

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**July 13, 2016
reconvened from July 6, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida, Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; 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 read the Requests to Postpone petitions into the record.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the Petition A (Public Hearing Old Business) Request to Postpone was changed to a Request to Withdraw by the applicant. Chairman Almeida then read Work Sessions D, E, and F Requests to Postpone into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petitions to the August meeting.*

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

Mr. Cracknell read the Administrative Approvals into the record. He stated that Item #3 was removed from consideration because it was a replacement in kind, and Item #5 was requested by the applicant to be continued to the August meeting. Item #4 was pulled for discussion.

1. 89 New Castle Avenue – rear door installed with a smaller transom window.
2. 300 New Castle Avenue – minor alterations.

Mr. Wyckoff noted the railing on the granite steps and the absence of balusters and asked whether the Building Inspector had vetted it. Mr. Cracknell said he didn't know. Mr. Wyckoff said balusters were required on the steps and suggested a stipulation.

3. 154 Market Street – There was no need for approval because it was previously approved as an exempt activity.
4. 404 Middle Street - Mr. Cracknell read the three modifications: moving one egress window higher on the gable facing the street; changing the egress window on the other side of the gable to match the size drawn on the original elevation; and reducing a bank of windows on the lawn side from 21 inches to 24 inches.

Mr. Wyckoff requested that it be pulled for discussion, and the Commission discussed it in detail.

5. 31 Cabot Street – continued to the August meeting.

Mr. Rawling recused himself from the Administrative Approvals vote.

*Mr. Wyckoff made a motion to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for Petitions #1, 2 and 4, with the following stipulation:*

#2, 300 New Castle Avenue – if required, the same balustrade design shall be used for the stairs.

*Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion. The motion **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0).*

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Stephen Lichtenstein and Karen Jacoby, owners**, for property located at **35 Wibird Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace seven windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 134 as Lot 38 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts. *(The applicant has asked to postpone the application to the August 3, 2016 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the August meeting.*

B. Petition of **Robert McDowell, owner**, for property located at **379 Newcastle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition to an existing structure (demolish existing metal carport and garage) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new two car garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 4 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 6, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The applicant was not present.

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the end of the meeting.

III. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Ann L. and Mark M. Wilbur, owners**, for property located at **199 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing two story rear addition) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new two story rear addition, new deck, re-work existing fence and gate) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 6 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 6, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida recused himself from the work session.

The architect Juli MacDonald of DeStefano Architects and the owners Ann and Mark Wilbur were present. Ms. MacDonald reviewed the packet and said the new two-floor addition would replace the old addition and would have two decks, and an existing fence would be reworked. She discussed the massing and detailing and said the same size windows and shutters would be used. The only ornamental piece would be at the front entry. The clapboards would match the existing trim and shutters. An asphalt roof would replace the existing slate roof, but slate would be kept on the original structure and they would consider faux slate if necessary. The same eave lines would be carried and the shutters would stop at the mud room.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether there was ventilation in the gable, and Ms. MacDonald said there probably was not but that they would use insulation for the roof. She discussed the railing system and the basement entry on the east elevation.

Mr. Rawling asked about the foundation. Ms. MacDonald said the existing foundation was granite where the door was being added but was brick on the back of the house, and they proposed doing a brick veneer where the foundation was exposed. Mr. Wyckoff suggested concrete forms to resemble the granite, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Shea said the massing was good and thought the addition was subordinate to the main house, but he felt that the addition of the hip roof seemed a bit awkward and suggested that the roof be flattened and have a slight pitch.

Mr. Mayer asked whether the addition had been offset. Ms. MacDonald said she didn't know how far it was set back, and she said it was a corner board. Mr. Mayer suggested that a more obvious offset might help to differentiate what was new and old. He asked about the shutters on the addition. Ms. MacDonald said they hadn't looked at shutters in detail. Mr. Wyckoff said it

was important that the new shutters be hung properly and also felt that the clapboards should be 3-4" because it was a potential leak location.

Mr. Rawling suggested exploring synthetic slate instead of asphalt because the asphalt would emphasize the fakeness of the slate. He also suggested that the mulling width of the bay windows be increased a bit.

Ms. Ruedig said she walked by the house a lot and had never noticed the addition. She said it was a 1950's or 1960's look and not sympathetic to the original structure, so she didn't see a major loss with its removal. She thought the new design was much more sympathetic to the historic structure because it was simple, matched the window proportions, and was horizontally aligned. She also thought the new addition would be more visible from the street and that the entryway and deck would also be visible. She questioned the arch over the doorway and said it could be discussed at the next work session.

Mr. Lombardi said he couldn't add anything new to what had already been said, and he thanked the applicant for taking care of the house. Mr. Mayer asked whether shutters were planned for the west elevation, and Ms. MacDonald said they had the space and could consider it. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he agreed with Mr. Shea that the rooflines were awkward. He also thought the door on the ell was more ornate and enhanced the front door but said it was usually the other way around.

Ms. MacDonald asked the Commission for their input on whether windows should be replaced or repaired. Mr. Rawling suggested that the HDC guidelines be referred to, saying they leaned heavily toward preserving windows.

Ms. MacDonald asked the Commission's opinion of cementitious clapboards. Mr. Shea said they didn't look real, and most of the Commissioners agreed.

Ms. MacDonald said the house had wood gutters and asked whether fiberglass gutters with the same profile would work on the addition only. Vice-Chair Gladhill said they would, and Mr. Wyckoff noted that wood gutters were on 100-year-old houses and had lasted all that time.

No one from the public rose to speak.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimously (7-0) to continue review of the application at the August 2016 meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Thunderbolt Realty Trust of 2011, owner**, for property located at **17 Gardner Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolition of two rear additions, removal of rear deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a two story rear addition, relocate front gate and fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan

103 as Lot 14 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 6, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting.)*

Chairman Almeida recused himself from the work session.

The architect Juli MacDonald of DeStefano Architects and the owner Alison Jewett were present. Ms. MacDonald said they wanted to replace the existing addition with one that would simplify the massing. She reviewed the elevations. She said they proposed doing both shingles and clapboards on the addition, with a simple window replacement, and they also wanted to add a bay for an eating area. She further discussed the windows.

Mr. Lombardi asked when the original addition was done, and Ms. MacDonald said she thought it was done in the early 1900s.

Mr. Mayer asked whether a one-story connector could be maintained and go up a second story on the addition instead of engaging the existing building with the second floor. Ms. MacDonald said there would be a doorway connecting the existing bathroom and the new addition, and she said Mr. Mayer's suggestion would be difficult because it would require another stairway.

Mr. Rawling said he found it difficult to support the garrison look and said the awkward overhangs on the back were incompatible with the house. He said the two shingle materials tended to make the structure look like a gambrel, and the detailing of the bay on the back seemed awkward because it looked clunky and incompatible with the house. He also noted that the back side would probably have to be Hardiplank to be approved by the Building Inspection department due to its proximity to the property line.

Mr. Wyckoff said he also had problems with the east elevation because of the amount of windows, the doors on both sides, and the cantilever. He said it looked very busy and suburban. He said the box bay on the back was inappropriate and should be a traditional angled bay. He suggested preserving the window on the back addition. He didn't see a problem going from the second floor into the addition, or any issue with the existing window being changed to a door.

Ms. MacDonald said the addition had a lot of windows because the main house was very dark. She said the upper floor could be pulled back, and she discussed having a more traditional bay on that elevation. Mr. Shea said he thought the massing was okay and felt that the addition should also be a simple form but opened up a bit to let natural light in. He thought the addition should be all shingles instead of different textures, and he suggested bringing the garrison in to stay with the pitch. Ms. Ruedig said she echoed Mr. Shea's comments and agreed that the addition was the place for windows, but suggested that they be simplified. She discussed bringing in the west side's vertical addition to the other side. She agreed with the shingle and lighting comments.

Mr. Lombardi said he agreed with a lot of the comments but didn't understand the two doors in the addition. He said the box bay needed work and also said he wasn't excited about the garrison look. Vice-Chair Gladhill said he liked the design of the addition but didn't feel that it was appropriate, and he also didn't like the garrison look. The Commission discussed suggestions for the garrison look. Mr. Rawling suggested a carriage house or stable look for the back piece.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by unanimous vote (7-0) to continue the work session to a future meeting.*

The Commission then heard Public Hearing B because the applicant was present.

B) Petition of **Robert McDowell, owner**, for property located at **379 Newcastle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition to an existing structure (demolish existing metal carport and garage) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new two car garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 4 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 6, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Vice-Chair Gladhill was not present for this petition.

Attorney Bernie Pelech was present to speak to the petition. He stated that the owner wanted to build a two-car garage to replace the existing garage and metal carport. He noted that two 8-ft garage doors were originally proposed but would not fit, so they were proposing one 16'x8' garage door with the same appearance. Attorney Pelech described what the garage would look like. He also said there were approval letters from the abutters in the packet.

Mr. Wyckoff said the garage was well designed but noted what looked like wood shingles in the drawing. Attorney Pelech said it was a photo that the owner found that he felt was similar. Mr. Wyckoff asked why the owner hadn't considered wood shingles, and he said he had no problem with the AZEK but hoped the garage door would look as drawn. Attorney Pelech said it would.

Mr. Wyckoff said the front window was drawn as four panes of glass, and he asked why. Attorney Pelech said they were proposing six panels because a four-pane glass couldn't be found to match the dimensions of the one in the drawing. Mr. Wyckoff said the four-pane window was better. Attorney Pelech asked whether the 2/0 could be substituted for the 2/9.

Mr. Shea asked about the Brosco vinyl window shown in the packet. Attorney Pelech said it was supposed to be a wood sash and would be the same size and configuration.

Mr. Rawling said the drawing had building details but the scale was so small that he couldn't tell what anything was. Attorney Pelech said he would submit larger drawings to Mr. Cracknell.

Ms. Ruedig said she didn't think that shutters were necessary, seeing that it was a fixed window. She also noted that the siding on the drawing showed shingles. Attorney Pelech said the owner preferred clapboards.

Attorney Pelech also noted that there was a cupola on the existing garage with a codfish weathervane on it that the owner wanted to put on the new garage. Chairman Almeida asked whether it vented the garage, and Attorney Pelech said it was just decorative. Mr. Shea said he thought the cupola was acceptable and also suggested that the clapboards be made out of wood with a 4" exposure. Mr. Rawling said the cupola seemed undersized for the new garage but didn't think it would draw a lot of attention.

Ms. Ruedig asked how old the home was. Attorney Pelech said it was built in the early 1900s.

Chairman Almeida said the garage was successful but felt that the door was different. Attorney Pelech said the metal door had the same configuration as the previous door and would be field painted to make it look more convincing. Chairman Almeida asked what the roof material was, and Attorney Pelech said he assumed it was architectural asphalt shingles.

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** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) Azek may be used for the trim detail and shall be field-painted.*
- 2) The siding shall be wood clapboards with no greater than a 4" exposure.*
- 3) The window shall be a Brosco, 2/2 (four light square) – 2' x 2'9".*
- 4) All windows shall be wood windows and shutters are optional.*
- 5) The windows, doors and trim details shall match submitted drawings.*
- 6) The existing cupola may be used on the new garage.*
- 7) The garage door shall be field-painted.*
- 8) Architectural asphalt shingles shall be used.*

Mr. Lombardi seconded the motion.

Mr. Wyckoff said the project would preserve the integrity of the District and would conserve and enhance property values.

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

C. Work Session requested by **Brian J. Bednarek, owner**, for property located at **10 Humphreys Court**, 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 and mudroom) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 43 and lies within the General Residence and Historic Districts.

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studios representing the owner stated that the home and garage were built in 1960 and that the owner wanted to replace the garage with a new garage and mudroom. She noted that it was approved by the Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Ramsey reviewed the site plan, noting that the one-car garage would have the same footprint. She pointed out a substantial grade change from the garage to the house and also said that the door and window would be reversed from what was shown on the layout. She discussed the shed dormer above the addition as well as the egress windows on the second floor, which she said were spaced due to a homogenous wall separating two bedrooms. Ms. Ramsey said the alternative was to do a gable dormer on the front of the addition, but it felt heavy. She said all the details would match the existing home.

Mr. Shea verified that the dormers on the garage were not original to the house. He discussed how close they came to the ridge. Ms. Ramsey said they increased the overhang on the front of the garage to protect the doors and get more inside square footage, and they aligned the dormer as well. Mr. Shea suggested bringing it up a bit higher. He noted there was a lot going on with the front elevation of the garage and felt that the dormer didn't relate to anything. Ms. Ramsey said they could break it up or shift the dormer. Mr. Rawling said he felt that the dormers were the most awkward part, particularly the windows with dormers, and that both elevations were unrelated to anything going on with the house. He also noted different proportions with the mulling details. Ms. Ramsey said the glass proportions on the existing windows were more rectangular than what was shown on the drawing and that the rectangle portions on the new shed dormer windows were close to what the house had. She said she could change the spacing on the windows as well, and Mr. Rawling said the issue was the width of them. Chairman Almeida said that multiple pane sizes would be distracting, and it was discussed.

Chairman Almeida noted that one of the examples of similar homes on the street showed a long, linear horizontal band of windows that he didn't think was the best solution. Mr. Rawling said the project seemed like three different parts, the existing house, the first floor of the addition, and the second floor of the addition, and he found them disconnected.

Ms. Ruedig discussed the window and the door on the first floor of the garage and also said the little window seemed to be floating. Ms. Ramsey said it was driven by the inside space.

Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the shed dormers were driven by the owner. Ms. Ramsey said the owner suggested the shed dormer on the back, but on the front, they just needed light. Mr. Wyckoff said it seemed uncomfortable from the front elevation and suggested a larger gable dormer instead. Mr. Shea asked whether the dormer could be shifted. It was further discussed.

Mr. Mayer asked why the door was set back, and Ms. Ramsey said the owner wanted the covered area to stand out. Mr. Mayer suggested moving it forward or aligning the plane to balance it out. He also note that the back elevation felt like a huge mass compared to what was there and suggested breaking or pulling in the roofline.

Mr. Lombardi said the existing house had symmetry, and he thought the garage and mudroom seemed awkward. It was further discussed.

Mr. Wyckoff suggested that the owner solicit opinions from the neighborhood because he felt it was more important that the neighbors thought the project was appropriate. Ms. Ramsey said all the neighbors signed letters of support.

Ms. Ruedig asked that Ms. Ramsey make sure that the window sills were drawn in because it made a big difference in how they appeared to the Commissioners. Mr. Rawling suggested that the entrance into the mudroom be recessed to give more emphasis to the house and set the garage back. Mr. Wyckoff asked whether the siding on the house was vinyl, and Ms. Ramsey said it was wood.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to continue the work session at the August 2016 meeting.

IV. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

D. Work Session requested by **Kimberley A. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, Kimberley A. and James C. Lucy, trustees and James C. Lucy Revocable Living Trust, owner, James C. and Kimberley A. Lucy, trustees**, for property located at **127 & 137 High Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to existing structures (construct new building at rear of 137 High Street, construct roof deck at rear of 127 High Street, both with associated parking and landscaping) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 20 and 21 and lies within the CD 4, Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the June 8, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the August meeting.

E. Work Session requested by **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct new mixed use, 4 to 5 ½ story building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was continued at the June 8, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the August meeting.

F. Work Session requested by **Michael De la Cruz, owner**, for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (rebuild historic parapets, add series of flat roofed dormers, add series of roof walkways and decks, add series of windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 5 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 8, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

It was moved, seconded, and passed by unanimous vote (7-0) to postpone the petition to the August meeting.

G. Work Session requested by **355 Pleasant Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **355 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct a two unit dwelling) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 64 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 8, 2016 meeting to the July 13, 2016 meeting,)*

Mr. Shea recused himself from the work session.

The project architect and direct abutter Richard Shea introduced the owner Katherine Kane. Ms. Kane said she had addressed all the previous comments from the Commissioners. She showed several examples of nearby homes that had Greek Revival elements. She discussed massing and dimensions and said her home fit in nicely with other homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Shea discussed previous comments made by the Commission regarding the front elevation, the lack of front doors, the feel that the house was too wide, the casements, the southern feel that the metal railings on the lower windows gave, and that the house was too high. He said he removed two feet from the width and went to 6/6 windows on the top floor but kept the tall windows on the first floor. He said the shutters were operable, the front entry was formalized, the overall height came down a bit, and a typical side elevation was a mirror image of the other side. He said the pediment was a stronger feature on the side elevation and made it more formal. He said the windows would probably be Green Mountain ones, and would have a basement sash instead of egress windows on the bottom. The rear elevation would be similar to the previous presented one, and each party would have a garage and rear door.

Mr. Shea said that the box picture window for the kitchen had a lot of glass over the counters.

Mr. Shea then passed a mockup of a PVC shutter to the Commissioners.

Chairman Almeida said he was concerned about the wide pilaster corners and felt they would stick out of the foundation and look like they were floating. It was further discussed, and Mr. Shea said plantings would take care of the problem.

Mr. Shea discussed the shutters and said they would be hung to look operable. He said the two chimneys would be brick veneer flashed into the roof with a gas flue. He also discussed the shingles and said they would be a slate line series and would look like slate from the road. Ms. Ruedig asked him to bring in a sample.

Mr. Shea discussed the windows, noting that they would be the Milestone double hung series with no plastic jamb liners and cased with PVC but with wooden sashes and no half screens. He said they were trying to find old doors for the two front doors but otherwise would use reproduction wooden ones. A bulkhead was necessary, and he said they may put a panel door overlay on it. The garage doors on the back of the house would be metal with a PVC overlay and probably field painted.

Mr. Shea showed a sample of the siding to the Commission.

Mr. Wyckoff said the box bay was successful. Mr. Rawling said he was supportive of all the changes but thought the windows on the front seemed a bit awkward, especially the small window. Mr. Shea suggested an oval window. They further discussed it. Mr. Wyckoff said he had no problems with the windows. Ms. Ruedig said she didn't think anyone walking or driving by would notice the windows. Chairman Almeida said the oval window would be noticeable as a decorative feature, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Rawling noted that the caps on the column seemed heavy, and Mr. Shea said he could bevel them. Mr. Rawling also said he found the pediments a little undersized and suggested that they be wider, but he thought the angle was okay.

Chairman Almeida said he was disappointed by the excessive amount of drip edge on some of the roof details, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Mayer suggested getting a Lead Certification for the project and thought the building would be a good benchmark for it. Ms. Ruedig said it was a thoughtful project and said she appreciated the angularity of it but suggested that it be made simpler.

Chairman Almeida said the application was one of the most complete he had seen and thought it should be used as a model for future applications.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The applicant said she would file for a public hearing.

V. ADJOURNMENT

*At 9:50 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (7-0) to adjourn the meeting.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
HDC Recording Secretary

These minutes were approved at the Historic District Commission meeting on August 3, 2016.