

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**August 2, 2017
to be reconvened on August 9, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice Chairman Jon Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Richard Shea; John Mayer; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternate Martin Ryan

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Reagan Ruedig, Alternate Molly Bolster

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

Chairman Lombardi read the three Requests for Postponements into the record.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. July 5, 2017
- B. July 12, 2017

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **approve** the two sets of minutes, with a minor amendment on the July 12, 2017 minutes.*

II. REQUEST FOR ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

Requested by 355 Pleasant Street, LLC, and granted on August 3, 2016.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **grant** the one-year-extension of the Certificate of Approval. The Certificate of Approval will now expire on August 3, 2018.*

III. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- 1. 77 State Street

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to pull the item for separate discussion.

Mr. Cracknell stated that the applicant wanted to insert vertical privacy boards on the penthouse unit that wouldn't be visible from anywhere and also wanted to replace a permanent roof canopy

with an awning, add a privacy fence on the penthouse, and replace the internal display boxes in the garage with a window film.

Mr. Rawling noted that the film could easily be changed or removed. Mr. Mayer said it was challenging because it would be part of the building's finish and the Commission was agreeing to a third-party's work without understanding their capacity. He said he would rather see the fully-programmed window boxes and noted that the film could deteriorate. Mr. Cracknell said Strawberry Banke was doing it at their own expense and that the program was defined and the partnership settled.

Jennifer Ramsey representing the applicant was present to speak to the petition. She said they were still building the window boxes as originally approved and that it was Strawberry Banke's design. She said it would go on the inside of the glass and would not deteriorate.

Mr. Rawling said he wanted to discourage the use of window film in the downtown area's windows and felt that the use should be kept as an active display one because it too strongly resembled empty storefronts with faux graphics. He recommended continuing the original design intent in the approval. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it was a temporary application on the inside of the glass and the design had been set, which was a map of the Puddle Dock area that he felt was a wonderful thing for the City to have. He emphasized that it was a parking garage and he had no problem with the petition as long as the window cases were made and were there in the future. Mr. Shea agreed, saying the design was an attractive view of Strawberry Banke and better than looking at car headlights.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Administrative Approval with the following stipulation:*

- 1) That the shadow boxes shall be constructed as originally approved and the proposed window film may be directly applied as presented.*

*Mr. Shea seconded the motion. The motion **passed** (5-1), with Mr. Rawling voting in opposition and Mr. Mayer abstaining.*

2. 28 Dennett Street
3. 393 New Castle Avenue
4. 401 State Street
5. 37-51 Hanover Street
6. 116 Middle Street

Mr. Cracknell read the descriptions for the remainder of the Administrative Approvals. Regarding Item #6, 116 Middle Street, Mr. Shea asked whether flat storm windows would be placed on the rounded entry windows. The owner Rose McMaster stated that the rounded windows were all redone.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to approve the remainder of the Administrative Approvals, and Councilor Pearson seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7) vote.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Worth Development Condominium Association, owner**, and **The Friendly Toast, applicant**, for property located at **113 Congress Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (replace one front windows with retractable windows with screens) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 6-104 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(At the applicant's request, this item was postponed at the July 5, 2017 meeting to the August 2, 2017 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the September 2017 meeting.

B. Petition of **Kristina Logan, owner**, for property located at **220 South Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, remove asbestos siding, replace with cedar shingle siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 1 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the July 5, 2017 meeting to the August 2, 2017 meeting.)*

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the September 2017 meeting.

C. Petition of **82 Court Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **82 Court Street**, wherein permission was 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 116 as Lot 48 and lies within the CD4-L1 and Historic District. *(This item was postponed at the July 12, 2017 meeting to the August 2, 2017 meeting.)*

The Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the September 2017 meeting.

D. (Public Hearing) **Petition of 46 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein a Conditional Use Permit and a Certificate of Approval was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct 3 ½ story mixed use 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 CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(The item was postponed at the July 5, 2017 meeting to the August 2, 2017 meeting.)*

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

Jennifer Ramsey of SOMMA Studies was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. She noted that the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) was for the penthouse and not the building height. She stated that, as a result of the Commission's previous comments, the only

outstanding items were the glazing on the rails with the etched glass and the bandings on the bay. She noted that the rendering was the second option from the June submission and was the one that the Commission had preferred, and she reviewed it in detail.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked what the horizontal element on the glass panel was. Ms. Ramsey said the etching had a clear portion that emulated the metal railing's pattern. Mr. Rawling said the Commission had discussed adding a piece of metal, and he proposed that they add the metal strip somewhere to the top. Ms. Ramsey agreed to do it.

Councilor Pearson said she supported the current design and didn't think it was detrimental to the building. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed. Mr. Rawling said the Commission's intent was to get some relationship between the different elements. Mr. Shea said he liked the way it was proposed and thought it was appropriate for the District. Chairman Lombardi said that adding a metal-adhered element could be problematic and felt that the design should be left alone.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the bay material was a factory finish. Ms. Ramsey said it was and would be field painted. Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that a few Commissioners had gone to York, Maine to examine the house that had the same finish and found it blotchy. Mr. Rawling agreed, saying it had bad stains and irregular weathering in less than a year. Ms. Ramsey said she would ensure that they wouldn't hire the same contractor.

Ms. Ramsey then reviewed the landscape plan and the roof plan, noting that the penthouse would be pulled to the bullnose corner. Mr. Cracknell said it looked like it exceeded 50% of the floor. Ms. Ramsey said it did, due to components. Ms. Ramsey reviewed the elevations, rail systems, windows, door systems, materials and colors. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked about the window manufacturer. Ms. Ramsey said it was the Marvin Integrity series. Mr. Shea asked whether the penthouse trim and panel would be painted, and Ms. Ramsey agreed. Mr. Ryan asked whether the canopy would be etched. Ms. Ramsey said it wouldn't but that she could include etching.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the CUP for the application with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The stipulations of the Certificate of Approval shall be implemented as approved.
- 2) The program elements listed in Exhibit A as civic space, parking, building materials and building scale elements shall be implemented as presented and approved.

Mr. Shea seconded.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff addressed the CUP first. He stated that the maximum height was 45 feet where it should be 40 feet, the floor ratio was 62% of the entire floor instead of 50%, and that

there was a zero setback. He said he thought they were minor differentiations from the code and that the Commission had actually requested a bit of height on the corner, so he felt that the CUP was justified. He reviewed the criteria, noting that the civic space criteria would be met because there would be permanently accessible public open space that would tally 30% of the lot size. He said there was an easement to extend the landscaping up to the building and that the applicant proposed to make cosmetic improvements to the building. Relating to the rest of the criteria, he said the applicant would provide underground and concealed parking, the materials (masonry, glass panels, storefront metals, and windows) were all high quality, the building scale elements were very successful, and the pedestrian experience was very good.

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

The Commission then addressed the Certificate of Approval.

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented with the following stipulations:*

- 1) Option 2 for the railings shall be used as shown on the Plan Set.*
- 2) All exterior lighting shall be subsequently submitted for Administrative Approval.*

Councilor Pearson seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff stated that the Commission had reviewed the building for years, which included a lot of detail in the last 6-9 months, and were not rushing it through. He said the petition would preserve the integrity of the District and had a lot of design elements that spoke to Portsmouth. He said the building's scale, mass, location, and style would maintain the character of the District and would promote the District's contribution to the education, pleasure and welfare of the residents. He noted that the building was on a very important corner coming into the City and that it would meet the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties, matching up well with Portwalk and the eventual northern project. He said the project's exterior design arrangements met the existing and were compatible with surrounding properties, and the materials had innovative use of modern technology.

Chairman Lombardi said the project was long in coming and thought the applicant worked very hard with the HDC and that the cooperative nature of the project was exemplary.

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

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Sundance Holdings, LLC, owner**, and **Union Pub Co., applicant**, for property located at **77 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows on front façade, install make up air venting) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new compliant egress stair for upper floors on rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department.

Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 10 and lies within the CD 4 and Historic Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The architect Brandon Holben was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the petition. He said that historic photos showed only 1/1 windows, indicating that the existing 6/6 and 3/3 windows were installed in the 1970s. He said they would retain the brick mold and replace all three levels of windows, replicating the 3/3 ones on the third floor and the 6/6 ones on the second floor.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked how the windows with acoustic glazing were different. Mr. Holben said they were almost like a car windshield and were insulated, with a double pane and a laminated inside layer. In response to further questions from Vice-Chair Wyckoff, Mr. Holben said the first-floor windows had no acoustic glazing, and he explained how the integrated screen would work, comparing it to a vertical accordion. He said there would be no screen when the windows were closed.

In response to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. Holben said the existing windows on the second and third floors were wood, that they would install the new window and maintain the existing brick mold, and that the new window's sill would be on top of the old window but set back. Vice-Chair Wyckoff said it seemed like some framing should be put in. Mr. Holben said there was a step there, so there would be brick mold on three sides and a trim between the existing sill to cover the bottom. Mr. Shea said the existing window sill was wider than the brick opening and suggested stipulating that it be replaced in kind, with the same dimensions. He asked whether the window size would be the same and was told that it would. Mr. Holben said the windows would be open during the day so people could see in, and during the shows at night there would be a shutter system.

Mr. Ryan noted that it was the back of the house but that it could be seen looking down the alley. He asked whether the sill was stone. Mr. Holben said it was wood. Mr. Ryan asked whether the windows could be infilled in such a way to retain some of the history. Mr. Holben said they could maintain the existing brick. In response to further questions, Mr. Holben said the skylights would stay the same, and he explained how the window and screen unit would work.

Mr. Mayer said he shared Mr. Shea's concerns about the new window program and that he didn't want to see diminished openings. He thought it was important to retain as much of it as possible. He said he was surprised that there was no detail on the installation system in the packet. Mr. Holben said he would submit it before doing the windows. Mr. Mayer asked whether the conduit could be buried as much as possible. Mr. Holben said he would bring everything inside the building as much as possible.

Mr. Mayer noted that sustaining the feeling of a period treatment on the first-floor front windows would make the building more compatible with the streetscape and asked whether Mr. Holben had considered a double-hung window. Mr. Holben said he had but it wasn't in the budget. The Commission further discussed it. Mr. Shea noted that other City restaurants had windows that

opened up and said he didn't find it a contemporary detail. He said the windows would be wood, and that it was obvious that the first floor had evolved through several incarnations. He said the windows were the same size but had a different function, and he thought it would be enjoyable to have the window opened up in nice weather. He asked Mr. Holben to return with more details on the second and third floors and that he do either half screens or no screens. Mr. Holben said the Marvin windows had an interior screen option.

Mr. Rawling said he was more accepting of the lower-level windows than before due to the number of elevation changes but felt that the double hung was more in keeping with the original building's character. He noted that the nano walls were a contemporary but popular feature, so he could accept them but preferred the double hung window.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked about the cement walls on the back. Mr. Holben said there were a few window openings and they had to do continuous rebar reinforcement, so they would block up the openings to do the rebar. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the cement block section could be painted or have material placed on it. Mr. Holben said it could potentially be done.

Chairman Lombardi said the building represented Portsmouth's old history as well as its more recent one and was an iconic hangout for the residents. He said he didn't have a problem with the front window because the building had changed numerous times, and that even though it was modern, he thought that the wood and multi-lighting could be viewed as very compatible. He said he wanted to see the cement block building look a lot nicer, though.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Shea moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The use of an interior or half screen shall be required.*
- 2) Prior to installation of the upper floor windows, a detail shall be submitted showing the profile, placement and trim details.*

Councilor Pearson seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea said the changes would preserve the integrity of the District and were consistent with the special and defining characteristics of surrounding properties. He said he appreciated that an iconic Downtown building was being saved and thought the proposed changes were good ones.

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

2. Petition of **Michael De La Cruz, owner**, for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design

(remove roof top cooling tower and supporting structures, extend roof top dormer) 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.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Michael de la Cruz was present to speak to the petition. He said he wanted to remove the large cooling tower and extend the penthouse in its place. He said he added a decorative rail to the penthouse, a fence design, and some round windows. He distributed diagrams to the Commission showing the design elements and reviewed his petition in detail.

Mr. Rawling asked whether the fence was a different height or a lattice fence. Mr. de la Cruz said the existing fence could be infilled with a design and have a sign on the top, so the height would be taller. Mr. Rawling said an enhancement to the existing gate would be nice but didn't need to be embellished, and he asked that it not be painted red. He said the G3 concept was a more decorative, nicer piece that wouldn't draw the attention that the bright red would. Mr. Mayer suggested that no signage be included because it might indicate that it was a public access. He asked for more information about the window's structural system. Mr. de la Cruz said there were posts on most of the elevations and that the window would fit within the two posts, and he showed the rendering of it and further discussed it.

In response to Mr. Shea's questions, Mr. de la Cruz said the penthouse had the original design and height and that the window pattern was similar. Mr. Shea said it would be great to put the cooling tower on the ground. He also suggested a more attractive design for the gate screening system, with a gesture toward the Vaughan Mall.

Chairman Lombardi said he had a problem with the cooling tower being on the ground in that location because the alley was an important one that went through to Fleet Street. Mr. de la Cruz said the tower was raised so one could walk under it. He said it was 7-8 feet off the ground, and he also gave its dimensions. He said there was no separation requirement needed to make the tower run properly.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the alley was public. Chairman Lombardi said it was a private alley but close to multiple buildings, and he asked how much moisture or heat the tower emitted. Mr. de la Cruz said it gave off moisture and made most of its noise when it started up. He referred to a similar tower that was completely exposed and not even set back as far, but no one noticed it. Mr. Cracknell suggested that Mr. de la Cruz return with more details.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **continue** the petition to the September 2017 meeting, and Mr. Shea seconded. The motion **passed** by unanimous (7-0) vote.*

At this point in the meeting, Councilor Pearson left.

3. Petition of **Kenneth Charles Sullivan, owner**, for property located at **40 Howard Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct overhang over rear French doors, construct wooden enclosure to shield utility components, construct wooden gate) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace existing fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 61 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Mr. Shea recused himself from the petition.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The owner Ken Sullivan was present and reviewed his petition, noting that all the construction would be within the fenced back yard.

Peter Harris of 46 Manning Street said he was an abutter and that he wanted to put a similar design of a pergola on a fence between the two yards, with vines growing up it, for privacy.

Mr. Sullivan submitted a design of the pergola to the Commission and it was discussed. He pointed out the location and said it wouldn't be too close to the house. Mr. Mayer asked that a schematic be submitted for more clarity. Mr. Ryan said he needed more clarity on the changes made regarding the hip roof, overhang, and enclosure because there were several problems, including the lack of a fascia board, incorrect trims, and lack of detail on the doors.

Mr. Sullivan said he planned to do a 3-panel door with a louver. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed that there were several problems, like whether the clapboards would fit. Chairman Lombardi said the shed was overdesigned for its use and should be simplified. He agreed that the roof overhang portico over the doors needed more detail and that the high step coming down to the ground should be included in the proposal. Mr. Rawling suggested that the shed be built out of the same material as the fence, with more neutral elements.

Chairman Lombardi concluded that the Commission wanted to see more detail on the portico over the door, the shed, and the pergola.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Richard Shea said he was an abutter. He said the project was in the back of the house and that none of the features would be seen unless someone went into the backyard. He agreed, however, that more information should be gotten regarding the canopy.

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Vice-Chair Wyckoff moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval for the application as presented and advertised, with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The hip roof on the door canopy and utility shed shall be clad in asphalt.*
- 2) A pergola, as submitted, (approx. 10'-12') shall be located on the fence between the house and the HVAC screen. A final design shall be submitted for Administrative Approval.*
- 3) The shed shall be cedar boards to match the fence. A detailed drawing shall be submitted for Administrative Approval.*

Mr. Rawling seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that both abutters were in favor of the project. He said it was in the back of the house and wouldn't affect the surrounding property values or historic characteristics of the neighborhood, so he supported it with the stipulations.

*The motion **passed** by a vote of 4-1, with Mr. Ryan voting in opposition and Mr. Shea recused.*

4. Petition of **Robert A. Brown, owner**, for property located at **36 Wibird Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (reconfigure windows and door on right side of rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 14-2 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

Mr. Shea resumed his voting seat.

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

The project manager Jeff Nesbit of Diamond Hill Builders was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the petition in detail.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he was surprised about the door's style because it wasn't typical of a front door and the Commission had never approved a steel door. Mr. Nesbit said the existing door was metal. He said the door was located behind the jut-out and had no canopy over it but had a gutter on the second floor. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the building to be demolished was on the deck. Mr. Nesbit said the deck was built around it and that the deck would be reconstructed and the existing rails repaired. He said that most of the windows had trim that varied in size. Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether a window sill would be applied to the bottom of the windows, and Mr. Nesbit said he hadn't planned to.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked whether the French door was on the other unit. Mr. Nesbit said it was. Mr. Rawling said the windows should have exterior casings and sills and suggested that the solid door be a light one with some glazing. Mr. Mayer said the project would improve the livability of the house and noted that the applicant was dealing with a compromised elevation

that had been through several design changes. Mr. Shea and Chairman Lombardi said they agreed with all the comments.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*Mr. Ryan moved to **grant** the Certificate of Approval to the application as presented with the following stipulations:*

- 1) A historic sill shall be used and the casing shall match the existing windows.*
- 2) A rear door with nine light windows shall be used and the casing around the door shall Match the window casing. It shall be submitted for Administrative Approval.*

Vice-Chair Wyckoff seconded the motion.

Mr. Ryan stated that the project would be compatible with the design of surrounding properties. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed that there should be a glass door but said there were several different designs and that the applicant would need an administrative approval if he decided to install a door with some glass in it. He said a basic 9-light back door would be well received.

*The motion **passed** by unanimous (6-0) vote.*

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Barbara Bickford Revocable Trust, Barbara Bickford, trustee and owner**, for property located at **45 Gardner Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition to accommodate interior elevator for accessibility between floors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 21 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

The architect Alyssa Murphy was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicants. She asked the Commission's opinion about the elevator tower. Mr. Shea said it was a big structure to put on the house and suggested a smaller tower. They further discussed it. Mr. Shea said the elevator mechanism could stay at the soffit level. Mr. Ryan said he would like to see the elevator more integrated by tying it into the roof and making it look like an addition that was gabled in, like a dormer. Vice-Chair Wyckoff agreed, saying that the flat roof was too utilitarian in a residential neighborhood. Mr. Mayer asked if the bay could be converted into the elevator tower, but Ms. Murphy said not without significant structural changes. Mr. Rawling agreed that it should attach to the house rather than be separate.

Chairman Lombardi said there was an entryway into the interior where the elevator would be, which would almost necessitate an exterior elevator door. They further discussed it. Chairman Lombardi encouraged the applicant to try to pull the elevator closer into the house if possible.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously (6-0) to **continue** the work session to the September 2017 meeting.*

B. Work Session requested by **Thunderbolt Realty Trust, owner, John K. Bosen, trustee**, for property located at **180 Washington Street (also known as 39 Gates Street)** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story addition with other misc. changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 30 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

The architect Joe Almeida of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the petition. He introduced Lauren Burwell of DeStefano Architects and the owner Craig Jewett.

Mr. Jewett gave a brief history of the house, noting that the original 1763 house burned to the ground, with the rest of the house built before 1800 and an ell built around 1810. He said there were three additions in the back of the house built in the 1990s.

Mr. Almeida said he intended to replicate all the historic details and modify the 1990 additions. He reviewed the petition in detail, noting that the addition would not be seen from Hancock Street and would have the same eave and gutter lines. He said they would work around the small one-story hip addition, building on top of it and trying to match the roof of the existing house.

Mr. Shea said he liked the massing and noted that no changes were being done to the original structure. He liked the traditional approach to the architecture and the way the second floor was stepped back, but thought the hip roof looked odd coming off it. Mr. Mayer asked whether the second-story wall could be pulled back so the hip would have more presence. Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested that it just be brought out as far as the one-story addition or out to the corner board. He said the only problem was working the second-story roof into the older house. It was further discussed. Mr. Rawling said he could accept it as one of the quirky things of old houses and appreciated the way the volumes worked on the upper floors and the distinctions between them. Mr. Ryan said he agreed with Mr. Shea's comments about the massing and the fact that the applicant wasn't altering anything that hadn't already been done. He said the proposed back windows were place-making and would enhance that part of the house.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff asked what the screen room consisted of. Mr. Almeida said it was a series of double hung windows, and that they would keep the pane size the same. He said the color would match the house.

Chairman Lombardi said he saw the 1990 construction as it was being done and thought they did a fine job. He agreed with the comments about bringing the new addition out a bit further, and he thought the rooflines were a little complex.

Public Comment

Page Trace of 27 Hancock Street said she was surprised the project needed a work session because it was so beautifully done, and the back addition was something frequently seen in an 18th century structure. She said she was in favor of the project.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that he would return for a **public hearing** at the September 2017 meeting.*

C. Work Session requested by **Louis F. Clarizio Trust 2000, Louis F. Clarizio, trustee and owner**, for property located at **566 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new exterior trim, awnings, light fixtures, sign lighting, parapet detail, and applied graphics to windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 156 as Lot 24 and lies within the CD4-L2 and Historic Districts.

Joe Almeida of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the petition, noting there would be no changes to the footprint or to the window and door locations, and that the paint scheme would change slightly. He said they would do a decorative pattern on the glass and that the numerous fabric awnings would change to a single continuous gray aluminum awning on both sides. He discussed the parapet over the entrances, the lighting, and the window treatment.

In response to Chairman Lombardi's questions, Mr. Almeida said the decorative pattern would be applied rather than etched, and that the reflective windows were a privacy feature for the patients. Mr. Shea said the changes enhanced the original design and that he liked the project the way it was. Mr. Rawling asked that the parapet walls and the bracing be paid attention to.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant said he would **return** for a **public hearing** at the September 2017 meeting.*

D. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Savings Bank/Bank of NH (TD Bank), owner**, for property located at **333 and 340 State 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 116 as Lots 5 & 10 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The contractor Tom Gianni was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He introduced his consultants, which included Chris O'Connor of Ricci and James Gagnon of Andersen Windows.

Mr. Gianni stated that they originally planned to replace all the windows but discovered that they could maintain all the moldings and sills and just do a sash kit. He said the bottom windows would be frosted and sealed and that the Andersen paint color of antique white would almost match existing, which he showed a sample of. He reviewed the rest of the petition.

Mr. O'Connor discussed the windows and said the sashes were rotted on the first floor and were beyond repair. He said the Andersen Eagle Series windows would replace the sashes and match the muntin profile. He noted that some detailed windows over the entry would not be replaced but would be re-glazed and repaired with a storm window applied on the interior.

Mr. Shea asked whether they would replace the sash where the arch top windows were and was told that they would. It was further discussed. Vice-Chair Wyckoff noted that rot was only found on a few windows and putting aluminum on it might introduce an element that would work against the project. He said he took off aluminum all the time and found dampness and rot.

Mr. Rawling said he thought the windows on the first and second floors were in good shape. He said some windows needed glazing and others had problems due to the storm windows dropping and water coming in, but they were not deteriorated and just needed minor maintenance. He noted that there was a functional issue in maintaining the windows because of the way the storm window system was installed, and he suggested that a different storm system would be more appropriate for maintenance.

Chairman Lombardi said he was impressed with how well-built the existing windows were and had trouble with wholesale replacement of the windows without understanding what the problem was. He suggested that there were storm windows that could be removed from the outside to do maintenance. He said the original windows seemed solid on the main structure.

Mr. Gianni said he would bring in photos of the damage.

There was no public comment.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that he would **continue** the work session to the September 2017 meeting.*

E. Work Session requested by **Eric and Johanna Landis, owner**, for property located at **540 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (expand and enclose porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 79 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

Sarah Hourihane of DeStefano Architects was present to speak to the petition. She introduced the owner Johanna Landis. Ms. Hourihane reviewed the petition, noting that they wanted to bump out the existing porch six feet and turn it into a sunroom. She said there would be six windows on the top with awning windows below, two new patio doors on the lawn side, and a gas fireplace in the center. She also noted that the roof had changed to a metal one.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff said he would rebuild the roof. He said the windows had almost a commercial look facing Marcy Street, with their awnings underneath, and wasn't something normally seen in the District. He suggested double hung windows that would give it more of a traditional look. Mr. Rawling noted the change in rhythms and the way the posts and framing were used. He suggested modeling the opening on the south elevation around the entrance so that it was wider, and also going with every post to emphasize more of the frame. He said the windows could be mullioned tighter together to infill the post frame porch structure. He suggested building the framework from the porch and filling it in with glazing, then doing something similar turning the corner to keep it a porch feeling. He also felt that the windows with the awnings should be replaced with double hungs with a panel underneath.

Mr. Mayer said it was difficult to get a feel for the proportions because the presentation showed only part of the elevation and that the addition didn't seem to have a proportional relationship to the main building. He suggested that a more successful design would be to create a porch feel even though it was an enclosed element. Mr. Shea agreed said the addition had lost its closed-in porch feeling and took away from the New England character of the house and didn't feel like a porch because it was too wide. He suggested pulling it back in and going back to a more enclosed look. He said he didn't care for the metal roof or the fireplace and had problems with the west elevation. He suggested pulling the fireplace inside to eliminate the bump-out and putting in more traditional double hung windows.

Vice-Chair Wyckoff suggested keeping the idea of the posts and infilling with windows. He said the posts should be accented, stick out, and be proud of the windows so that the porch looked enclosed. He also suggested a gas fireplace. Chairman Lombardi agreed that the idea of the porch was lost and that the presentation showed just a portion of the house, giving no idea how the massing fit in with the rest of it. He also agreed with the Commission's comments about the windows and posts. Vice-Chair Wyckoff added that a metal roof would make the addition stand out too much, and he suggested shingles.

Public Comment

Marty and Kristina Kuworski of 111 New Castle Avenue stated that they weren't told of the plans and that the project would block their view. He said they didn't feel it was historic because of all the metal and glass and the 6-foot protrusion. He said it wasn't similar to much else in the south end and would be visible. He also noted that it didn't look like an enclosed porch but more like a new room that bumped out. Ms. Kuworski said the changes were not historic, noting that they bought their house mainly for the water view and the project would block it.

No one else rose to speak, and Chairman Lombardi closed the public comment session.

Ms. Landis said the house was built in 2005 and that she wanted nothing more than to make it part of the neighborhood's fabric but that it was not a historic house.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

*The applicant indicated that she would **continue** the work session to the September 2017 meeting.*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*At 11:30 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 September 6, 2017.