

APPROVED
New Castle Historic District Commission
December 4, 2014

Continued Work Session re: Philip Llewellyn, 38 Main St., Map 18, Lot 64-1

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Irene Bush; Jeffrey Hughes; Kate Murray; Elaine Nollet;
Peter Reed; Rodney Rowland

BOARD MEMBER ABSENT: Patty Cohen

Chairman Rowland called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Continued Work Session re: Philip Llewellyn, 38 Main St., Lot 64-1:

GUESTS: Philip Llewellyn, applicant; Bill Greenier, General Contractor for Project

Chairman Rowland announced this was a continued work session for Philip & Diane Llewellyn, 38 Main St., Map 18, Lot 64-1. The applicants wish to build a new single family home on a “nonconforming lot of record” 18-64-1 which they currently own.

Philip Llewellyn, said they are here this evening with totally revised ideas regarding their proposed home and hopes the Board will provide additional comments and direction. He distributed several sketches of the proposed home, i.e., the front of the house facing southwest; the back of house facing northeast; the left side of house facing northwest; the right side of the house facing southeast; the front of the garage facing west/northwest; the side of the garage facing north/northeast; and the back of the garage facing east/southeast, (Attachment A.)

Llewellyn reviewed the Board’s concerns from last month: the home does not appear to face Main Street; it does not look symmetrical from the road and it does not exhibit specific architectural style compatible with the historic district;

Another concern - the Board would like to see the chimney constructed in brick instead of stone and the house should be comparable in size to surrounding properties;

Concern - too many different roof heights; the house appeared too modern looking and the many different window types, styles and sizes;

The garage windows seen from Main Street were too unusual and the second floor porch was not built to be compatible with the historic district;

Llewellyn pointed out that the general house architecture is now a straight front colonial, 4/4 windows and a front door facing Main Street; the house is placed very symmetrically on the lot and the garage is now in the rear of the home so it is not tremendously visible from Main Street.

With this particular lot, the orientation of the house was bounded by the lot on what they can do. In trying to accommodate the changes that are required by the regulations, this seems to be a good compromise.

Llewellyn discussed Page 2, Attachment A, showing the front of the house and a rear view of the house. The windows shown on the drawings are still 4/1 and the intent is that all of the windows are going to be 6/6 except the window in the small gable that might be 4/4. Llewellyn pointed out that the windows themselves are consistent, as far as the size goes, aside from the smaller windows at the top of the house and the window set over the kitchen sink which will be shorter. On the roof, in that same view, he penciled in a skylight located in the back of the house that is not visible from the street.

Llewellyn discussed page 3, Attachment A, showing the two ends of the house. The windows will be all the same size, 6/6; there will be two windows on the second floor and one window on the first floor.

Page 4, Attachment A, shows the connector from the house to the garage and how the garage would be viewed. On the garage roof facing the driveway, the intention would be to have a couple of small skylight windows. The connector is envisioned to be a single floor connector. There would not be two floors in the connecting structure. There would be an open ceiling and they would have a staircase at one end of the connector to get to the second floor of the garage.

There is a door from the driveway side to get into the connector then one would be able to walk through the connector and in the back of it there would be another door to get to the other side of the house. One would be able to walk from the driveway into the small door, through the connector, and back up to the area that would be a patio.

Llewellyn noted they have shortened the garage. It is the same width, 24 feet, but the depth is now 22 feet. With these changes, the prior design of the house was 2960 square feet. It is now less than 2600 square feet and that is comparable to the surrounding properties.

At this point, they now have three roof lines or ridges; all of the windows are mostly the same size except where it is absolutely necessary; the intent is to have Andersen double pane windows with divided lights.

Llewellyn said the porch is still there and they would like to have a view from their property and hope they may be able to retain that in some fashion. They are more than happy to make changes to the design but being able to get somewhat of a view from the property is what they hope they can accomplish.

Murray questioned the garage elevation and wondered where it is visible from?

The Chair replied it would be visible from Wentworth Road.

Reed asked for clarification regarding a large tree.

Llewellyn replied there were several trees in the area. In order for the house to be built, one of the big trees would have to come down. The other large tree is further in and it is growing in the midst of that lot. They are going to try to prune the tree between the properties.

Reed asked for clarification regarding the room above the garage and what type of a room would it be?

Llewellyn replied the room itself would be a sitting room and emphasized it would not be a bedroom.

Reed asked for clarification on the 24 ft. wide and 22 ft. deep room over the garage.

Llewellyn replied they did not know if they would be able to finish the entire room. They may just bring it to the edge of the dormer to have storage room.

Chairman Rowland said this was an outstanding move in the right direction and he appreciates the thought that went into the new design. He would like to continue to discuss the porch doors. He said the glass style the applicant was showing is not what they are going to end up with. He would love to see that mimic the window style. The double glass door is a modern feature but he feels if they blend with the rest of the architecture, they tend to become part of it and it is much less obtrusive.

The Chair discussed the upper deck. The Board has had a great concerns with upper decks and they have denied one fairly recently. He is intrigued by what the concept is thus far and that the applicant is trying to make it blend. He appreciates the gabled dormer roof to go with the rest of the architecture and the small window in the gable matches the other gables. What he would like to work on would be the amount of glass. What the Board is looking at is the glorified dormer and he likes that. The dormer architectural style is fine.

The Chair pointed out that if the applicant could continue to move closer in appearance to a dormer but accommodate the deck, that would be preferred. Regarding the windows on the side of the doors, he suggested to just go with the doors and make those mirror the ones below. He is trying to simplify and suggested trying to bring it down in style to look more like a dormer and less like a deck. The applicant should try to make it blend and to get rid of the finials.

Llewellyn said they want to try to keep the view but they can try to do it in such a manner where it looks more like the rest of the house.

The Chair asked for the Board's comments.

Murray said the two doors are not typical in the historical part of the village and she wondered if it were possible for the applicant to have one door, possibly a wider door, and make it look more typical.

The Chair suggested the applicant could blend the two doors together. The Board is asking for the door to be more traditional.

Chairman Rowland pointed out that the windows are appropriate but the doors are not so appropriate. He feels if the applicant shrinks the door surface but increases the window size he would end up with a 6/6 picture window.

Llewellyn asked the Board about the skylights in the rear of the home.

Chairman Rowland replied the skylights are not in a highly visible area and he is not concerned.

Llewellyn asked the Chair if there is a window manufacturer he did not approve of.

Chairman Rowland replied this Board is more interested in style than who makes the windows as long as it looks historic.

Llewellyn said exterior-wise they plan on using a combination of clapboards and shingles.

The Chair questioned the front entrance, Page 2, Attachment A, and wondered if the drawing was fairly close to what they are thinking of having.

Llewellyn replied yes with a small overhang in order to protect the front door and a small amount of steps.

Chairman Rowland suggested the applicant keep the front entrance very simple.

Llewellyn discussed the roof material on the overhang and asked about copper.

The Chair has no concerns regarding copper on the roof overhang. Copper will weather and look beautiful.

Chairman Rowland asked if the Board had further comments. There were none. He asked for public comments.

Wally Mallett, 34 Main Street, expressed his concerns: 1) what was the setback to the house; and 2) he thought he heard the applicant say he was going to have a metal roof.

The Chair replied the applicant was putting a metal roof only on the front covered entry portion of the front door.

Bill Greenier, Contractor, replied the setback to the house is....? (tape did not pick up what Greenier said as he did not come up at the table)

Chairman Rowland asked if the public had further comments. There were none. He closed the public portion of the work session for Philip Llewellyn.

The Chair announced that the work session for John & Elizabeth Levis, 81 Piscataqua Street Map 18, Lot 12, had been postponed to a future date.

Review of HDC Minutes of November 6, 2014:

Hughes moved to approve the HDC minutes of November 6, 2014, as amended. Bush seconded the motion. Approved.

Roof Height/Style Restrictions:

Chairman Rowland distributed a copy of the New Castle Zoning Ordinance Roof Pitch that states the following: *“The minimum roof pitch on the primary building of a lot shall be 1-to-3 (one foot vertical distance for every three feet in horizontal distance)”*. (See Attachment B.) He discussed the Roof Height/ Style Restrictions with the Board and after lengthy discussions the Chair will seek guidance from the Building Inspector to help him review the zoning ordinance on roof pitch.

The Chair asked if anyone had any suggestions on how to move forward on this question of roof pitch and height.

Rita Fusco, 33 Piscataqua Street, suggested the Board undertake site visits in the historical district.

The Chair tabled the discussions on roof pitch to the next HDC meeting in January.

New Business:

Chairman Rowland announced that the regular HDC meeting scheduled for January falls on New Year’s Day. He has rescheduled the January HDC meeting to January 8, 2015.

The Chair distributed information on Demolition Criteria, (Attachment C.) This issue will be discussed further at the January meeting.

Adjournment:

Nollet moved to adjourn the meeting. Murray seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anita Colby
Recording Secretary

Attachment A: Sketches of the proposed home re: Philip Llewellyn
Attachment B: Copy of the Zoning Ordinance Regulations re: Roof Pitch
Attachment C: Information on the Demolition Criteria

