

APPROVED
New Castle Historic District Commission
November 6, 2014

Continued Public Hearing re: Ann Pattison, 152 Main St., Map 17, Lot 53
Public Hearing re: Clarissa Christiansen, 81 Piscataqua St., Map 17, Lot 38-1
Public Hearing re: Edward & Barbara Bouchard, 111 Main St., Map 13, Lot 17
Work Session re: Philip Llewelyn, 38 Main St., Map 18, Lot 64-1

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Irene Bush; Patty Cohen; Jeffrey Hughes; Kate Murray;
Elaine Nollet; Rodney Rowland

BOARD MEMBER ABSENT: Peter Reed

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

Continued Public Hearing re: Ann Pattison, 152 Main St., Map 17, Lot 53:

GUESTS: Anna Housko-Pattison, representing the applicant

Chairman Rowland announced this was a continued public hearing for Ann Pattison, 152 Main St., Map 17, Lot 53. The applicant requests a 6 foot cedar post fence to run the length of the property that abuts 160 Main Street. The public hearing has been properly advertised, abutters have been notified and all fees paid.

Anna Housko-Pattison did some research and found that a survey had been done in 2005 for the Littlefield's by Jim Vera. They met with Vera and he gave them a photo copy of the survey, (Attachment A.) Housko-Pattison said that the abutter's fence was falling down even more than a month ago and they plan on waiting for the fence to fall down completely and they will replace the fence with a 6 foot cedar post fence to run the length of the property line.

Housko-Pattison distributed a photo copy of the abutter's fence that is falling down, (Attachment B) and mentioned the Board had concerns regarding the tree that stands on the property line and how the fence would butt up to the tree. She distributed a photograph of said tree, (Attachment C.) Their plan is to have one section of the fence up to one side of the tree; the fence would stop and then continue on the other side of the tree to the end of the property line.

Cohen assumes the proposed Pattison fence would go directly along the property line. Housko-Pattison agreed and indicated they may wait until spring to replace the fence when the abutter's fence comes down.

Murray questioned the upkeep of the fence when it is right on the property line. Housko-Pattison said they were only going to stain their side of the fence and not the abutter side of the fence.

The Chair asked if the Board had further comments.

Bush asked for clarification on the dimensions of the proposed fence.

Housko-Pattison replied the proposed fence will be 6 ft. along the tongue and groove cedar, and the height will be 4 ft. from the bottom of the scallop as it approaches the main street.

The Chair asked if the Board had further comments. There were none. The Chair asked for public comments. There were none. He closed the public portion of the meeting.

Murray moved for the Board to approve the applicant's request to construct a cedar fence on the lot line and to approve the timing as to when the applicant wishes to install the proposed fence, starting at 4 ft. with the scallop and continuing 6 feet along the tongue and groove cedar down the property line. Also, there will be a break in the fence around the tree.

Bush seconded the motion. Approved.

Chairman Rowland closed the continued public hearing for Ann Pattison.

Public Hearing re: Clarissa Christiansen, 81 Piscataqua St., Map 17, Lot 38-1:

GUESTS: Attorney Bernie Pelech, representing the applicant; Donald Hardy, Contractor

Chairman Rowland announced this was a public hearing for Clarissa Christiansen, 81 Piscataqua St., Map 17, Lot 38-1. The applicant requests an addition of a 21 ft. hip eave over the garage, 9 ft. wide garage doors rather than the 8 ft. doors approved, and a 6 ft. light side door rather than the approved 9 ft. side door. The public hearing has been properly advertised, abutters were notified and all fees paid.

Attorney Bernie Pelech introduced Donald Hardy and distributed a colored photograph taken by the applicant showing what was built and what has since been taken down, (Attachment D), because it did not comply with the original approval and that is reflected on the photograph.

Attorney Pelech referred to Plan A1, HDC Approved Left Elevation, (Attachment E) that refers to what the HDC approved and all the changes the applicant is requesting for approval.

Attorney Pelech referred to Plan P1, (Attachment F) which is what the applicant is asking to have changed. He addressed the following three changes.

1. *Request addition of 21 foot hip eave to fill awkward space above garage doors. The Hip Eave only has a 16" projection. John Chagnon, the engineer for the project said this addition will not add to impervious ground water issues, and does not affect setbacks.*
2. *Request 9 foot wide garage doors rather than 8 foot wide garage doors.*
3. *Request 6 light side door rather than 9 light side door for privacy and "R" value issues.*

Attorney Pelech explained the first request, (Attachment D) which is a 21” wide hip eave that has a 16” projection over the garage doors that was installed. The Building Inspector issued a cease and desist order because it was not approved. The color photograph shows the garage door before it was removed.

Attorney Pelech said the applicant did not like the way the garage door looked and preferred the way her next door neighbor’s garage door looked. This requested addition also provides more protection from the elements when coming in and out of the garage. He asked Donald Hardy to provide the reasons why the applicant would prefer a 6 light side door versus a 9 light side door.

Donald Hardy said that it is predominantly an aesthetic issue. It has a slightly higher “R” value and slightly less heat loss with a six light side door rather than a 9 light side door.

Attorney Pelech said the final change is to make the garage doors 9 feet wide versus the 8 feet wide garage doors. He said the three changes are relatively minor and, hopefully, the HDC does not have a problem with them.

Cohen questioned the width of the garage doors on the photograph. Hardy replied it has an 8 ft. opening.

Cohen asked if it had the same number of lights across the top. Hardy replied it has the same number of lights and the same number of panels below.

The Chair asked if the Board had further comments. There were none. He asked if the public had further comments.

Samantha Fuller, 23 Elm Court, questioned the historical significance from the house across the street from the applicant.

Mary Johnson, 9 Elm Court, owns property at the corner of Elm Court and Piscataqua St. She is here because she has concerns about some of the construction that has been going on next door. When the applicant previously came before this board their presentation described the height as 12 ft. 8 ½” high. They now have a second floor with 8 windows.

Johnson presumes this second floor is under the HDC’s purview and assumes it is this board that decides the conformation of the second floor.

The Chair replied that was decided at the last public hearing.

Johnson pointed out that on the applicant’s second floor of this new building are eight (8) windows along the side of the house, very close to their property line and giving them no privacy at all in their yard, looking down on their back porch and diminishing the value of their house.

Chairman Rowland said that was decided at the last public hearing for the applicant. This evening the Board is only addressing the three new requests that are before this Board at this time.

Johnson said they are very upset about this change regarding the eight (8) windows and feels that some changes should be made at this point. She emphasized that their privacy is completely diminished.

The Chair does not feel there is much the HDC can do as this application was previously approved. He reiterated this application is about the three changes that the applicant is requesting.

Johnson said they received an application for the garage but never received any other application by the owner or by the town.

Cohen suggested that Johnson check with Pam Cullen whether or not they received a certified letter in the mail regarding notification on the construction of this garage. Pam would have a receipt of any notification being sent to Johnson and all of the abutters. The Town Hall needs to make sure that Johnson was notified properly as an abutter.

Chairman Rowland asked if the public had further comments. There were none. He closed the public hearing.

Discussion followed on the three requests for changes, (Attachment G.)

Hughes feels the changes are minor and he has no concerns.

Nollet agrees with Hughes.

Bush dislikes the overhang.

The Chair has concerns regarding the overhang.

Hughes pointed out there has already been a precedent set with the house across the driveway and does not understand why this Board feels this is not acceptable.

Chairman Rowland said in previous discussions about precedent they had received help from Town Counsel regarding that issue and determined that this HDC does not have to be bound by earlier decisions by other HDCs. One has to treat each case individually and one has to determine whether it works or not.

The Chair has no problem with the garage doors. His only concern is with the overhang.

Cohen agrees with the Chair on his point of view regarding the overhang. Aesthetically, she feels it looks entirely different when it is a dog house dormer versus a shed dormer. In her opinion, it does not look historically correct. She has no problem with the doors.

Nollet feels it looks better with the overhang and noted there is a valid point when they talk about safety regarding the elements.

Hughes said the roof line height matches the height of the porch roof line and it provides symmetry.

The Chair asked if the board had further comments. There were none.

Bush moved for the HDC to approve the applicant's Request #2, (see Attachment G) "Request 9 foot wide garage doors rather than 8 foot wide garage doors" and to approve the applicant's Request # 3, (see Attachment G) "Request 6 light side door rather than 9 light side door for privacy and "R" value issues, are approved.

Cohen seconded the motion. Approved.

Bush moved for the HDC to deny Request #1, (see Attachment G) "Request addition of 21 foot hip eave to fill awkward space above garage doors. The Hip Eave only has a 16" projection." Cohen seconded the motion.

Bush votes for the motion to deny Request #1.

Cohen votes for the motion to deny Request #1.

Chairman Rowland votes for the motion to deny Request #1.

Nollet is opposed to the motion to deny Request #1.

Murray is opposed to the motion to deny Request #1.

Three votes to deny Request #1.

Two votes opposed to the motion to deny Request#1.

Motion to deny Request #1 is approved.

Chairman Rowland closed the public hearing for Clarissa Christiansen.

Public Hearing re: Edward & Barbara Bouchard, 111 Main St., Map 13, Lot 17:

GUESTS: Jeff Greene, Carpenter, representing the applicants

Chairman Rowland announced this was a public hearing for Edward & Barbara Bouchard, 111 Main St., Map 13, Lot 17. The applicants request to rebuild existing deck to provide stairs for direct driveway access with new balusters, rails and treads. The public hearing has been properly advertised, abutters were notified and all fees paid.

Jeff Greene noted that the existing steps the Bouchard's have are not very useful and definitely not safe. They propose to cut the deck back a couple of feet so they can fit in five steps and rebuild the hand rails. Materials will be mahogany with azek trim, (Attachment H.) Greene would like to change the existing decking, newels, balusters and handrails that are mahogany and will be replaced in kind.

Cohen questioned the width of the current treads.

Greene replied approximately 30". They plan on making the treads at 3 feet clear, slightly wider.

Cohen asked if it would be the same number of stairs. Greene replied no.

The Chair asked for clarification on which newels would be eliminated.

Greene replied he wanted to eliminate the two outer newels on top of the steps.

Murray asked to see a photograph of the home.

Greene referred to (Attachment I and Attachment J)

The Chair asked if the Board had further comments. There were none. He asked if the public had any comments. There were none.

Murray moved for the HDC to approve the application to replace the deck stairs for Edward and Barbara Bouchard, as submitted, with removal of the two outer newels making only two newels at the top of the stairs instead of 4.

Cohen seconded the motion. Approved.

Chairman Rowland closed the public hearing for Edward and Barbara Bouchard.

Work Session re: Philip & Diane Llewelyn, 38 Main St., Map 18, Lot 64-1:

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

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

Bill Greenier presented his proposal to build a new single family home on "non-conforming lot of record" 18-64-1, (Attachment K.) They are here this evening to get the Board's comments on the design of the proposed home. He discussed the roofing and siding material, windows, trim and doors, (Attachment L.)

The Chair expressed his concerns regarding the many different size windows.

Murray said, in her opinion, this house did not look historic. The windows do not match anything that she can see in the historic district.

The Chair said most of the windows in that particular area are divided lights, i.e., 6/6. He sees many different windows, many different styles and would like the applicant to bring some uniformity to the window styles throughout.

Cohen questioned the square footage of the entire structure. Grenier replied it is 2800 square feet.

Cohen questioned the prevailing architectural structure. Grenier replied an expanded cape.

Cohen pointed out that one of the requirements of the zoning ordinance is that the structure shall conform in form and style to the structures in the neighborhood and such structures shall conform to a specified historic architectural style.

Chairman Rowland emphasized that most of the neighborhood has colonial structures and, in his opinion, the proposed structure looks too modern for that area.

Cohen agrees with the Chair.

The Chair noted that every house on Main St. has a front door. This house does not have a traditional colonial front entry.

Llewellyn is not certain if one would be able to do that with the width they have to build on. He explained the envelope is not that wide. Originally, the thought was to have the driveway shared with the main house. They changed their thinking and changed the garage to the other side as they thought this would be more conducive. It is difficult with the size of the lot to have balance.

Chairman Rowland's concern is in all of the buildings on Main St. he is picturing colonial architecture, very symmetrical, very traditional. There may be more flexibility on other streets because the architectural styles are much more varied but the Main Street view is not in keeping with that area of the historic district. The Chair suggested if the applicant could design that elevation to create a more traditional architecture.

Cohen feels it may be safer if the applicant could go out in the back rather than on Main St. She pointed out that the lots used to be merged and now they are unmerged.

Llewellyn said that coming off of Main St. allows the two lots to be more autonomous.

Hughes agrees the front of the house should be on Main Street as oppose to the side of the house.

The Chair has no concerns with the siding, trim, roof, and materials.

Cohen said she is particularly sensitive now after going through several other projects. The zoning ordinance states regarding the criteria for new construction that the surface shall be consistent with the prevailing sides and scale of other structures within the district or relevant neighborhood.

Chairman Rowland asked the applicant if he would consider a more traditional brick chimney versus a stone chimney. Llewellyn replied yes.

Bush looked at the plans and noticed they seemed to have a visible porch overhang on the back portion of the house.

Llewellyn replied they would like to get a view of the water.

The Chair emphasized that the HDC struggles with second floor decks or porches because they are not really a traditional feature. He discussed the uniformity of the windows and asked the applicant if he could be more traditional.

Hughes agreed the proposed home needs more symmetry from Main St. and Wentworth Road. There are three dormers and they are all different sizes.

Grenier summarized the Board's concerns: The need to address the symmetry, the windows and the doors. He asked what the Board would like to see that is different regarding the doors.

Chairman Rowland replied no full glass doors.

Llewellyn asked if the 4/1 windows would be acceptable to the board.

The Chair replied 6/6 is preferred.

Cohen summarized no double doors. She has no problem with single doors.

Hughes questioned the roof height because the house steps up and he noted there are two different style elevations.

Chairman Rowland suggested the applicant consider another work session. He closed the work session for Philip & Diane Llewellyn.

Review of HDC Minutes of October 2, 2014:

Cohen moved to approve the HDC minutes of October 2, 2014, as amended. Murray seconded the motion. Approved.

Other Business:

Samantha Fuller asked the HDC if the Board ever got together, as a group, every three or four months and walk around to other houses the HDC had previously approved and critically look at them to see if they could have done better or what did the Board do wrong?

Cohen said there have been a number of occasions that the Board has had discussion on what they should have done differently.

Adjournment:

Cohen moved to adjourn the meeting. Murray seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anita Colby
Recording Secretary

Attachment A: Copy of 2005 Littlefield Property Survey

Attachment B: Photo of Pattison's abutter's fence falling down

Attachment C: Photo of tree that stands on property line

Attachment D: Photo showing what was built with a 21" wide hip eave with a 16" projection over the garage doors before taken down.

Attachment E: Plan A1, HDC Approved Left Elevation

Attachment F: Plan P1, what applicant wants changed

Attachment G: the applicant's three requests for changes

Attachment H: Photograph of Bouchard's stairs

Attachment I: Photograph of Bouchard's home

Attachment J: Photograph of Bouchard's home

Attachment K: Llewellyn's Proposal to build new single family home

Attachment L: List of roofing material; siding; windows, trim & doors.