

**New Castle Historic District Commission  
July 2, 2015**

**Work Session Re: Jesse L. & Christine B. Ambrose, 3 Oliver St., Map 16, Lot 22**

**Question & Answer Session Re: Mike Sullivan, 81 Piscataqua St.**

**Question & Answer Session Re: Tom Brown, Portsmouth Avenue**

**BOAR MEMBERS PRESENT:** Irene Bush; Lorn Buxton; Jeff Hughes; Kate Murray;  
Elaine Nollet; Peter Reed; Rodney Rowland

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

**Work Session Re: Jesse L. & Christine B. Ambrose, 3 Oliver St., Map 16, Lot 22:**

The Chair announced this was a work session for Jesse L. & Christine B. Ambrose, 3 Oliver St. Map 16, Lot 22.

**GUESTS:** Jesse L. & Christine B. Ambrose, applicants; Joseph Paquet, Portsmouth Builders

Joseph Paquet, Owner, Portsmouth Builders, discussed his written proposal, photographs and architectural renderings. Paquette proposes the following alterations to the existing house structure at 3 Oliver St:

- 1) *Extension & Winterization of the rear porch*
- 2) *Extension of the rear second floor gable dormer*
- 3) *Remodel of the entry to the rear porch*

He pointed out that these alterations would primarily affect the rear face of the house structure, with no effect on the façade. He believe these alterations will have a minor impact on the style and appearance of the existing house structure.

Paquet discussed the *Detailed Work Plan; Materials; Visual Impact of the Proposed Alterations; and Additional Considerations;* for the project, (Attachment A.)

Paquet explained they would like to take some of the rear exterior of the home that is currently a two-season porch that needs significant repairs and make some definite enhancements that would increase the footprint by a very small amount. They plan to keep all of the architectural details very similar to what they are presently.

They would also like to extend the porch, which is currently on posts, and bring a foundation aspect to that addition, enclose that space and create a four-season room with proper heating and energy conservation while making a better use of this space, including a mud room and the extension of the existing gable on the second floor by four (4) feet.

Paquet distributed current photographs of the present porch, (Attachment A) and pointed out that the present space of the porch's current windows are single pane and in many cases are simply glued together side by side.

He distributed some current plans of what they are proposing, (Attachment A) and noted they plan to keep that current presentation to Portsmouth Avenue, as is, with a small adjustment that will increase the size of the screened porch into a porch with easy living space and add some additional windows on that side of the house.

The clapboard façade would be kept the same; the 2/2 window presentation would be kept the same; the features of the shadow boards, crown moldings, and exterior trim details would all be consistent with the new construction.

Chairman Rowland asked if the foundation would be brick, existing and proposed.

Paquet replied they would like to keep that as a consistent detail throughout and they would like to bring a modern method of foundation detailing with a monolithic cross protection modern foundation that gives the building the best thermal insulating properties that it could have but also creates an architectural look that could be blended and matched to the original. They are reviewing the design with the Building Inspector to make sure that what they are proposing would meet current energy and structural components while preserving the historic character of the home.

The Chair asked for the Board's comments.

Murray asked for clarification regarding the windows on the side of the porch.

Paquet replied they would preserve the 2/2 characteristics. There are three windows in that space now and they would be adding two extra windows to make it a wall of windows and there would be a total of five windows. Presently, it is a wall of windows and they would like to keep it a wall of windows.

The Chair assumes the building has new clapboards to the first floor. Paquet replied yes and he is proposing to do the same in the back.

The Chair asked for clarification regarding the materials. Paquet replied they are proposing to use an Anderson Woodrite Series Window.

Reed asked for clarification on the windows. Paquet replied the light from the west in the afternoon is wonderful and they would like to preserve the character of that room.

Hughes believes it is not a big addition and they are keeping within the style of the present house.

Nollet said they are doing a wonderful job in preserving the house.

Murray questioned how old were the existing windows.

Paquet replied the windows still have their sash weights and the lock sets...?... are off set from the center mullions. If the windows are not the original, they are very close to being the original windows. The second floor dormer windows are not as old as the front windows. The 2/2 single pane gable windows on the rear addition are less than twenty years old.

Reed asked if all of the front windows were single pane.

Paquet replied single pane with storms in front of each of the windows.

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

The Chair believes it is a very respectful treatment of a wonderful turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. He suggested the Board will need a sample of the brick veneer at the public hearing.

Paquet asked if the Board prefers the whole brick or a clay fired veneer brick. The Chair suggested bringing a sample of both. The Board will also need a list of the building materials they plan to use; a sample of what the clapboards and the shakes are going to be; a sample of what the roofing materials are going to be; specific window styles, sizes and door styles.

The Chair asked for clarification regarding the fence around the property. Does the applicant have the intention of replacing it in kind? If that is something that will be changed, that is within the purview of the HDC.

Paquet replied at the present the applicant has no plans to change the fencing.

Chairman Rowland closed the work session for Jesse L. & Christine B. Ambrose.

### **Question & Answer Session for Mike Sullivan, 81 Piscataqua Street:**

**GUESTS:** Mike Sullivan

Chairman Rowland announced this was a Question & Answer Session for Mike Sullivan regarding 81 Piscataqua Street.

Mike Sullivan, 22 Atkinson St., distributed a Design Considerations/Constraints for 81 Piscataqua St., (Attachment B.) He would like to retire on the Island and has looked at the available property at 81 Piscataqua St. and would like to have the Board's feedback for this property on what options exist. He discussed the Acceptable Designs, Design Details, Materials, on Page 4, Page 5, and Page 6 of his proposal.

Sullivan was thinking of the need for a garage given the climate in the winter and what kind of options exists. Basically, this is a general discussion and he has included photographs of ideas on what he has.

Sullivan explained Page 3 and the site of the property. It is a challenging site per se, there are many deep elevations, and there are common areas committed since this house is part of a condo association. There appears to be a limited set of flat areas that one can actually build on. There is a great deal of exposed rock so the general idea of traditional foundation might be problematic with rocks almost at ground level.

He referred to Page 4, regarding some of the designs they had in mind, (Attachment B.) Whether it would be a cape design or a two story Greek revival style. He asked the Board for their feedback.

The Chair said the historic district is not a single entity, it has many entities. Just because there has been a house by the river or by the cemetery that you like does not mean that it would be appropriate for your particular area. The applicant needs to look at the surrounding properties around your area and ascertain what has been approved in your particular area and has been around for a very long time. He suggests getting a flavor and trying to find some architecture that fits in your area. Also, just because some style has been approved in the past by a past HDC Board does not mean that this Commission will approve it. The HDC is not beholden to past decisions by previous Commissions.

Chairman Rowland suggests that the applicant gets a sense and a flavor of the particular area he or she is considering, in this case, 81 Piscataqua St., and try to find something that fits within the architecture that is prevalent in that area.

Sullivan said they would like to have some space around the property as the back side of the property where the house is right on the property line.

The Chair pointed out that the Board prefers traditional materials but we have approved nontraditional materials but has approved non-traditional materials as long as in appearance it looks like it belongs in the historic district.

Sullivan referred to Page 5 of the proposal and commented on the following: Clapboards – Cedar/Cement with 3 1/2 – 4” reveal; Shutters- he would like to have real functioning shutters. Windows – they have done the windows on Atkinson St. in Marvin Wood/Clad 6/6. Trim – Wood/Azek.

Sullivan said the thought was smaller structures but connected together so it can sit on the site appropriately as opposed as something large. They are not looking for a lot of square footage; they are looking for 3,000 s.f. total.

The Chair said that garages are not historic but we live with garages today as they are part of our lives. We do like to minimize their appearance so that they do not stand out.

Sullivan said a public side versus a private side. It sits on the hill and depending on how you orient the house, whether it would be from Main St. or as you come up the hill, in his mind, that would be the view that is a public view and that would be consistent with whatever the appropriate design would be that would ultimately fit in that neighborhood. The other side which faces the trees and essentially that lot outcropping in the front, the thought would be to have some traditional decking or porches in order to have some outdoor space.

Sullivan said another thought would be to have a deck from the access of the bedroom on the second story in order to have a view of the river.

Chairman Rowland said the concept of a second story walk-out deck in not well received by this Board. He emphasized it is very hard to do specifics without any particular plans, etc. If the applicant wishes to go down this road this Board will need to have several work sessions.

Buxton emphasized that the site is highly visible.

Murray said the site is up very high and the HDC does not want to see a “Lord of the Manor” house.

Sullivan appreciates the time and effort the Board has taken this evening.

The Chair said that the applicant will need to spend a great deal of quality time with the Building Inspector in terms of code review and the condominium association requirement. All of that has to be taken care of before the applicant comes before this Board.

Chairman Rowland closed the Question/Answer Session for Mike Sullivan, 81 Piscataqua Street.

**Question/Answer Session for Tom Brown, 164 Portsmouth Avenue:**

**GUESTS:** Tom Brown, applicant

The Chair announced this was a Question/Answer Session for Tom Brown, 164 Portsmouth Avenue.

Brown distributed drawings to the Board, (Attachment C.) They have been working on the inside of the house and now have started to work on the addition and would like to move it over approximately 2 feet and this would be all within the setback.

He referred to Page 1, the Approved Site Plan, (Attachment C); Page 2, Actual Site Plan, (Attachment C) and on the Portsmouth side of the Island shows a portion the Master Bedroom peak overhanging 5 feet from the structure. On the New Castle side it overhangs presently about 4 feet in the approved plan. They are asking for permission to move it back so that the 5 feet becomes 3 feet on the Portsmouth side and the side facing New Castle is 6 feet. They are asking permission to shift the rear section addition 2 feet to the right, towards New Castle.

Brown discussed Page 3, Attachment C – the Proposed Site Plan. The size stays the same; they are only shifting that space. He asked the Board what would be the process to come back before the Board. He questioned adding shakes on the front of the garage at the gabled end of the garage. What is the process?

Chairman Rowland replied if there are changes from the original approval, in material, in site plan, in windows, the applicant will need to come back before this Board for a new public hearing.

Brown had a question of window placement. There may be a movement of a window. He referred to Page 5 of the drawings and noted there were two separate windows in the Master Bath and the two windows may have to go together instead of being apart.

The Chair questioned the angle of the driveway, to the garage, to the main road, and asked if this would change at all?

Brown replied it would be out a bit further and it will be going into the common drive. We may have an angle change in the surround area.

Chairman Rowland asked if the Board feels this requires a continuance of the previous public hearing that gave the approval.

Buxton has concerns regarding the shifting of the overhang.

Brown explained this is not an overhang, he meant the overhang was only in the drawing itself. It is the last section, if one looks at the adjoining piece of the property. It sits outside of that about 5 ft. on one side and it sits on the foundation.

The Chair asked for the Board's comments.

Murray suggested another alternative to bring it 2 ft. to the left.

Nollet agrees with the Building Inspector that 2 feet is not significant.

Bush has concerns over the ganging of the two windows.

Chairman Rowland is not concerned regarding the 2 feet, what bothers him is the ganging of the two windows together. The HDC has no problem with the shift but the applicant needs to keep the windows the same. He closed the Question/Answer Session for Tom Brown.

#### **Review of HDC Minutes of June 4, 2015:**

**Nollet moved for the Board to approve the HDC Minutes of June 4, 2015, as amended. Hughes seconded the motion. Approved.**

**New Business:**

Chairman Rowland spoke on the HDC procedures and relationships to work session. He pointed out that other towns treat work sessions like public hearings.

Discussion followed among the Board.

**Hughes moved for the Historic District Commission to follow the same procedure for Work Sessions as it does for Public Hearings in that abutters should be notified about the work session by first class mail and the posting of the meeting should be properly advertised. Nollet seconded the motion.**

Discussion followed on the fees for work sessions.

**Hughes moved to withdraw his motion. Nollet second the motion. Approved.**

**New Motion:**

**Chairman Rowland moved for the Historic District Commission to notify abutters of work sessions by first class mail and the posting of the meeting at two public locations and the website. Bush seconded the motion. Approved.**

**Other New Business:**

Nollet said the Historical Museum is re-doing the New Castle Walk About regarding the Historical Houses in New Castle. She gave a sample copy to Chairman Rowland and suggested a copy should be kept at Town Hall.

Andy Schulte asked if he had to come before the HDC to replace an aluminum storm door with an all glass door. Instead of seeing aluminum, you would see a six-panel door. Does he need to come before the HDC?

The Chair replied he would have to come before the HDC to change the door.

**Adjournment:**

Hughes moved to adjourn the meeting. Reed seconded the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Anita Colby  
Recording Secretary

Attachment A: Proposal describing the detailed work plans for Jesse & Christine Ambrose  
Attachment B: Design Consideration/Constraints Re: 81 Piscataqua Street  
Attachment C: Drawings of Approved Site Plan & Proposed Site Plan for Tom Brown

