

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

DRAFT
New Castle Historic District Commission
February 7, 2013

Public Hearing re: Rebecca & Rej Audet, 31 Oliver St., Map 16, Lot 25

Public Hearing re: Wayne & Paulette Semprini, 35 River Rd., Map 17, Lot 18

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Irene Bush; Patty Cohen; Peter Follansbee;
Elaine Nollet; Rodney Rowland; Marjorie Smith

Chairman Smith called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed Peter Reed as a potential Alternate to the Board.

Public Hearing Re: Rebecca & Rej Audet, 31 Oliver St., Map 16, Lot 25:

GUESTS: Rebecca Audet & Rej Audet, applicants; Amy Dutton, representing the applicants;
Bob Gray, Gray Construction

Chairman Smith announced this was a public hearing for Rebecca & Rej Audet, 31 Oliver St., Map 16, Lot 25. The public hearing has been properly advertised, abutters have been notified and all fees paid.

Amy Dutton, Juniper River Home Design, representing the applicants, addressed the demolition of the existing one-car garage that will be removed and replaced with a new two-car garage. The house and garage do comply to all setbacks and height restrictions.

The Chair asked for the Board's comments.

Bush, Cohen, Follansbee, Nollet and Rowland were in favor of the present garage demolition.

Nollet moved for the Historic District Commission to approve the Audet's proposal for a demolition permit for the garage and additions to the house, as proposed. Follansbee seconded the motion. Approved.

Dutton addressed the applicant's request. The homeowners want to renovate the existing structure, improving the quality, structure, finishes and presentation of the home as well as placing an addition on the back of the house. The addition will blend gracefully with the existing structure by continuing finish materials and window sizes as well as keeping the addition lower than the existing rooflines. With great respect of the historic nature of the home, it is their intended goal to bring the house back to a quality home, (Attachment A.)

They will remove a series of additions that detract from the home's beauty – the side addition in the right (now a bathroom) and a back addition and side deck (not structurally sound) and an existing garage.

It is their goal to comply to all building codes and setbacks. With this compliance, they will be able to improve the home as it sits on the lot and improve existing interior conditions that are deemed unsafe.

1 Dutton reviewed the overall project: they are adding an addition on the back of the house that
2 will measure 15 x 42 ft.; adding a 24 x 28 ft. garage; and a 14.6 x 14.6 breezeway connecting the
3 two. They comply with all of the setbacks.

4
5 The material proposed for the front of the house is clapboards on the lower level and shingles
6 upper level of the house. They will continue along the driveway side, in back, and around. On
7 the other side, they will introduce natural cedar shakes on the gable end and the back end.

8
9 The present roof is slate. They proposed a flat metal roof in black for the addition and showed
10 an example to the Board. Regarding the siding, they plan to use the white cedar shakes and red
11 cedar clapboards which match the existing house.

12
13 They want to use the Anderson A-1 Series windows with clad exterior, simulated divided lights
14 and wood interior. The casement and double hung window all have the same profile. They need
15 easement for egress. They want 2/2 windows. The windows will be double pane glass and all the
16 new windows will be the same size.

17
18 Dutton mentioned the existing window was 24 ½ x 5 feet. They are going to continue that
19 dimension in the addition. The egress window in the master bedroom needs to be bigger than the
20 existing window.

21
22 Regarding the rake and roof overhang, they are planning to match all the existing in order for the
23 gables to look the same. They are planning to keep the front door as is, and the side and back
24 doors will be wood doors. The foundation will be poured concrete.

25
26 Chairman Smith questioned the front elevation and asked if the front porch would change.

27
28 Dutton replied the front porch is not changing and emphasized that nothing is changing on the
29 front of the house.

30
31 Rowland asked for clarification regarding the shutters.

32
33 Dutton replied all the shutters will match and they will stay with the same look.

34
35 Cohen asked for clarification on the gutters.

36
37 Dutton replied that gutters have not been discussed and feels they are not planning on having
38 gutters.

39
40 Chairman Smith questioned the shed roof versus a gable roof.

41
42 Dutton replied they have made the dormer off the ridge smaller. During the work session the
43 Board's concern was that the dormer looked so big.

44
45 Cohen referred to Plan A-4 and asked for clarification on the casement windows.

46
47 Dutton replied they plan to stay with the 24 x 60 dimension.

48
49 Follansbee questioned the front elevation and noted that the windows on the first and second
50 floors were not lined up.

51

1 Dutton replied they are using the same openings.
2
3 Follansbee pointed out that the drawings were not correct.
4
5 Dutton replied the drawings are correct but they are off 6 to 9 inches.
6
7 Follansbee said from the photograph that he is looking at, the center of the door and the low
8 casement window, the centers of the double hung and picture window are all the same. He
9 asked Dutton if they are going to maintain the present façade.
10
11 Dutton replied they are going to maintain the present façade and the present openings.
12
13 Follansbee questioned the north elevation as he feels that deviating from the clapboards on the
14 lower part is not resonating with him. Going from clapboards and shakes to all shakes and totally
15 different colors is a big concern for him.
16
17 The Chair feels that by continuing with clapboards would make the addition less obvious.
18
19 Rowland totally agrees with the Chair. He feels the façade is very visible and it would be quite a
20 contrast between the existing house and the addition if not wrapped around.
21
22 Rej Audet said if the Board prefers we wrap it, they would continue to wrap it around the house.
23
24 Bush prefers to see it wrapped.
25
26 Discussion followed on the garage door and the upper door that could be seen from the road.
27
28 Dutton said it looks like a two-door garage but it is a single-door garage door.
29
30 Follansbee questioned the change of a window style from a 2/2 to a 4/1.
31
32 Dutton replied that was an error and all of the windows are 2/2.
33
34 The Chair asked for the Board's comments.
35
36 Follansbee questioned using steel on the shed roof in the front of the home. A steel roof next to
37 a slate roof. Slate and steel together are too dissimilar to be compatible.
38
39 Rowland pointed out that the zoning ordinance is very clear that the materials should be
40 compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. He does not know of any steel roofs in that
41 neighborhood.
42
43 Dutton said they wanted to introduce new roofing materials. The existing roof is a gable and it
44 makes a difference if they are not interfacing together.
45
46 Rowland said that from Oliver Street the new metal standing seam roof would be visible next to
47 the existing slate roof.
48
49
50
51

1 Bush said if it is visible from a street, it should not be a seam roof.

2

3 Nollet thought the metal roof was historical. She does not have a problem with it.

4

5 Cohen said that introducing new materials is in conflict with the zoning ordinance. The roof
6 types needs to be consistent with the neighborhood.

7

8 Chairman Smith agrees that the HDC would not vote in favor of a metal roof in that area.

9

10 Rej Audet replied their other option is to go with a slate roof.

11

12 Rowland said the roofing material should be a synthetic slate shingle or asphalt shingles
13 wherever it can be visible from a street.

14

15 Cohen emphasized if it can be seen from the street, no standing seam roof.

16

17 Chairman Smith asked if the Board had further comments. There were none. She asked for
18 public comments. There were none.

19

20 **Bush moved for the Historic District Commission to approve the plans, A-4 and A-5,**
21 **dated 1-21-13, with the following revisions:**

22

- 23 1. the clapboard and shingles be continued around the entire house and around the
24 gable end;
- 25 2. the roofing material to be a synthetic slate shingle or asphalt shingles wherever it
26 can be visible from a street;
- 27 3. all the windows to be 2/2;
- 28 4. the front elevation windows need to be aligned to maintain the front façade and
29 opening.

30

31 **Follansbee seconded the motion.**

32

33 **Unanimously Approved.**

34

35 The Chair closed the public hearing for Rebecca and Rej Audet.

36

37 **Public Hearing Re: Wayne & Paulette Semprini, 35 River Rd., Map 17, Lot 18:**

38

39 **GUESTS:** Wayne Semprini, applicant; Attorney Tim Phoenix, representing the applicant;
40 Dennis Morrell, Architect.

41

42 Chairman Smith announced this was a public hearing for Wayne & Paulette Semprini, 35 River
43 Rd., Map 17, Lot 18. The public hearing has been properly advertised, abutters have been
44 notified and all fees paid.

45

46 Attorney Tim Phoenix, representing the applicants, handed out a packet to the Board explaining
47 the history of the Semprini home, (Attachment B, Item #II of Packet.) Attorney Phoenix said the
48 Semprinis bought this home in 1996 and undertook renovations in 1997. In 2005, they made
49 additional improvements. Wayne & Paulette Semprini now seek to upgrade again, both to gain
50 more “livability” inside, and to upgrade the use, look, and utility of the exterior.

1 The primary changes are to move back the main rear dormer peak, install French doors and a 3
2 foot wide balcony in order to provide for air/breeze from the water and a more desirable view to
3 the water from the master bedroom. The plan also calls for improvements to another upstairs
4 bedroom/ bath area.

5
6 Attorney Phoenix discussed the changes to the master bedroom, (Attachment B, Item III, Page 2,
7 of the packet.) The master bedroom dormer changes feature two sets of double-doors and a short
8 3 foot balcony.

9
10 After hearing the concerns of some of the Board members, the Semprinis worked with Dennis
11 Morrell, Architect, to make some changes and presented a revised proposal, which is in the
12 packet, (Attachment B, Item III, Page 2.) The revised plans shows a proposed front elevation.
13 He explained the revised plans and referenced before and after photographs of the Semprini
14 home, (Attachment B, Item #4 of the Packet.)

15
16 Some of the HDC Board members felt that this end of the house, which has a small shed dormer
17 and another small dormer, were unsatisfactory. The Semprinis got together with Dennis Morrell,
18 and redesigned the ell at the end which has allowed them the use of that bedroom and is more in
19 keeping with the line of the larger dormer on the left side.

20
21 Attorney Phoenix understands there were some comments made about the second floor balcony
22 and that feature is very important to the Semprinis. They now have a window and which faces
23 the water. They want to improve the view from their master bedroom by creating a double-door
24 opening on to a 3 foot balcony. He pointed out they are not an inch closer to the water than they
25 were.

26
27 He feels that the balcony, along with the changes to the dormer on the right, makes the house
28 more aesthetically appealing.

29
30 He provided photographs to illustrate the local use of balconies: (Attachment B, Item #5.) shows
31 the house in 1997 with two porches on the second floor. (Attachment B, Item #6) are
32 photographs taken of at least twenty homes in New Castle that have second floor
33 porches/balconies or widow's walk.

34
35 The last packet in the presentation (Attachment B, Item 7.) which is a publication titled "The
36 Shingle Style & the Stick Style" which shows that second-floor balconies and/or porches are
37 very common and historic throughout the seacoast in the 1800's.

38
39 Attorney Phoenix said the look of this house is in keeping with the historic nature of the property
40 such as this. He would ask the HDC Board to consider that the Historic District in New Castle
41 has various districts. The "village" which many of the houses are colonial. Outside the
42 "village", the New Castle Historic District contains homes and architecture of varying types,
43 design, and size, (See Attachment B, Page 2 & Page 3,) Section 9.3.1 – Authority and Purpose.
44 He may ask that the Board consider the historic nature. It is not the individual property that one
45 considers, it is the area. In the area which this house is located, there are different houses and
46 different shapes. This is a 1970's house modernized.

47
48 Attorney Phoenix said that (Attachment B, Pages 4 and 5 of the packet.) was written by Town
49 Counsel, Peter Loughlin, and referred to a paragraph "As the treatise on Historic Districts
50 provides" (Attachment B, Page 4 of packet.)

1 He also referred to the Administration of Historic Districts 15 (April, 1980) prepared under the
2 direction of the Environmental Law Clinic, Franklin Pierce Law Center, Concord, N.H. that
3 states the following: Page 5 of packet - *“The area may include groups of related buildings and*
4 *spaces that represent the standards and tastes of a community or neighborhood during one*
5 *period of history, unrelated structures that represent a progression of various styles and*
6 *functions or comprehensive townscapes or streetscapes that possess and identity of place.”*
7

8 Attorney Phoenix asked if these folks have the right to change their home that is pleasing to them
9 without violating the rules of the Historic District, meaning to change the environment to which
10 it is in. They feel very strongly that it is not. They hope the Board agrees.

11 Chairman Smith asked for the Board’s comments.

12
13
14 Nollet likes the change and, in her opinion, it is more aesthetically pleasing than it was.

15
16 Wayne Semprini feels very strongly that bringing this to a 1 ½ story cape breaks it up somewhat.
17 The house is almost 100 ft. long and he feels this architecture is an important relief.

18
19 The Chair asked the Board for further comments.

20
21 Bush said the changes made from last month make sense but the balcony is still a major issue.

22
23 Rowland has no problem with the changes as it fits in with the neighborhood. He does not feel
24 that the house seems out of place.

25
26 Follansbee said that aside from the porch, he questioned the two sliding glass doors and asked
27 Semprini if they needed the two glass doors.

28
29 Semprini replied they do not need both sliding glass doors but, aesthetically, they need both
30 doors. They eliminated one window and the shed dormer.

31
32 Follansbee asked if they could go with two single doors with a window on the outside.

33
34 Morrell said in keeping with the rest of the windows in the house, which are 3 ft. wide windows,
35 he probably would not like to go with different sizes. The doors are for the view.

36
37 Follansbee said the Semprinis have done a wonderful job and have made some nice
38 improvements. Personally, he has a hard time seeing two sliding glass doors on the second floor.
39 In his mind, it is contemporary architecture.

40
41 Semprini replied that is why he went to research the Vincent J. Scully, Jr. Article. The most
42 current in this volume was 1890 and there are numerous balcony and porches throughout the
43 article.

44
45 Cohen feels the Semprini home is definitely improved. She has two concerns. There were too
46 many different style dormers and the applicant definitely cleaned that up. She has no issues with
47 the balcony and feels that what the HDC ordinance states that it must be consistent with the
48 streetscape and the area. She walked the area and saw a number of decks in the historic district.
49 She emphasized that this is a 1970’s house and the abutters have the same type of treatment. She
50 agrees with Follansbee that the French doors do have a contemporary effect but she feels that the
51 house is well represented.

1 Semprini replied the reason they went with the sliders was to stay consistent with what was
2 below. Not that it matters, but the sunlight hits these windows for about one hour a day, one
3 month of the year.

4
5 Follansbee said he prefers the sliders to double doors because the mullions look smaller and
6 more in proportion than having two side by side as you would in a regular French door.

7
8 Follansbee questioned the window schedule.

9
10 Morrell replied they are Pella windows with true divided lights and are indicated on the plans.

11
12 The Chair asked if the Board had further comments. There were none. She asked for public
13 comments. There were none.

14
15 Cohen wanted to make sure there would be no railings added at the front door entry.

16
17 Semprini agreed there would not be any railings and said the rendering of the chimney was put in
18 the wrong place on the plans. He emphasized that the chimney is further up the roof.

19
20 **Nollet moved for the Historic District to approve the revised plans of Wayne and Paulette**
21 **Semprini, dated 1-29-13, as presented. Bush seconded the motion.**

22
23 **Cohen votes for the motion to approve.**

24 **Bush votes for the motion to approve.**

25 **Nollet votes for the motion to approve.**

26 **Follansbee is opposed of the motion to approve.**

27 **Chairman Smith votes for the motion to approve.**

28
29 **Approved.**

30
31 The Chair closed the public hearing for Wayne & Paulette Semprini.

32
33 **Review of HDC Minutes of January 3, 2013:**

34
35 **Nollet moved for the HDC to approve the minutes of January 3, 2013, as amended.**

36 **Bush seconded the motion. Approved.**

37
38 **Adjournment**

39
40 **Rowland moved to adjourn the meeting. Cohen seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned**
41 **at 9:15 p.m.**

42
43 Respectfully Submitted,

44
45 Anita Colby

46 Recording Secretary

- 1 Attachment A: Proposal for the Audet Residence
- 2 Attachment B: Item 1 of Packet, History of Semprini Home
- 3 “ “ Item 3, Page 2 of Packet, Changes of Master Bedroom
- 4 “ “ Item 4, of Packet, Photographs Before and After Revised Addition
- 5 “ “ Item 5, of Packet , Second Floor Balcony Issue
- 6 “ “ Item 6, of Packet, Photographs of Homes with Balconies/Porches
- 7 “ “ Item 7, of Packet, Publication of Homes with Balconies/Porches
- 8 “ “ Page 2 and 3 of Packet, Section 9.3.1, Authority & Purpose of HDC
- 9 “ “ Pages 4 of Packet, As the treatise on Historic District Provides
- 10 “ “ Page 5 of Packet, Administration of Historic Districts
- 11