

**ACTION SHEET
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**March 5, 2014
to be reconvened on March 12, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak; Richard Katz, John Wyckoff, George Melchior; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternates Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. July 10, 2013
- B. July 17, 2013
- C. August 14, 2013

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the three sets of minutes as presented.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

There were no administrative approvals to report to the Commission.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

*The Board's action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

1. Petition of **Christopher Brodeur and Kristen B. Ward, owners**, for property located at **51 Manning Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing fencing) and allow a new free standing structure (install new fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 58 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes and objectives of the Historic District ordinance and the Review Criteria.

2. Petition of **Alan and Pamela Gordon, owners**, for property located at **215 Washington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing storm windows, replace with new storm windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 80 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes and objectives of the Historic District ordinance and the Review Criteria.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

*The Board's action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

A. Petition of **Brian M. Regan and Susan M. Regan, owners**, for property located at **28-30 Dearborn Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing concrete wall) and to build a new structure (construct new wood wall) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 140 as Lot 1 and lies within General Residence A and Historic District. *(This item was postponed at the February 12, 2014 meeting to the March 5, 2014 meeting.)*

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to **postpone** the application to the April 2, 2014 meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

*The Board's action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

3. Petition of **7 Islington Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a second extension of the Certificate of Approval granted on March 7, 2012, as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **denied** as presented for the following reasons:

- 1) Timely construction of the building has not commenced;
- 2) A change in ownership or project management does not justify the delay;
- 3) The applicant did not give just cause for the delay or why a building permit was not requested in a timely fashion;
- 4) Many zoning changes that would effect this project have occurred since the original approval;
- 5) Many changes to the membership of the Historic District Commission have occurred since the original approval.

4. Petition of **Martingale Wharf Limited Partnership, owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct trash enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within Central Business A, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the height of the screening does not exceed the height of the existing fence located directly behind it.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
- Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
- Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
- ✓ Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
- Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
- Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
- Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
- ✓ Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
- Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

5. Petition of **Portwalk HI, LLC, owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (changes to all facades) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1-2 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to postpone the application to a work session/public hearing at the April 2, 2014 meeting.

6. Petition of **Zoe Copenhaver Daboul and Michael Edward Daboul, owners**, for property located at **53 Humphreys Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish garage) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct addition and garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 39 and lies within General Residence B and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the proposed screen door shall be wood.
- 2) That 1" x 5" casings will be used on the new windows.
- 3) That 1" x 8" (or less) trim will be added on the left side of the front door.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
- Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
- Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
- ✓ Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
- Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
- Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- ✓ Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
- ✓ Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures

- ✓ Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
- Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

7. Petition of **36 Market Street Condominium Association, owner,** and **Rob Sevigny, applicant,** for property located at **36 Market Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing Ladd Street door with recessed door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 29 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
- Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
- Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
- Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
- Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
- Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- ✓ Yes No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
- ✓ Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
- Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
- Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

8. Petition of **St. John’s Church, owner,** for property located at **100 Chapel Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted (5-2) to **deny** the request for the following reason:

- 1) The windows were deemed to be original and the majority of the Commission felt they were worthy of restoration.

- 2) The applicant was encouraged to re-submit a new application that included a restoration component.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application meets the following purposes of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

A. Purpose and Intent:

- Yes No - Preserve the integrity of the District
 Yes No - Maintain the special character of the District
 Yes No - Assessment of the Historical Significance
 Yes No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character
 Yes No - Conservation and enhancement of property values
 Yes No - Promote the education, pleasure & welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District ordinance (as applicable):

B. Review Criteria:

- Yes ✓ No - Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
 Yes No - Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
 Yes No - Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
 Yes No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Bradley Boisvert and Karen Bannon Boisvert, owners**, for property located at **124 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add elevator at rear of building, construct stair access, construct walkout decks and add doors at 2nd and 4th levels, construct dormer, add skylights, and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 55 and lies within Central Business B and Historic Districts.

The Commission voted that the request be **postponed** to the March 12, 2014 meeting.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Design Review Toolkit: 3D massing model project update

Due to the lateness of the hour, the above item will be discussed at a future meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

At 12:00 a.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary