

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**April 2, 2014
to be reconvened on April 9 & 16, 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

1. October 2, 2013
2. October 9, 2013

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

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- A. 55 Congress Street - antennas
- B. 1 Harbour Place - antennas
- C. 36 Market Street – mechanical equipment

Mr. Cracknell updated the Commission on the three administrative approvals.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

4. Petition of **Brian M. Regan and Susan M. Regan, owners**, for property located at **28-30 Dearborn Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing concrete wall) and allow a new free standing 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 March 5, 2014 meeting to the April 2, 2014 meeting.*)

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

- 1) That the fieldstone used for the wall will look similar to what was presented in the revised site plan (dated 4/2/14) and submitted at the meeting.
- 2) That the HDC will send notice to the City Council of their approval of the proposed granite steps that will be on City property and will require a license.

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. (Work Session/Public Hearing) 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. *(This item was postponed at the March 5, 2014 meeting to the April 2, 2014 meeting.)*

The Commission voted to continue review of the application at the April 9, 2014 meeting.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **AHI Holdings, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install 9 condensing units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan

127 as Lot 1 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented. It was determined that the application met all of the purposes and objectives of the Historic District ordinance and the Review Criteria.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

2. Petition of **Cyrus Lawrence Gardner Beer and Erica Caron Beer, owners**, for property located at **64 Mt. Vernon Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct awning over side door, add copper gutter and downspout) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 30 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 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

3. Petition of **Community Investment Properties, LLC, owner**, for property located at **86 South School Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (remove second floor window, reconfigure existing second floor window) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 63 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 stipulation:

- 1) That the awning window on the second floor of the rear façade is replaced with a 2/2 wooden, double hung, true divided light window with a similar width to match the existing windows. The height shall be 6” off of the shed roof and the casings shall be similar on the outside as the existing windows.

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

4. Petition of **Briggs Realty Association of Delaware, LLC, owner**, for property located at **363 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove siding, replace windows, reconfigure misc. windows) and allow demolition and reconstruction of an existing structure (remove and replace chimney) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 3 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That half screens shall be used.
- 2) That the 3/3 window on the shed dormer shall be as shown on the rendering.
- 3) That window #5 will be modified to be a 3/3 window.
- 4) That the shutters on the rear windows shall not be used on the back of the house.

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 **Clayton M. Emery and Susan L. Therriault, owners**, for property located at **114 Mechanic Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install rear window, construct awning) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 24 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 new window will be replaced with a 6/6 true divided light all wood Brosco window as presented.
- 2) That a trim board will be added to the awnings and the awnings shall be shingled with cedar shakes 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

6. Petition of **Strawbery Banke, Inc. owner**, for property located at **65 Washington Street (Thales Yeaton House)**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (renovate Thales Yeaton House) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 7 and lies within Mixed Residential Office 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 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 **6-16 Congress Street Condominium Association, owner,** and **Janette Desmond, applicant,** for property located at **20 Congress Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install spot lighting on signage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 37 and lies within Central Business B, 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 option without conduit shall be used.

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. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **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 (construct 4th floor rear dormer and walk out deck, replace misc. windows with doors, install spiral staircase and railings, add skylights to roof ridge, replace second floor windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 56 and lies within Central Business 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 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

9. Petition of **7 Islington, LLC, owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove existing two story wood-framed building, construct 3-4 story mixed use building) 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 to **deny** the request as presented for the following reasons:

Findings of Fact: Due to the proposed scale and design of the building presented, the proposed application does not meet 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 does not meet 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. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:35 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
HDC Recording Secretary