

**APPROVED
AUGUST 5, 2021
HDC MEETING**

Members Chair Rodney Rowland, Tom Maher, Kate Murray, Elaine Nollet,
Present: Judy Groppa and Ruth Zikaras.

Absent: Vice Chair Irene Bush

The meeting was held in the Macomber Room. Chair Rowland called the meeting of the New Castle Historic District Commission to order at 7:00 pm. Rowland stated there were four hearings on the agenda and advised that the applications had been published, fees paid and abutters notified. The Chair, Maher, Murray, Nollet and Groppa will be voting.

1. Public Hearing for Weston Family Trust, 158 Portsmouth Avenue, Map 15, Lot 9 for new siding, new windows, new additions, garage demolition and new garage.

Guests: Arilda Densch, Designer and Mr. Weston, Owner

Ms. Densch began by going through the application sheet by sheet, starting with the description of work to be done and the list of materials. The applicant is removing the existing two car garage and building a new one, bringing it out of the setback and closer to the home, with a connector to the house. The original house will have new windows, siding, trim and shutters. Entry doors will be repaired as they are unique and the storm doors will be replaced or repaired to match the existing doors. Two rear one story additions will be removed and a new addition constructed, some of which is two story but the majority is one story with a connector to the new garage. The gutter system will be replaced and extended, it will be aluminum and a different style and lastly, there will be new roofing.

As to the materials for this project, the siding on the front and left side of the house has clapboards and a more upscale trim package and the right side and rear is less fancy with no trim at the windows. This design will be kept as is, with cedar clapboards, and shingles which will be either cedar or a composite such as painted hardy shingles, all to match the existing siding. The trim will be Azek or a composite trim, both of which cut clean and when painted, you cannot tell the difference from wood.

The doors and windows will be Marvin ultimate aluminum clad, traditional windows with standard muntins, simulated divided light. Other windows in the connector from the garage will be Marvin Ultrex windows. Storm doors will be repaired or replaced with wood to match the existing doors and the transoms will be repaired with wood to match the existing also. The connector will have wood Simpson doors, $\frac{3}{4}$ glass on top and panels below, which will repeat and match the storm door on the left side of the house. The bracket upholding the little roof on

the door on the connector will be painted wood; the garage doors will be steel insulated with a composite overlay, which suggests wood, and painted white. The garage utility doors on the back and side are Simpson wood doors in a barn style. The railing on the 2nd floor deck elements is Intex brand Hampton composite style, top and bottom rail, with simple PVC posts with caps which will be brush painted white. The gutters will be ½" round and downspouts, which are more traditional style than square which are what is there now.

The roof will have architectural grade asphalt shingles with aluminum flashing. The steps at all entries will be granite as two entries now have granite, however, the steps in the rear on the connector will be a composite deck and railing.

Sheet #1 has a key on the right showing which structures are being removed and the new additions. The square hatch are the new additions and the diagonal are the structures which will remain. The new garage will be moved over and the two small additions on the back are being removed. The house is U shaped, but from the road it looks square. The two story house will become a big square with two stories to fill the "U" and a one story addition in the rear. The house is set way back from the river and has a steep embankment. The connector will be 300' from the high water mark and will be difficult to see from the river. Propane tanks and a condenser on the East side will be screened by evergreen shrubs and the generator pad which is behind the garage, will be screened from public view. The driveway is 38.5' long and the new garage will be set back 5' from that and the connector will be back an additional two feet.

The house is currently two small apartments and it will be brought back to a single family home. The existing photos of the house show that the front and left side are similar and they will remain the same, as everything will be replaced to match the existing materials. The rear one story additions will be removed. The storm door has ¾ glass above and raised panel below and this will be imitated on the rest of the house. There are narrower windows on the back and right side of the house and the front and left side have wider, grander windows with shutters. The shed will remain.

The next sheet shows some details such as the door trim which is unique and will be remade out of composite materials. There is band molding on the front windows and the front also has shutters. The heavy sill on all of the windows will be replaced, custom cut out of composite materials. The fascia trim with heavy bed molding under the soffit will be reused or replaced to match and the weathervane will also be reused.

The front elevation is shown and the face of the garage is 43' back from the front of the house and the connector is 45' back. The connector and garage are secondary structures and will therefore have less heavy trim on the eaves and simpler window trim. The front door behind the storm door is a beautiful wood door that will be rebuilt.

After the feedback received from the Commission at the work session in July, Densch removed the sidelight from door #4, and now has a single door, and also the roof over the side door was made smaller. The roof is for safety and to draw attention to this door for people to enter the house. The garage is carriage house style with transoms above the doors and a hip roof to complement the house.

Sheet 7 shows the left side view with the garage in the foreground; the additions on the back where window F is shown are a couple feet back from the face of the existing house, and the deck rail is another 4' back from there or 5 ½' back from the corner of the house, so it is more pushed back than it looks on the drawings. The style of the deck rail is one the owners prefer to keep, as simpler railings looked too modern. Sheet 8 shows the rear elevation and you can see clearly how the deck on the back is set back with a sloped roof leading to a parapet; the railing is actually only 2' high. The back has narrower windows and simpler trim and will be sided with shingles. The Simpson door is ¾ glass with a raised panel below which is imitated in the sliding French doors. The simpler trim on the garage was again pointed out. There are skylights which are not visible.

The house has hip roofs all around and Densch is trying to keep the rhythm of elements of windows and make it look harmonious. The rear addition is just one story. Densch pointed out that window G is in the kitchen and set way back from the face and does not have muntins. The only entry steps that are not granite go to the connector and are hidden from the road.

Sheet 10 shows the house from above as a square shape with a hip roof all around and low pitch in the middle. Sheet 11 provides the window and door schedules with all sizes and particulars about muntins, as well as windows that are egress that are double hung casements with divided light patterns. Sheet 12 shows a profile of the roof over the entry on the connector which has simple detail and a simple bracket. This also shows the 2nd floor deck rail detail and parapet wall. The parapet is 1' high and the rail is 2' and will be a composite material reinforced with steel so there will be no sagging. The next two sheets show materials such as the muntin detail on the doors which will match the Marvin muntin detail, French doors with a raised panel below and glass above, the Marvin windows and garage doors. There is a closer view of the Intex deck railing system and also the skylights, which are weather tight and low profile.

Elaine Nollet stated the plans are quite impressive. Murray asked if the owners had looked at the existing walls and whether they are anticipating any rot. Mr. Weston stated they had someone inspect when they first purchased the house and he was advised it was in good shape; there may be a little sill issue on the base of the granite foundation, but that will be addressed during construction. The attic is in good shape and dry. Weston said the back side where the kitchens are may have moisture leakage on the back wall but that wall is coming out so it's irrelevant.

Murray asked Densch what is a water table board. A water table board is a flat board, which is flush with the corner boards. On this house it is 6" in height across the bottom and above the grade, and provides protection for splash back from rain and snow buildup. Murray then stated she is not going to have a problem with the deck in the back and Chair Rowland agreed now that he has seen the plans. Maher commented that given the topography, most people driving by won't see the deck and your eye won't go to it.

The Chair asked Densch if she was calling for new chimneys and she advised that there are three chimneys and all are staying. Rowland asked about the foundation for the addition as the plan notes it is going to be concrete and he wanted to know how much is going to be revealed. Densch advised that around the garage it will be a little over one foot and the connector will have a little more concrete revealed but it will have shrubbery to conceal it. The Chair also asked about the clapboard reveal as the plans call for 4" uniform and he asked if they could do a graduated pattern. Densch stated whoever did the last clapboard did not have graduated but Rowland suggested they use a graduated clapboard. The Chair then confirmed that the window openings are not changing, and also expressed concern for the Evergreen screening for the condensers and propane tanks. Evergreens can die and he prefers some sort of fencing but Maher said he doesn't have a problem with the Evergreens, adding that if they die, the owners can contemplate what to do. Densch stated there is a large hedge along the neighbor's driveway which is deciduous and provides additional screening.

Judy Groppa stated she is not familiar with the river view but was concerned that there is this lovely symmetrical house until you get to the back. Groppa stated everyone tends to not keep things symmetrical and wondered if in winter the house could be seen from the river. Densch stated it's a long way to the river and quite a high embankment, adding that the house is a mess in the back now as it is quite a hodge podge. Tom Maher stated that if you're on a boat you are looking up 40' from the river and up a gradual incline, adding that the design is an improvement and much more organized. Densch said she thinks the house is balanced though not symmetrical.

Kate Murray stated she was very relieved the house is getting this treatment and reverting back to a single family. Rowland asked if they were using Boral composite for the trim and Densch confirmed as it cuts nicely, adding that Azek shrinks and Boral does not.

The Chair opened the hearing to the public at 7:35 p.m. but no one spoke to, for or against and the public hearing was closed.

Murray stated that she could not think of any conditions and this looked like a straight up approval to which Tom Maher concurred.

Murray moved to approve the application from the Weston Family Trust, 158 Portsmouth Avenue, Map 15, Lot 9 for new siding, new windows, new additions, garage demolition and new garage as submitted, referencing the plans dated August 5, 2021. Maher seconded. All in favor, including the Chair.

2. Public Hearing for Jacqueline Heard and Michael Burns, 5 Atkinson Street, Map 18, Lot 7 for change to original approval, widen of front steps.

Guest: Michael Burns

Burns stated the house is extremely hot in the back yard where it faces West, but in the front on the East side of the house, the sunrise is quite beautiful and the wind comes off the river and cools things off nicely. The family would like to expand the space on the front of the house to enjoy it more by increasing the width of the front steps entering the house from 48" and extend them to the bay window which will be about 88-89" wide, and have the steps come all the way down to be as wide as the porch, which will provide some sitting room on the steps. All the same natural materials as proposed at the April meeting will be used.

Murray asked if they were just requesting an additional 40" of stairs which Burns confirmed. Taking away the railing on the porch makes the landing wider. A variance is required which has been applied for and the hearing is in two weeks; it is a pre-existing non-conforming setback. Murray commented that it looks nicer. It increases the space because the railing is removed and they can sit on the stairs.

Burns reminded the Commission that it questioned whether there were ever shake shingles on the house and Burns advised that he found shake shingles when removing the beadboard on the front porch. He also had a picture of the house from 1947 and the steps went further out.

Burns has also removed roof shingles and has been getting estimates for the roof and was advised by the Building Inspector that the HDC would be opposed to metal roofing. The Chair advised Burns that they could not vote for metal on a low roof because it is extremely visible, adding that copper roofs may be seen on a Victorian house in the historic district, but Atkinson Street has some of the earliest houses in the district and that asphalt would be fine. Burns stated there is some metal roofing in the historic district and Rowland stated it may have been put on before the HDC existed. Burns said he would go back to asphalt as the pre-dipped, fire retardant shingles, are not available until 2022 and they have four low roofs which the HDC approved for shake shingles, but they will replace with asphalt. Burns asked about putting metal on the back shed which covers the oil tank and has a low roof, which is at eye level. The Shed is located in the back by a neighbor's house that has a metal roof. The Chair advised Burns to first provide a rendering which he can circulate to board members.

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 7:46 pm.

Elaine Nollet moved to approve the plans for Jacqueline Heard and Michael Burns, 5 Atkinson Street, Map 18, Lot 7 for a change to the original approval to widen the front steps; Murray seconded. All in favor including the Chair.

3. Public Hearing for Brandon and Alyson Tanguay, 15 Main Street, Map 13, Lot 6 (sub-lot 3) for window replacement, new dormers.

Guest: Alyson Tanguay

Ms. Tanguay stated that she and her husband, Brandon have lived next to the Bakers but that their house was constructed in 1996-1997 to look like it was built in 1797 so it looks old but functions differently. The house is just within the bounds of the historic district and although the house looks like it fits in, it has lots of idiosyncrasies. Tanguay stated they came before the HDC to replace the paladian window when they bought the house, and replaced the paladian window with three 2 over 1 double hung windows. The windows are only 20 years old but are wood and have rot and water infiltration through the window unit onto the sill. The Tanguays are moving to replace all the windows but their first priority are the windows on the front of the house. When the Tanguays moved into the house, the window configuration was 6 over 6 and she showed the configuration of windows with snap in grids which were secured with very sharp clips. Tanguay stated they removed the bottom sash grills for their children's safety, and some of the top grills have fallen out of the windows, so essentially the windows are currently one over one. The Tanguays would like to install 2 over 1 casement windows which were approved for the original replacement casement windows and are tighter and energy efficient. They have a thickened meeting rail across the center of the window and have historically accurate simulated divided light grid in the glass.

Tanguay would also like to install dormers on the 3rd floor of the house. There are currently no dormers on the house on the Main Street side, however the neighbors, the Haberstrohs, have dormers and their house was built in 1995-1996. The Tanguay attic is finished and the applicants work out of their 3rd floor space. The 3rd floor needs more light and dormers on the Main Street side would take advantage of the morning light and the view to the water. Currently there is a hip roof on the back of the house with a larger dormer that faces the back yard. Tanguay proposed a hip roof with an exterior wall that does not extend to the exterior face of the house, so the front face of the dormers will be pulled back to minimize them and will have 2 over 1 windows. (Page A 2.1 says "Existing Exterior Elevation" but it should say proposed.)

Tanguay went through historical society photos to look at window dormers. The building that used to stand where the post office is, which was a school, and also the house 4 doors down from the Tanguay house, have a two window hip roof dormer. Tanguay would have a dormer with double windows, a hip roof and a sill height higher than those on the 2nd floor of the house. The exterior face of the dormer would sit back from the exterior face of the house.

Tanguay stated the roof will be redone at the same time as the dormers and they propose installing just one row of solar panels on the back side that faces the Bakers' house. Tanguay showed the commission where the solar panels would be on pictures of the house; the panels would be seen from the road but not very visible. The commission stated the Bakers had solar panels approved because they are in the back of their house, however Tanguay advised that the Baker panels will face the Tanguay house, addressing the green space between the two houses. Maher stated it makes sense because they want maximum exposure to the sun and the real estate does not face true south so instead the Bakers are going southeast. Maher commented that the Bakers roof that will have panels will be on the addition and will be higher than the Tanguay roof. Tanguay argued that the Baker panels are more visible because they are higher however, Maher thought neither would be very visible from the street. Maher asked Tanguay why they are installing just one row of solar panels and Tanguay advised it is Revision's design. Chair Rowland stated the HDC wants uniformity on the roof and this would not be, as there would be shiny material on part of the roof and it's also visible from the public way. Maher pointed out the space between the homes and there is less than what one would think but it would not be uniform and not keeping in what the HDC has approved. The benefit of the other side of the roof is that it is not visible to anyone driving by, but the one strip, while not really visible, creates a new issue with what the Board has focused on, which is uniformity and consistency in appearance. Tanguay stated the panels are matte black but don't look like roofing. The Chair stated it's not that it's visible from the street but that it is not uniform. The Schwabs wanted panels on their garage and were denied the application because the panels were too low and you could easily see them. This would break the rule with non-uniform coverage; it would almost be better to request to cover the entire roof. The one strip is not uniform no matter how hard you try. Even if the panels are matte, it will look different. The commission has been striving to be consistent that if solar panels are allowed, they must have a uniform appearance. There are dormers and all sorts of challenges on older houses but that's what the commission agreed to when it accepted solar in the historic district.

Tanguay was surprised to hear this feedback as the Bakers have skylights and their roof is not uniform. The Chair has an email from Todd Baker who says the panels are not visible from the street, so the issue of uniformity didn't matter because the commission thought it was not visible. Tanguay's panels are visible from the street so uniformity does matter. Tanguay showed a google view of their house which sits below street level adding that their condition is different from

the Bakers because their house sits lower and is more screened from Main Street. The Chair suggested the Commission do a walk by and check on the Bakers' house also. Rowland also advised that there are new guidelines put out by the fire department and Building Inspector on solar panels and that is, that solar panels have to be offset 18" from the edge of the roof. These guidelines shut down the Smyser project. The Building Inspector and fire chief suggested the solar panels are hazardous to firefighters. Maher stated he debated the fire chief advising when firemen go on a roof, they can break the panels with an axe, but the code is now that the panels have to be set back 18" to give firefighters room on a roof. There are now non-conforming solar projects because the panels go right up to the edge of the roofline. Maher agreed that Commission members need to walk the Tanguay site as he is not convinced it's exceptionally visible from Main Street and will detract from the neighborhood. The Commission may also have to assess what Todd Baker is doing.

The Chair stated the Commission could vote on the windows and dormers and opened the hearing to the public but there was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed at 8:13 pm.

Murray asked if someone could speak to why thick muntins are used as opposed to thin muntins. The Chair stated the intent is to match the current windows and Tanguay stated the windows are double hungs, and pointed out the window details with a thick "meeting rail" where the two sashes meet; it's an applied piece. The meeting rail is thick while the vertical muntin is thinner. Tanguay was asked whether she was requesting 2 over 2 windows instead of 2 over 1, which is what is on the back of the house. She advised "Choice is tyranny for me which is bad as a designer" adding that she put 2 over 1 windows in the application because it's more consistent with the side and back of the house. Ruth Zikaras asked whether the trim on top of the windows was staying the same and whether the trim on the side of the windows is flat and Tanguay confirmed it is on both counts.

Tanguay stated she would prefer 2 over 1 windows for consistency; Elaine Nollet stated she likes the 2 over 2 windows shown on the dormers. Murray likes 2 over 2 but also likes the consistency. The Chair asked Tanguay if she was showing 2 over 2 windows to show a different era and stated he also likes that the dormer windows are considerably smaller. Murray thought the dormers seem wide but that is because they contain two windows and the Chair added that he likes that they are offset with some wood detail. Groppa thinks they look heavy but Tanguay stated that is because the plan is flat and elevations are tricky and you do not see what recedes. The windows do sit back from the exterior wall, so it's an optical illusion. There is currently a dormer on the back for some light and a window in what is now an office but it is not an egress window.

Murray motioned to accept the application for Tanguay for window replacement and new dormers as described in plans dated 7-12-2021 for 2 over 1 replacement

windows and 2 over 2 for the dormer windows, per cut sheet A2.1; Maher seconded. All in favor including the Chair. The issue of solar panels will be stayed until next month's meeting.

4. Public Hearing for Daryl Mojdehi, 27 Riverview Road, Map 16, Lot 12 for new 10 x 16' shed

Guests: Daryl Mojdehi and Lisa Mojdehi

Mojdehi's application included a list of all residents offering support and he stated that most of them also went to the zoning board meeting. The shed is built by Reeds Ferry in Hudson NH, a very reputable company. The shed sits in the back of the property and the applicant met with the ZBA because of space challenges as it is an odd shaped, but large lot. Mojdehi stated they have kept many things that are important to the land including a silver maple, and have put a driveway on the other side of the lot. The original driveway sits between 27 and 33 Riverview Rd. The driveway to 27 Riverview Rd has large evergreens and because of the shape of the lot, the Mojdehis want to set the utility shed in a place accessible but not imposing on the home. The shape of the shed mimics the house and is the same color as the house, so it's a mini of the house. The shed will sit on 6" deep crushed stone, there will be no pouring of concrete. There is accessibility by the driveway without going over the septic. Mojdehi had concerns about encroaching on 33 Riverview Rd, which the Mojdehis own and is where they actually reside. They wanted to make sure the roof and windows match and the vinyl siding is the same color as the house. The driveway that sits on the right belongs to 27 Riverview Road and separates the two homes. They need a small space for storage to maintain the property at 27 Riverview Rd as there is no garage or storage and they want it to look like a natural extension of the home. The picture of the shed is virtually the same as the house and is in back so it is not very visible. The picture with the stakes shows where the shed will be placed and is quite far from the street.

As the applicant had mentioned the septic, Murray asked whether the shed would be hooked up to septic, but it was confirmed they would not be hooking up to septic as it is not a "she" shed. The applicant just noted the septic location as there was a concern with the ZBA as the septic needs to be serviced.

Landscaping will be done around the shed once it is in place. It is a non-permanent shed, on gravel with concrete blocks in the corners. It is a large lot, over 1/4 acre and the shed will be situated way back.

Mojdehi showed a sample of asphalt shingles and of the siding. The Chair asked the Board if there were any questions. There was no one else present so the Chair did not open the hearing to the public.

Elain Nollet moved to approve the project of Mojdehi for a new shed; Maher seconded. All in favor, including the Chair.

5. Approve minutes from July 1, 2021

Murray motioned to approve the minutes of July 1, 2021; Maher seconded. All approved including the Chair.

Motion to adjourn at 8:46 pm. All approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Diane L. Cooley, Recording Secretary