

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**July 9, 2014
to be reconvened on July 16, 2014**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman Tracy Kozak; John Wyckoff, George Melchior, Dan Rawling; Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Alternate Reagan Ruedig

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Esther Kennedy

ALSO PRESENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. May 21, 2014
2. June 4, 2014
3. June 11, 2014
4. June 18, 2014

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the May 21, 2014, June 4, 2014, and the June 11, 2014 minutes as presented.

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the June 18, 2014 minutes as amended.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Request for Re-hearing of the Certificate of Approval for 195 Hanover Street – submitted by the City of Portsmouth

The item upon which the rehearing request has been filed was conditionally approved and final action by the Historic District Commission is still pending. Thus, this request is premature pending such action. Note: The 30-day period to file a Request For Rehearing will commence when the Historic District Commission has taken final action on this item.

- B. Request for Re-hearing of the Certificate of Approval for 195 Hanover Street – submitted by Joe Caldarola, et al

The item upon which the rehearing request has been filed was conditionally approved and final action by the Historic District Commission is still pending. Thus, this request is premature

pending such action. Note: The 30-day period to file a Request For Rehearing will commence when the Historic District Commission has taken final action on this item.

(These items were postponed at the June 18, 2014 meeting to the July 9, 2014 meeting.)

C. Petition of **Frank and Irja Cilluffo, owners**, for property located at **179 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow demolition of existing structure (remove widows walk) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 108 as Lot 1 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the June 4, 2014 meeting to the July 9, 2014 meeting.)*

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to **postpone** the application to the August 6, 2014 meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Treadwell House, Inc., owner**, for property located at **70 Court Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing storm windows, add storm windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 49 and lies within the CD4-L and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That the color of the storm windows shall have a baked brown or black finish.

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

2. Petition of **Danny Parker, LLC, owner,** and **John Bosen, applicant,** for property located at **266 Middle Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install two condensing units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 9 and lies within the 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 and objectives of the Historic District ordinance and the Review Criteria.

3. Petition of **Roxy James Realty, LLC, owner,** for property located at **110 Chapel Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct trash enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 3 and lies within the CD4, 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 and objectives of the Historic District ordinance and the Review Criteria.

4. Petition of **Charles J. Doane and Claire OBrien, owners,** for property located **283 Pleasant Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install generator) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 27 and lies within the 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.

5. Petition of **Carol J. Elliott Revocable Trust of 2011, owner,** for property located at **143 Gates Street** and **Jane A. Nelson, owner,** for property located at **135 Gates Street,** wherein permission is requested to allow exterior work on existing structures (repairs to the roof area where the two houses meet) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 115 as Lots 98 and 99 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to **postpone** the application to the August 6, 2014 meeting.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

6. Petition of **Warner House Association, owner**, for property located at **150 Daniel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 58 and lies within Civic, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

- 1) That an edge band be a solid material that is visible from the face of the sign.

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 **82-86 Congress Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **25 Chestnut Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (remove/replace windows, infill brick, add mosaic cladding to west elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 45 and lies within the CD5, 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. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Robert D. and Carlotta M. Holster, owners**, for property located at **46 Livermore Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (add two story rear addition, elevator, add screen porch to rear wing of building, add new windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 109 as Lot 21 and lies within the 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

9. Petition of **30 Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (changes to the parapet and eave finish material, add exterior lights, egress, door, and vents in place of shuttered windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

- 1) That three light fixtures are added beside the upper doors along the Maplewood Avenue and Hanover Street facades 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

10. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Joan S. Davis and Charles P. Allard, II, owners**, and **Elizabeth Levey-Pruyn and Bruce Erickson, applicants**, for property located at **35 Salter Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove exterior stairs) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new side entry and porch, install dormer, construct decks, replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 29 and lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That the metal roof shall be zinc.

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

11. Petition of **J.H. Sanders 1986 Revocable Trust, owner**, for property located at **30 Walden Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new deck and railing with composite materials) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 18 as lies within the Waterfront Business and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That the deck pattern and color shall be any color but IPE and Western Cedar as shown on fiberondecking.com/gallery website.
- 2) That the railing and post caps shall match the side door railing and post caps.

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

12. Petition of **402 State Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **402 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear additions) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct staircase) and allow renovations to an existing structure (change vinyl siding to composite wood siding, replace windows, add French doors, decks, and skylights on rear elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 12 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

- 1) That the proposed fence shown along the side yard shall be wood.
- 2) That the fiber cement siding shall have the smooth finish exposed.
- 3) That the existing chimney in the rear ell shall remain.
- 4) That the preferred antique vintage door shall be used 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

13. Petition of **Tess Casey and Michael J. Dipleco, owners**, for property located at **1 Jackson Hill Street, #2**, 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 141 as Lot 30-2 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to **postpone** the application to the August 6, 2014 meeting with a site walk to be scheduled prior to the meeting.

14. Petition of **Colaco, LLC, owner**, and **Karen Hayes, applicant**, for property located at **47 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 28 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

- 1) That a roof mounted condenser is preferred.

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

V. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Portsmouth Athenaeum, owner**, for property located at **6-8 Market Square**, 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 117 as Lot 20 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The Commission recommended a work session/public hearing.

B. Work Session requested by **Christopher D. Clement, Wendy L. Courteau-Clement, Andrew R. Courteau, Jr., and Elaine M. Perry, owners**, for property located at **41-43 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (upgrade the lower front portion of the building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 29 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The Commission voted to postpone the application to the July 16, 2014 meeting

VI. WORK SESSION/PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED)

C. (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 continued at the June 11, 2014 meeting to the July 9, 2014 meeting.)*

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to grant **final approval** of the apartment portion of the application with the following items approved (as enumerated and listed on Nicholas Cracknell's memorandum, dated July 9, 2014 and submitted plans, updated by Pro Con, Inc. on June 23, 2014 and dated stamped July 1, 2014 by the Planning Department):

Façade 1 & 2 – Portwalk Place (Page 1):

Façade 1

1. Modify the storefronts including changing the pier widths, adding a pier, adding a door, adding a mid-rail to the doors, changing the storefront height and width, raising the granite base height, and changing the window height above the canopy.
2. Add a column of windows and shift doors and windows.

Façade 2

1. Increase the width of the band height.
2. Add pilasters centered on windows above with 12-24" pier widths and add an awning.

Façade 5 – Hanover Street (Page 4):

Façade 5

1. Modify the height of the storefronts and change the double egress door to single door. The door shall be all glass.
2. Add column of windows, relocate doors and windows, and add a column of double doors with balconies.
3. Increase the height of the band.

Façade 5, 6 & 7 – Maplewood Ave. (Page 5):Façade 5

1. Modify the width of the storefronts along Maplewood Ave., modify the muntins at the door head, reduce the 2nd floor glazing heights, and increase the height of the band.

Façade 6

1. Change the paint color on the 5th floor.
2. Modify the storefront along Maplewood Ave. to include modifications to the entry glazing, awnings and the use of wooden doors.
3. Increase the height of the band and change the profile.

Façade 7

1. Add transformer gates to the wall using Option 2 with a curved rail system and a hammered or cast-aluminum finish with a decorative vine pattern (with a color similar to the gate) to be applied to the gate.

Façade 3B & 2B – Portwalk Place Rear (Page 6):Façade 3B

1. Modify the windows, relocate a door, change the granite base to concrete, and precast band to FRP.

Façade 2B

1. Increase in width of the window trim, add a green trellis, and add an additional 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

VII. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:07 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Administrative Clerk