

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**October 5, 2016  
to be reconvened on October 12, 2016**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Joseph Almeida, Members Jon Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

Chairman Almeida announced that Vice-Chair Gladhill had resigned and that the position was available. Ms. Ruedig nominated Mr. Lombardi, and Mr. Rawling nominated Mr. Wyckoff to fill the Vice Chair position. The Commissioners voted, and Mr. Lombardi was elected Vice-Chair.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. September 7, 2016

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to approve the September 7, 2016 minutes as amended.*

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

1. 536 Marcy Street
2. 200 State Street
3. 114 Mechanic Street
4. 236 Union Street
5. 77 State Street
6. 138/140 Maplewood Avenue
7. 90 Gates Street
8. 28 Dennett Street
9. 40 Court Street
10. 35 Portwalk Place
11. 40 Bridge Street
12. 180 Gates Street

Mr. Cracknell stated that Item #9, 40 Court Street, would be removed from the list because the contractors needed more time.

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Items #7 and #12, stating that it was originally required by the City Inspector that the siding on both projects be replaced with Hardiplank but the Inspection Department had changed the requirement to a recommendation. He said both applicants did not want Hardiplank.

Mr. Mayer requested that Item #11, 40 Bridge Street, be removed for discussion due to the number of issues.

Mr. Cracknell then pulled out Item #3, 114 Mechanic Street, for discussion. Ms. Ruedig said she was unsure about the appropriateness of having cedar shingles on the side of the building because she felt it was a 'Nantucket' feature not commonly seen in Portsmouth. Mr. Rawling agreed and asked whether there was information indicating that the house was shingled at one time. Mr. Wyckoff said he felt that clapboards were more correct unless it could be proven that there were previously shingles on the side. The owner approached the podium and stated that he found no evidence of previous shingles. He discussed several examples of other nearby properties with shingles on the sides.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he would withdraw his objection. Ms. Ruedig stated that she preferred to defer the item to the following week's meeting because she wanted to see other examples, and Mr. Rawling agreed. Chairman Almeida said it would be worth taking a closer look.

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Item #4, 236 Union Street, noting that there was not much information included in the package.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to postpone Items #3 and #4 to the October 12, 2016 meeting.*

Mr. Cracknell addressed Item #5, 77 State Street. Mr. Rawling and Vice-Chair Lombardi said there were too many mechanicals. Mr. Shea said there was not enough louver detail. It was discussed, and Chairman Almeida suggested a stipulation that the current finish be matched.

Mr. Cracknell discussed Item #7, 90 Gates Street, noting that the applicant did not want to put Hardiplank on the side of the house but would prefer to put cedar shingles to match the other side of the house. He said the applicant also wanted to use Azek trim on the side elevations with the same detail. Mr. Wyckoff said the cedar shingles might be more appropriate because the house was short. Chairman Almeida recommended that it be stipulated that the Azek be field painted.

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Items #8, 28 Dennett Street, and #10, 35 Portwalk Place, and there were no issues.

Pertaining to Item #12, 180 Gates Street, Mr. Cracknell said the applicant wanted to remove the request for fiber cement and replace the windows in kind with Brosco windows. He also noted that the contractor wanted to replace the trim on the garage with Azek and then field paint it. The Commission then voted on Items #1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval to the Administrative Approval Items #1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12, with the stipulations as discussed. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Item #6, 138/140 Maplewood Avenue. The contractor approached the podium with samples and said it was the same type of sample that he previously submitted to Mr. Cracknell. Ms. Ruedig said the texture was too heavy. Mr. Cracknell noted that the previous sample was much smoother. The applicant left to retrieve the original sample.

Mr. Cracknell then addressed Item #11, 40 Bridge Street, and read the revisions, noting that they were minor. Chairman Almeida agreed. Ms. Ruedig noted that the #9 change on the south elevation seemed substantial and asked for more information describing what it would look like. It was decided to stipulate that Change #9 be removed from the petition.

The contractor for Item #6 returned with the sample. Mr. Wyckoff said it was inappropriate for the front of the building because it wasn't a good product. Ms. Ruedig agreed and said a wooden product would be more appropriate. Mr. Cracknell suggested stipulating that the Hardiplank be replaced with cedar clapboards. He read the other requested items, and there was further discussion on the door. Mr. Cracknell suggested stipulating that the sidelights match the window specifications.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with three stipulations. Mr. Rawling seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote.*

Mr. Cracknell then returned to Item #11, 40 Bridge Street.

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application, with stipulations. Councilor Pearson seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote.*

### **III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Petition of **127 Parrott Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **127 Parrott Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install wall mounted ductless heat pump unit to northeast building façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 115 as Lot 3 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

#### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

Attorney Larry Gormley stated that he was one of the principals, and he reviewed his petition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the heat pump unit would sit on the ground or be mounted on the wall. Attorney Gormley said it would be wall mounted.

Ms. Ruedig said it would be out of the way and not really viewable. Mr. Shea said he had no issues but noted that the exhibit was a bad example of illustrating what the unit could look like. He asked whether anything would be exposed, and Attorney Gormley said no.

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

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, and Mr. Shea seconded.*

Ms. Ruedig said the request was very minor and the installation would be out of the way and not visible to the public.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

2. Petition of **Middle Street Townhouse Association, owner, and Charles R. and Jill E. LeMay, applicants**, for property located at **774 Middle Street, Unit 2**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows, replace front entry door/sidelights, replace garage doors, construct small roof over rear entrance) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 153 as Lot 9-1 as lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant Charles LeMay reviewed the property's background and the petition.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether there was a division on the window sills, and Mr. LeMay replied that there was not. He said the replacement windows were inserts and the frames were original. It was further discussed, and Mr. LeMay said he planned to remove the whole unit. Mr. Shea confirmed that Mr. LeMay would remove the entire window unit and install a new unit with field-applied casings and sills. Mr. LeMay said he would have the heavy sill on the bottom if possible but thought he would get the insert and have the sill built. He noted that he would match the upper window as closely as possible. Mr. Mayer asked whether a mesh screen would be included, and Chairman Almeida asked Mr. LeMay whether he would consider continuing the same screen detail that was on the other windows. Mr. LeMay agreed to both requests.

Mr. Rawling asked about the color, and Mr. LeMay said it would be white to match. Mr. Rawling suggested that the jamb liners be specified in white and stated as such in the application.

Mr. Wyckoff noted the brackets hanging over the door and two windows and asked how they would affect the light. Mr. LeMay said the light would either be moved or changed. Ms. Ruedig suggested simplifying the back entry and said she didn't think the brackets were necessary. Mr. Wyckoff agreed that the brackets were inappropriate. Mr. Shea suggested eliminating the hip roof. Mr. LeMay said he could change the roof sketch and resubmit it as an administrative approval. Mr. Rawling said he would support the simplification as well as a projected canopy and wide fascia. Chairman Almeida said they were all good comments but said that he applied the back-of-the-house rule and didn't believe that it would have a negative impact on the District. He suggested pulling that piece out to expedite the application.

Mr. LeMay then showed photos of the rear windows, noting that they were different from the front windows. Ms. Ruedig asked whether the top sash of the window would be the same size, and Mr. LeMay said it would be the same width but perhaps with a shorter window. Ms. Ruedig commented that it was part of the original house and that it was sad to see that design change but noted that it wouldn't be visible.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the trim detail on the windows was similar to the trim of the original windows. Mr. LeMay said they were on the 2<sup>nd</sup>-story windows. Mr. Mayer asked whether the window dimension could remain and the bottom part could be screened to keep the fenestration. It was further discussed.

Mr. LeMay said he wanted to replace the entire middle unit of the 1986 original front entry door with a similar design. Mr. Wyckoff asked why Mr. LeMay wouldn't simply replace the door, and Mr. LeMay said the frame was rotting. Mr. Shea asked whether Mr. LeMay would use the standard aluminum threshold or upgrade to wood, and Mr. LeMay said he would stay with the aluminum.

In response to Ms. Ruedig's questions about the garage, Mr. LeMay said it was built in 1998 and that the door handles were not necessary. Mr. Rawling asked whether Mr. LeMay had information about the door finish, and Mr. LeMay said he did not but knew that it could be field painted. Chairman Almeida asked whether the windows had an exterior muntin, and it was further discussed. He suggested going with the original, depending on the quality of the muntins.

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

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** a Certificate of Approval for the application as submitted, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) Half screens shall be used.*
- 2) The window jamb color shall match the casing color.*
- 3) The front door design shall match the existing door.*

- 4) *The garage door selection shall be from the three rectangular window options included in the submission materials.*
- 5) *The canopy roof component on the rear elevation is removed from the application and will be re-submitted with a roof detail under an administrative approval.*

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion.*

Mr. Cracknell then added the stipulation that the front door design shall match existing. Mr. Wyckoff said he agreed with the added stipulation.

Mr. Wyckoff said the petition would be compatible with the design of surrounding properties and preserve the integrity of the District.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

3. (Work Session / Public Hearing) Petition of **Charles A. and Patricia A. Corlin, owners**, for property located at **736 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations, new construction to an existing structure, and new free standing structures (complete exterior renovation of main structure, including installation of rear dormers, construct new garage, shed, install condensing unit, install fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 24 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

## **WORK SESSION**

The owner Charles Corlin and his daughter Laura were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Corlin said he wanted to replace most of the shingles in kind and paint them to match the house, install dormer on the back of the house and have fewer windows. He noted that the dormer would not go to the edge of the house, as requested by the Commission.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the windows were different sizes, and Mr. Corlin said a few of them were bathroom windows but the width would be the same. It was further discussed.

Mr. Corlin said he wanted to replace the piazza and make it flush with the house. He noted that it wasn't possible to salvage the detail around the porch because it was rotted.

Mr. Wyckoff noted that there was no detail on the window trims, the dormers, and around the sliding doors and that it wasn't drawn to detail. Chairman Almeida said it was customary to accept matching existing.

The Commission discussed stepping back the cornerboard. Mr. Shea recommended stepping it back 10 inches, but Mr. Wyckoff thought 4 or 5 inches would make a significant difference.

Mr. Shea asked about the roof material. Mr. Corlin said he planned to do a rubber roof. The bumpout was discussed as well as swapping some windows. They also discussed the deck and the shed, and Mr. Cracknell requested that a photo of the shed be forwarded to him.

There was no public comment.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **close** the work session and go into the public hearing. Ms. Ruedig seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote.*

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The Commission decided that they would simply accept the decisions and stipulations from the work session.

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

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) All new or repaired window and door casings and trim shall match the existing windows and doors.*
- 2) All windows located in the proposed rear dormer shall be uniform in size.*
- 3) The rear corner of the piazza shall be recessed at least 6" from the side wall of the main principal building. (A-7)*
- 4) A rubber membrane roof shall be used for the piazza. (A-6)*
- 5) The small bump out for the rear door section shall remain as existing. (A-6)*
- 6) The second floor window shall be replaced with the existing rear window being removed for the new door location.*
- 7) The shed design shall match the details as shown and presented on the image provided.*
- 8) The garage doors shall be metal with wood siding and the garage shall match the details shown in the application.*
- 9) The decorative fence shall be located behind the front building wall.*
- 10) Half screens shall be used.*
- 11) The rear deck proposal shall be removed from the application at this time and may be re-submitted under an Administrative Approval.*

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion.*

Ms. Ruedig stated that the improvements were major ones to the house, were compatible with surrounding properties, and would maintain the integrity of the District as well as conserve and enhance property values.

*The motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).*

4. Petition of **DeWarren, LLC, owner**, for property located at **69-71 Dennett 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 141 as Lot 8 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

### **SPEAKING TO THE PETITION**

The applicant Tim Pesce stated that he wanted to install Green Mountain windows.

Chairman Almeida confirmed that Mr. Pesce would replace the doors, windows, downspouts and pediment.

Mr. Shea noted that information was missing on the dimensions of the front entryway detailing. He said he explored other historic homes in Portsmouth to find out how side-by-side double doors were treated and found one that had a gable on it but not a lot of pitch. Mr. Rawling noted that the photo had a heavier tabulature than what the drawings showed, and he discussed how to raise the pediment. Chairman Almeida said he didn't think the pediment was overly wide and felt that the examples were much wider due to the sidelights. It was further discussed. Chairman Almeida said the dimensions were necessary and that it could be resolved the following week.

Mr. Rawling asked whether there was detail on the width of the pilasters and thought the wider one would look better. He recommended having a drawing with more detail.

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

No one rose to speak, and Chairman Almeida closed the public hearing.

### **DECISION OF THE COMMISSION**

*Ms. Ruedig made the motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

*1) The front door pediment shall be dimensioned, detailed and submitted for administrative approval.*

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion.*

Ms. Ruedig stated that the petition would preserve the integrity of the District as well as improve the appearance of the house, and it would be compatible with surrounding properties.

*The motion passed by unanimous vote (7-0).*

## **IV. WORK SESSIONS**

A. Work Session requested by **Jason Lander and Justus C. Bergweger, Jr., owners**, for property located at **34-36 Highland 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 135 as Lot 10 and lies within the



General Residence A and Historic Districts. (*This item was postponed at the September 7, 2016 meeting to the October 5, 2016 meeting.*)

Ms. Ruedig recused herself from the petition.

The applicant Jason Lander was present to speak to the application. Mr. Cracknell stated that there had been a site walk. Mr. Shea said the Commission had determined that all the windows were original. He said it seemed like some of the sash liners may have been changed but the majority of the sash had been there since the house was built, and he felt they were worthy of restoration. He also suggested that a better quality of storm windows be used. Mr. Cracknell said he would provide a list of recommended contractors to Mr. Lander.

Mr. Lander asked about the rear windows. Mr. Shea suggested that if a sash couldn't be restored, it could be replaced with a sash replacement kit. Mr. Cracknell suggested different types of windows and said they could be considered as an administrative approval.

## **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **1. Discussion: Demolition Review – Draft Ordinance**

Ms. Ruedig resumed her seat.

The Commission discussed the Demolition Ordinance. Vice-Chair Lombardi asked whether the time period was 90 days and whether the Ordinance referenced demolition by neglect. He believed there was a separate ordinance that dealt with it. Mr. Cracknell said there wasn't a separate ordinance. Chairman Almeida said it was difficult to enforce demolition by neglect and agreed that it should be in the Ordinance. Mr. Cracknell further explained the process and the Commission discussed it in length. The notice seemed to be the biggest issue.

Ms. Ruedig asked why the Music Hall arch was approved without the Commission's approval and said she wasn't comfortable with a private project on City-owned property bypassing a regular approval process, noting that it set a dangerous precedent. Councilor Pearson said she thought the Music Hall representatives indicated that they would return only for approval on the marquee, and it was further discussed.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

*At 10:40 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously (7-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Joann Breault  
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on November 2, 2016.