

APPROVED
HDC MEETING
MARCH 4, 2021

Members Present: Chair Rodney Rowland, Vice Chair Hughes, Tom Maher, Kate Murray, Irene Bush, Judy Groppa and Ruth Zikaras.

Absent: Elaine Nollet

Due to Covid 19, the meeting was held via Zoom.

Chair Rowland called the meeting of the New Castle Historic District Commission to order at 7:02 pm. Rowland stated there were three public hearings on the agenda and a continuation of a hearing from last month and advised that the applications had been published, fees paid and abutters notified. The Chair, Vice Chair, Maher, Murray, and Bush would be voting. Chair Rowland asked everyone to mute their computers if not speaking.

1. Public Hearing for Kristen McCormack and John McCormack, 41-43 Piscataqua St, Map18, Lot 43 for new fence and storage shed

Guests: John McCormack, Rita Fusco, and Russell Bookholz, the Building Inspector

McCormack advised that they want to install a 5' fence, not a 6' fence as the application shows. The Chair shared his screen and drew a red line while the applicant confirmed where the fence would be located. McCormack advised that standing on Piscataqua Street and looking at the property, the proposed fence runs on the left side of #41 and runs up the property line; it is a T shaped lot and the fence will go up the lower left of the T and then back down the property line and return between the two buildings to the back corner of 41 Piscataqua Street.

Kate Murray asked McCormack to indicate where Mrs. Fusco's house was as she needed a sense of direction on the plan. Maher asked if the shed is visible from the street and learned that the view of the shed will be obstructed by the house. Murray then asked what the purpose of the fence that is diagonal was for and McCormack advised it is just for privacy for the backyard.

Ruth Zikaras asked if the fence on the other side will also be 5' or 6', indicating the fence as the property goes toward the house at 47 Piscataqua Street. McCormack stated the neighbors have a small picket fence and then it changes to a different fence that increases in height but he was not sure if it is 5' or 6'. Irene Bush asked if the fence curves around to the other side, down the driveway back to Piscataqua Street and McCormack stated it will intersect to the corner of the building to hide the gas tank and will have a gate to access the gas tank, when it needs filling. Maher confirmed that the gas tank is already there and also inquired

as to how high the shed would be, which will be the same height as the fence. The Chair shared a view where the fence will go and McCormack pointed out the red house as Rita Fusco's and the grey one as his sister's house. The fence will enclose the back yard.

Murray asked about the materials for the fence and was advised it will be Northern white cedar, unknown yet whether it will be painted or natural. The shed will also be Northern white cedar, however the Chair stated he was not concerned about the shed because it is not visible from the street.

Chair Rowland asked if there were additional questions from the board and opened the hearing to the public at 7:13 pm. Mrs. Fusco asked McCormack if she was going to be looking at the shed from her patio and he advised the fence will block the view of their back yard from Fusco's patio so she will not see the shed. Fusco's other concern is that the wire for the invisible fence for their dog is planted where the mesh fence is. McCormack advised that a lot of the fence is going to be pinned to the ledge in the back, and that it will be drilled into the ledge, there will be no blasting. Fusco asked if the fence was coming down to the street as she was concerned about visibility and snow removal. McCormack advised Mrs. Fusco that he brought these things up to his sister and that Mrs. Fusco should talk to her and express her concerns. The Building Inspector, Russell Bookholz, then advised the applicant would need to go through the permit process for the fence and that it cannot be 5' up to the road because of visibility, so it may have to be lower at the road. McCormack said the fence will look better if it gradates down to the street. Groppa stated she likes the fence to the right, the way it steps down and suggested the applicant should match the two sides as it will make it more attractive. The applicant stated the fence on the right goes from a solid fence down to a picket fence and asked if Groppa was talking about the style of fence or the height of the fence. Groppa said she was referring to both, as she likes the way it steps down and it is very attractive. The Chair advised that the height of the fence will come from the building inspector.

The Chair closed the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.

Vice Chair Hughes motioned to approve the application; Maher seconded. Roll call vote: Jeff Hughes voted Aye; Irene Bush voted Aye; Tom Mater voted Aye; Kate Murray voted Aye; the Chair voted Aye.

2. Public Hearing for Jacqueline Heard, 5 Atkinson Street, new windows and doors

Guest: Michael Burns, Jacqueline Heard's husband, Jaime Morin, the window representative and Russell Bookholz, Building Inspector

Mr. Morin stated there will be nine windows in total which will be on the front and side of the house and a French door on the side which will be wood and swing in. The windows will be a Fibrex material; the current windows are

wooden with storm windows, and the storm windows will be removed. Morin stated the FDLs are applied to the exterior and interior of the windows and there is a spacer. Kate Murray inquired as to where the French door was going and Morin advised it will be on the side and will basically look the same as what's there now. It is a single door with one full pane; the current door is multi paned on top. Murray asked if the French door was going to be bigger, if it was two doors but was informed that it is a single door. The material will be wood interior and vinyl clad on the outside with one large glass pane. The Chair asked what the numbers represented on the application and was informed it is how the windows are represented in the contract.

The windows will be double hung, 2 over 1; they are different than what is existing. The house was built in the early 1900's and they are going for a 1910 look. The Chair couldn't find pictures of the windows as 2 over 1 and was informed they should be in the packet with the second application which Rowland did not have. The Building Inspector, Bookholz, was able to share his screen with Board members and showed the 2 over 1 window. Ruth Zikaras stated there is a description of the grill pattern, and referred to window 104.

The Chair then asked if there is more to Heard's proposal than window and door substitutions and was informed that there is much more. Burns stated there are at least 10 pages in the second application which includes drawings of how the house will look and elevations of all sides which he delivered to the town clerk's office. Board members did not have the second application. Bookholz suggested he could take pictures of the application and send to Rowland via email. The Chair suggested holding on this application and went to agenda item no. 3 while Bookholz sent information to the Chair.

The Chair resumed the hearing on the Heard application at 7:36 pm after Russell Bookholz graciously emailed pictures of the second application to Chair Rowland. Rowland asked the applicant if he had completed his presentation on the Anderson windows. Mike Burns stated they will also repair and replace rotted trim and siding on the entire house. There will be cedar clapboard and trim on the entire house and the window installers will replace the trim when installing the new windows. Burns presented a drawing of the 2 over 1 windows on the house.

Burns pointed out the window seat on the left of the picture, which has clapboard under all the windows; they want to replace the clapboard with custom panels painted white to match the trim color, the house will remain gray, however, they're not sure which of four grays from the Benjamin Moor historical collection, but they want to steer clear of matching any of the neighbors' houses.

There will be new downspouts as there is little to no overhang on the roof. The roof is sound but there are no gutters and the rain drips down the side of the house. They will install Douglas fir wood gutters and white aluminum downspouts to catch water and move it forward to the street away from the back,

as the backyard is a quagmire of mud. They would like white aluminum downspouts to match the trim color, and will install the old school pinched circular downspouts instead of rectangular.

Maher asked if the panels were a new feature. Rowland stated they basically look like a frame of wood within a trimmed out recessed panel. Burns confirmed they are a new feature and they will keep them as simple as possible as the house is only 764 SF so doing too much will get too busy. Murray asked if the panel will go on the front of the house as well. Burns stated there will also be a panel under the window on the porch and another under the window to the right. He also proposed an arch underneath the roof overhang which will be used for structural support while adding a little detail to the front. They cannot put a post because the roof is narrower than the house so a post would cut down on the stair width and they want to keep the same footprint all around. Judy Groppa asked if there will be one or two arch supports but there will just be one because of how the roofline comes over the window seat.

Russ Bookholz advised that they would address the gutters during the permit process because you cannot drain water into the street so he will discuss a stormwater management plan with the applicant. The Chair showed a picture of the front of the house with the panels under the windows and the contiguous roof line with only one support. The window seat is inside the house under the double windows and was an addition to the home possibly in the late 80's. Kate Murray asked about skirting, whether it is lattice and goes all the way around, which was confirmed by Burns. Murray stated it looked like some of the foundation is natural stone. Burns moved around to the back of the house where the fence has rotted and is banging in the wind. They would like to match the style of the panels on the front of the home and create a similar style 5' deck fence. There is a fence there now that is 5'.

Burns showed a drawing of the 2 over 1 window with simple trim that will give a three dimensional shadow at the top of the windows, adding that there are examples of this type of crown molding on other houses on the street. The skylights are existing and are not being removed at this time. The deck has fencing that closes in the front portion of the deck and they are removing that to add a pergola which will help alleviate the heat from the western setting sun. Irene Bush asked if the pergola could be seen from the street and was advised it can be seen from the driveway of the red house on the corner of Main and Atkinson Streets, otherwise it can only be seen by neighbors. The pergola will not be seen from the street. Burns pointed out the shed on the left which houses an oil tank and stands at shoulder level to the deck. He would like to change the roof shingles from asphalt to a flame retardant shake shingle and would like to change the shingles on all first floor rooflines such as the front porch and the kickout where the dining room is, which is visible from the street. Chair Rowland asked Burns to confirm which kickouts will have shingles. Burns said the shingles are not in the proposal but will add interest on the house. Kate Murray asked how the

house will look with asphalt on the main roof and shake shingles on the first floor rooflines as there will be two different materials. It is not uncommon on the island to have different materials on different parts of the house. The Chair stated it is an interesting approach and that Strawberry Banke has a number of houses with lower roofs in wood shake and the second floor roof has asphalt, adding that it saves money and adds detail.

Burns stated that everything will be wood. Redwood for the decking and stair decking, and they will be using a new product called "Acoya" for the trim and panels, which is paintable. Murray thought the changes were really charming.

The Chair asked if there will be any detail changes to the railings and Burns stated other than paint they will be unchanged. Irene Bush asked about the front door. Burns stated it is currently 15 panels and that will remain. In the future they may come back to install a storm door but will look at a one pane so you can see the multi panels of the main door.

Maher was looking at the list of changes on the application and noted that the shake shingles were not on there and asked if the board is allowed to add that to the application. The Chair stated that yes, the board could conditionally approve and can add the shake shingles.

Ruth Zikaras asked if the house was built around 1910 and stated the change in windows will make it the only house on the street with different windows, that the other houses have 6 over 6. The Chair stated that there are different ages of buildings on the street which has been lost over time, adding that this is nice because it will bring the house back to the way it may have looked.

The Chair opened the hearing to the public at 8:01 pm, but there was no one to speak to, for or against and the public hearing was closed. The Chair stated he awaited a motion or asked if there were any questions from the Board. Maher stated that the hiccup with the application notwithstanding, he was comfortable with what was presented, asking whether because there were the two applications if the Board needed two votes.

Maher moved to approve the window and door application with the 2 over 1 window; Murray seconded. Roll call: Vice Chair Hughes voted Aye; Irene Bush voted Aye; Tom Maher voted Aye; Kate Murray voted Aye; the Chair voted Aye.

Maher motioned to approve the second application for repair and replacement of clapboard, trim and gutters, the arch for the roof overhang, the pergola, the panels, and shake shingles on the first-floor roofs; Jeff Hughes seconded. Roll call: Vice Chair Hughes voted Aye; Irene Bush voted Aye; Tom Maher voted Aye; Kate Murray voted Aye; the Chair voted Aye.

The Chair stated it was a really nice application and apologized that the Board didn't get to enjoy it. He also thanked Russ Bookholz for his help in providing copies and moving things forward.

3. Continued Public Hearing for Tap Taylor, 1 Steamboat Lane for exterior door

The Chair stated that Taylor has been unable to find a door that will work, adding that it will be several thousand dollars to make a custom door to accommodate what the Board had requested. Rowland said if board members feel it necessary to have Taylor replace the main door with something more in line with the original, Taylor will appeal to the ZBA. Unfortunately this was a mistake by the previous Building Inspector that the HDC was not notified prior to changes being made. The Chair stated he is not sure the Board has a lot of footing to uphold a legal challenge and asked if Board members felt the HDC needs to pursue this.

Maher stated that unfortunately the mistake was made and that's the way it's going to be adding that he doesn't find it excessively egregious but it is not optimal and not what the Board would prefer to see. He suggested that the same mistake not be made again. Irene Bush asked if there was any way that the door could be altered by a skilled carpenter. The Chair stated that Taylor asked the company to substitute the light in the door to match the windows in the building and they are unable to do that. Kate Murray said it's frustrating and we need to look for ways to avoid this in the future.

The Chair advised that in the short time since Russ Bookholz has been the Building Inspector, he has had more conversations with the Building Inspector than he ever had with the prior Building Inspector, so he hopes it will not happen again.

Maher motioned to suspend the recommendation that the owner of 1 Steamboat Lane replace the door despite the errors and accept the door that has been installed; Vice Chair Hughes seconded. Roll call: Jeff Hughes voted Aye; Irene Bush abstained; Tom Maher voted Aye; Kate Murray voted Aye; the Chair voted Aye.

4. Public Hearing for Colin Haupt, 86 Main Street, Map 18, Lot 6 for new windows, roof line change.

Guest: Colin Haupt, Pat Driscoll, the contractor, and George Melcher, architect.

Mr. Haupt stated they are hopeful to be able to replace the roof and replace the siding, in kind. The more detailed change will be the roofline which is driven off the desire and need to raise the ceiling height at the top of the 2nd floor staircase so people don't hit their head on the ceiling when walking up the stairs. Haupt presented Proposal A and proposal B but for all intents, focused on Proposal B

which creates the least amount of aesthetic change to the house as you look at it from the street.

Driscoll reviewed the list of changes: the windows are double hung, 6 over 6; the Chair asked about the new window location. Driscoll stated there are two locations where the windows will change and referred to page 8, which is a view from Atkinson Street. He stated there are two windows on the right that are separated and they will put them together and move them toward the center to match the double windows on the other side. They want to match the older portion of the house and accommodate a new kitchen design on the interior. It will be the exact same window as on the left. The windows will be Anderson 400 series, clad windows with simulated divided light.

The second location is from the driveway side and Driscoll referred to the window toward the front of the house. Once again for the kitchen layout, they propose two windows which will be centered off the window above; these two windows will be separate and are located next to the driveway.

The Chair went through the list of changes on the application and asked to talk about the roof line. Pat Driscoll stated that Colin Haupt has made a great effort to keep the historical aspects in restoring the house. The windows currently are 1970 or 80 Brosco windows so are of no historic value. The front door however is historic and they will keep that door. The façade of the house has rot and they will use cedar siding and the window trim will match what is currently there.

They are also keeping the majority of the rooflines. Driscoll stated Proposal A is from George Melcher, an architect and structural engineer who has experience with HDCs. Melcher was trying to create something that didn't change the look of the house but would attain some height at the top of the stairs. 6'8" height is still not code compliant but it brings it closer and provides the ability that one can stand at the top of the stairs. Once they saw how much of a change Proposal A was to the aesthetics of the house, they went back and developed Proposal B. The difference between the existing roofline and the proposed roofline on Proposal B is about 18" and it comes to the top of the fascia, so it's a natural place for the roof to flatten off. Haupt wanted to avoid a flat roof but there was no conceivable way to accomplish it.

In existing pictures of the house, there looks to be a dollop on the flat section, which is a skylight that is about 18" above the flat roof. From the exterior it is not very attractive but it is the only place that brings natural light into the stairwell and they are trying to put the skylight in the least obvious spot on the roof structure. In Proposal B's east elevation, the square to the left of the peak is where a new skylight will go which will allow light over the staircase and bring natural light into the great room. It looks flat as the drawings are not three dimensional but it is actually on a slant and faces Atkinson Street. Haupt offered to email photos to the Chair to better show the roof.

Murray commented that a lot of it is in kind which makes it easier, however she wondered if it warranted a site walk for the roofline element. The Chair stated it depended on what the pictures being emailed reveal as it is important to know what the roofline and skylight look like under Proposal B. Judy Groppa thinks the rooflines are incredibly awkward and stated it would be nice if whatever is done to the roofline would improve the look of the house. The Chair stated that he sees a vast improvement between Proposal A and Proposal B, Proposal B being much better.

Driscoll said they have limited the flat roof portion and have reduced the flat roof which is currently there. Groppa did not like the flat roof and thought the roof should be brought to a peak. Driscoll stated they had the same thought as Proposal A started with a peak. Groppa pointed out that Proposal A is a hip roof and Driscoll said it was the only way to bring the roof to a peak as they couldn't bring in a self-supporting peak because it would bring water into the roof's valley in the middle of the house. Members did not like the hip roof on Proposal A.

Rowland shared current pictures of the house with the angled roof which he received from Haupt. Proposal A's option to get rid of the flat roof was to bring it up to a peak. Proposal B is to raise the flat roof 18" and bring it to the ridge line with a skylight. The Chair stated that given what is there, it certainly is not any worse, adding that they are raising the flat roof but the skylight is pretty prominent and it's a tough location. Driscoll stated that there is currently a skylight on the flat portion and when you have a skylight on a flat roof, you have leakage. By putting it on an angled roof, you eliminate the leakage. The roofs on the left and the right are currently the same height, so raising the left will bring it 18" higher than the right side. Driscoll stated that what you don't notice is how prominent the raised skylight is. The Chair stated that raising the roof would be helpful if the skylight was going to stay where it is but now you are bringing it down and it will be very visible.

Driscoll asked Melcher about the feasibility of putting the skylight back on the flat portion of the roof. Melcher stated the challenge is that no matter how it is constructed, it will be curved. If you were across the street, and raised the roof 18", you would still see some of the curving of the skylight. It will not be as prominent of a mass as what is currently there, it will be more subtle as the curve on a modern skylight will be less prominent than the current skylight. The location of the skylight will shift and whether on a flat or pitched roof, the skylight will be closer to the center of the house and not out on the edge as it currently is. The Chair asked whether the applicant could get a skylight that mimics the window detail with a grill detail of 6 over 6 on it. Groppa agreed as it would be in keeping with the other windows. Tom Maher stated it's not a big or tall house so the skylight is going to be quite visible, he agreed however, that it is the simplest way of solving the natural light issue. The Chair said what bothers him is the eye is drawn to the flat roof and skylight, although it is a step in the

right direction to make this detail higher as that will bring it out of the line of sight more. The skylight will be less visible than it is now, which would be a compromise and betterment of the district. Maher stated this house is a challenge and the application is moving in the right direction to improve it. Haupt asked Pat Driscoll if it was possible to raise the roof 18" and put another flat low profile skylight on top of the flat part of the roof. Driscoll had asked Melcher that same question and they had a preliminary discussion; it is possible and we are trying to accomplish that.

Kate Murray asked if the board could approve elements of the application and take a site walk to look at the house, the roofline and the skylight prior to next month's hearing. The Chair stated he was going to suggest the same thing and asked the applicant what his timing was. Irene Bush agreed that the skylight being less intrusive on the flat part of the roof makes sense and Murray wants a sense of how high the roofline would be compared to the other side and asked the applicant about providing a rendering of how it might look. The Chair asked Melcher, the architect, if he could provide some drawings adding it would be helpful to see the skylight from the post office perspective. Melcher stated that would be possible. The Chair confirmed with members that they prefer Option B to bring the flat roof up, so the question comes to the skylight, where it will go and how prominent it will be. The Chair asked if it was feasible to give Haupt the approval on the windows, including the new location of windows, and replacing the siding in kind, and asked if that would enough for Haupt to get started and at next month's meeting make a decision on the roofline and skylight. Haupt stated that yes as he was waiting to put an order in for the Anderson double hung windows so if he could get approval on the windows, he could wait on the roof and skylight details until the April meeting.

The Chair asked if the roof is to be replaced with a cedar roof, as he believes the roof has a percentage wood and a percentage is asphalt. Rowland stated the house had a prior approval to go from wood to asphalt adding that if the applicant were to go to asphalt, he already has the approval. Haupt stated he would like to stay with traditional wood shingles and add copper gutters on the Atkinson Street and north side of the house. He stated the gutters don't show in the details on the application and he would need to talk to Bookholz on a storm water management plan. Haupt stated that if the board is tabling the roofline, they can also table the gutters but he would like their opinion on copper gutters. The Chair stated he loves copper gutters as they are nicer than white aluminum. Groppa and Murray agreed that copper gutters were better.

The Chair opened the hearing to the public but there was no one to speak to, for or against and the public hearing was closed at 8:45 pm.

Murray moved to approve the application for new double hung windows, new window location on the Atkinson Street side and the driveway side, replace the siding in kind, and to replace the roof material with cedar shingles; Irene Bush

seconded. Roll call: Jeff Hughes voted Aye; Irene Bush voted Aye; Tom Maher voted Aye; Kate Murray voted Aye and the Chair voted Aye.

The Chair stated the board will hold off on the gutters, the roofline and the skylight which will be on the agenda for next month.

5. Approve minutes from February 4, 2021

Jeff Hughes moved to approve the minutes of February 4, 2021 as amended. Kate Murray seconded: Roll call: Jeff Hughes voted Aye; Irene Bush voted Aye, Tom Maher voted aye, Kate Murray voted aye, and the Chair voted aye.

6. No new business.

Irene Bush stated that raising the roof on Haupt's house is going to make the viewscape different from both Main Street and Atkinson Street. The Chair asked board members if they wished to have a formal HDC site walk or just walk by on their own. The members cannot discuss the application at a site walk. It is a quirky house with a lot of changes and it will always be quirky but the Chair believes Haupt is moving in the right direction. Hughes stated it is such a prominent feature in town and Groppa believes the original house was one room wide, set back from the street and then they added a wing and the back and exploded the front. She stated that when you look in the window there is some very nice wide plank flooring and an original fireplace; the house has only one chimney. The Chair stated he spent a lot of time in the house and appreciates the dilemma in the upstairs hallway because you really can't stand up.

Kate Murray motioned to adjourn; Jeff Hughes seconded. All voted Aye including the Chair.

Adjourned 9:01 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Diane L. Cooley, Recording Secretary