

**ACTION SHEET  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**6:30 p.m.**

**April 1, 2015  
to be reconvened on April 29, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Alternates Vincent Lombardi, Richard Shea

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** George Melchior

**ALSO PRESENT:** Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....  
**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. March 4, 2015

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

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

- A. 143 Daniel Street
- B. 300 New Castle Avenue

Mr. Cracknell updated the Commission on minor revisions to the 143 Daniel Street application. The 300 New Castle Avenue revisions will be reported on at the April 29, 2015 meeting.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)**

1. Petition of **Piscataqua Savings Bank, owner**, for property located at **15 Pleasant Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace slate roof with synthetic slate roof on drive-thru roof canopy) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 35 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to **deny** the request for the following reasons:

- 1) Although the structure was built in the 1970's, the Commission felt that the slate roof should remain to maintain the historic appearance of the surrounding neighborhood.
- 2) Due to the fact that the roof structure was so close to eye level, they felt that the use of a faux material was inappropriate in that location.
- 3) The slate roof was a character-defining feature of the building.
- 4) The use of slate on other new buildings within the Historic District was appropriate and the long-term durability was beneficial for the District.

2. Petition of **Hanover Apartments, LLC and Portwalk HI, LLC, owners**, for property located at **5 Portwalk Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install mechanical equipment on roof behind parapet) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the CD 5, 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 purposes and objectives of the Historic District Ordinance and the Review Criteria.

3. Petition of **Hanover Apartments, LLC and Portwalk HI, LLC, owners**, for property located at **35 Portwalk Place**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install mechanical equipment on roof behind parapet) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the CD 5, 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 purposes and objectives of the Historic District Ordinance and the Review Criteria.

4. Petition of **Pickering Wharf Condominium Association, owner, and Kevin A. Beane and Melinda Salazar, applicants**, for property located at **33 South Mill Street, Unit A**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing first floor rear window and door, replace with French doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 17-A 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 purposes and objectives of the Historic District Ordinance and the Review Criteria.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)**

5. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Brick Act, LLC, owner**, for property located at **102 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (window and door reconfigurations on the front façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 52 and lies within CD 4 and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That the window on the right side of the front elevation may be shifted 9” to the east if the code officials cannot approve a waiver to the egress requirements of the IBC for the use of the alleyway for primary access.
- 2) The proposed glazing in the front door shall include replacement of the two upper wood panels with glass lights.

**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 **Babak Samii and Aida Garcia Vazquez, owners**, for property located at **426 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (complete renovation of carriage house) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 135 as Lot 45 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) If the windows cannot be salvaged, the applicant will return for approval of any new window design;
- 2) The cupola will be restored but if it is not possible, it shall be replaced in-kind, with the exception that LEXAN MR may be used as the top material and the finial shall be replaced;
- 3) Cedar clapboards shall be used;
- 4) The covers for the barn doors may be redesigned and shall be replaced in their original positions; and
- 5) Because the drawings presented were not entirely accurate, revised drawings shall be submitted prior to a request for a building permit to ensure compliance of the project with this approval. The City's Land Use Compliance Officer shall monitor the construction.

**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 **North End Properties, LLC, owner, and Deer Street Development Company, Inc., doing business in NH as HarborCorp of Portsmouth, applicant**, for property located on **Russell Street, Deer Street, and Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow a Conditional Use Permit (construct a multi-story, mixed-use building where the height exceeds the 45' maximum height restriction) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 21, Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28, Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12, Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1-1A, Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1-1C, and lies within the Central Business B, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The Commission voted to **continue** review of the application at the May 2015 meeting.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

At 11:30 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good  
Administrative Clerk