. Wyckoff wondered about doing the same thing on the right side elevation as well. He also expressed concern with the foundation transition, and Ms. Whitney said they planned on addressing that issue.

Discussion ensued regarding the size, height, width, spacing, placement, and pane size of the windows. The Commissioners said they had a preference for six over six windows on the garage. Councilor Kennedy said she preferred a traditionally larger window at the back attic window. Ms. Whitney said she could go with a smaller double hung window. Ms. Whitney said she didn't like that the trim came down close to the window. Mr. Wyckoff disagreed.

B. Work Session requested by **Timothy M. and Beth Finelli, owners**, for property located at **297 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new garage). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 23 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Matthew Beebe, designer and builder for the Finelli's said they already appeared before the Board of Adjustment and received approval.

Mr. Beebe said the existing garage dated back to the 1940s or 1950s, and it received a lot of patchwork repairs over the years. The renovation design had some of the details of the main house. They had to orient the gable façade toward the street in order to put a stairway up to the second, but it did highlight the gable end details. He said they would use a roof pitch similar to the existing house, with a lifetime laminated shingle. Chairman Almeida asked if it would match the house. Mr. Beebe said it appeared it was the same as what was already there.

Mr. Beebe said they would match the six over six windows. He said they would also use the same casing and sill details with Azek to withstand weather and outlast wood.

Mr. Beebe said they would probably use cedar or possibly mahogany siding. He said they would be open to discussing the style of the garage doors. He said they could use wood on the side door, but it didn't get a lot of visibility, and they would save a lot of money if they could use a fiberglass door. Mr. Wyckoff said a fiberglass door would be fine in this location. Chairman Almeida said he had no problem with a fiberglass door either. Mr. Beebe said they could get a smooth fiberglass door and paint it.

He said he thought the south elevation needed some relief because it was so visible from the parking lot. Mr. Beebe said they could put windows on the back wall, but the window near the stairway would need tempered glass and guards. Mr. Wyckoff wondered about a single pane glass, barn sash. Chairman Almeida wondered if there was a property line issue. Mr. Beebe said they moved it back from the property line 3 feet. Chairman Almeida said it would make sense to put windows there. Mr. Beebe said they would see the stairs from the window, but he would be okay with that. Mr. Wyckoff said they could put some inexpensive Plexiglas on the inside of the window to block the view of the stairway.

Mr. Rawling said he didn't have any issues with the detailing, but had a problem with the massing and bulk of the structure. He said he thought it was an overwhelmingly large generic structure unrelated to the existing house. Mr. Rawling said he could see it if there was a broad gable over two of the doors and over the other side to put it in a proportional scale. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it would give some detail to the building if there was a small overhang over the garage door. He said it was a nice suburban garage, but it needed to be stiffened up with some more historic details to go with the house. Vice Chair Kozak said she liked the simplicity, but agreed that the proportions seemed too wide and short for the house. Mr. Beebe said the problem was that they could make the roof pitch steeper, but the Board of Adjustment might say it needed to be lower because it was so close to the lot line. Mr. Rawling said they could do other things to make it appear smaller. Mr. Wyckoff asked if it would make more sense to turn it the other way. Vice Chair Kozak said changing the direction of one of the gables would help break up the mass. Mr. Beebe said he would consider the change. Councilor Kennedy said the footprint was already there, and thought this house would have had a carriage house behind it. She said a cupola or even an oval window detail would help. Chairman Almeida liked the simplicity too, but suggested it would be better if they brought the window down, and put two together. He also said it was important to match the glass treatment on the building with the door. Ms. Ruedig said she felt the doors were busy, and would like to see them simpler. Mr. Beede said only two doors were necessary for vehicles and the third would be for pedestrian equipment like a snow blower.

Chairman Almeida suggested Mr. Beebe come back for another work session with a public hearing.

C. Work Session requested by **Kathryn Saunders, owner**, for property located at **140 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new garage with connector). Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 26 and lies in Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

Ms. Anne Whitney said the 1910 house was at the end of New Castle and Marcy Street and the primary access was off of Ridges Court. Ms. Whitney said they would demolish the existing garage, and then rebuild a new garage and a connector addition with a sunroom projection out the back. She said they were also trying to save the existing bulkhead. Ms. Whitney said they were granted a variance for the project.

Councilor Kennedy asked if the garage was original, and Ms. Whitney said it was not and was poorly built.

Ms. Whitney said they were planning on an off-center, recessed entry with a Craftsman style door. Mr. Wyckoff asked if something could be done with the panels or vertical v-groove board in recessed entry. Ms. Whitney said it was a primary entry presented as an informal entry so she didn't want to over decorate it like a formal entry. Chairman Kennedy agreed, and thought she could simplify more by doing away with the Craftsman style. Ms. Whitney said she intended to match the garage and sunroom doors with the side entry door. She said the sunroom door would be glazed and the garage door would be solid panel.

Chairman Almeida said he did not think the four square window was appropriate. Ms. Whitney said originally they were six over one and then all of the windows were replaced with one-over-one windows. But they couldn't replace all the windows now. Ms. Ruedig suggested getting rid of the mullions on the four square window on the rear elevation.

Discussion ensued regarding making the garage a bit taller in keeping with the original house. Councilor Kennedy did not like that idea. Mr. Rawling suggested the use of a column to make it appear taller.

Vice-Chair Kozak said it appeared the addition was lower. Ms. Whitney said she was trying to avoid replacing the windows on the second story. Chairman Almeida said it would be more true to the rest of the house if the line carried through. Mr. Wyckoff said it would make it look larger and less Craftsman-like and more like the original Neo-Colonial look of the rest of the house. Ms. Whitney said it would mean changing an upstairs window.

Chairman Almeida said he saw three different roofline conditions between the main house, the connecting addition and the garage. Discussion ensued regarding alternative roofline solutions including the creation of a roof deck off the bedroom. Ms. Whitney said it would be a large place to maintain off a bedroom, and they often go unused. Chairman Almeida said she didn't have to keep the roof symmetrical either. Vice-Chair Kozak wondered if a flat roof would help avoid a low pitched gable. Ms. Whitney she would need to raise the height of the garage, and Chairman Almeida said he would like it to be at least two feet higher because he thought the house deserved a certain structure and height. Ms. Whitney said the garage was about 18' high, and she said she thought it would be imperceptible when approaching even if she brought the roofline up by 18". She said she liked how it nestled in, and she was trying to keep the sunroom lower so they could go out two steps into the yard. Ms. Whitney said she would review the doors and roofline heights further before returning to the next meeting.

Chairman Almeida stated that it had been a very long night. He said there were a lot of big projects coming in, and they needed to manage their time carefully because it wasn't fair to all the applicants, so they couldn't hand people microphones during work sessions, but would still give people an opportunity to speak by letter or note cards.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:00 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane K. Kendall
Acting Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on Dec. 4, 2013.