

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**July 1, 2015
to be reconvened on July 15, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; Alternate Richard Shea

MEMBERS EXCUSED: City Council Representative Esther Kennedy

ALSO PRESENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 28, 2015
2. June 3, 2015

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

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- A. 456 Middle Street
- B. 7 Portwalk Place
- C. 18 Mt. Vernon Street
- D. 35 Mark Street

Items A, C, and D were approved as presented by Nick Cracknell. Item B was continued to the August 15, 2015 meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Zoe Copenhaver Daboul and Michael Edward Daboul, owners**, for property located at **53 Humphreys Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 39 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.

2. Petition of **Wright Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **67-77 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes to doors/windows, add screens to all windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 18 and lies within the CD 5, 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 dormer options shown on Sheet 2 have been removed from the application.
- 2) That a half screen shall be used in the “invisible” product line and color to match the window finish.

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

3. Petition of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (add skylight, locate condensers on roof, replace window with door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the CD 4, 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 items listed on Sheet 3 shall be removed from the application until additional information is submitted and reviewed.

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

4. Petition of **233 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (revisions to railings, paving, rooftop appurtenances, minor façade elements, add fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 and lies within the Central Business A, 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 and Review Criteria.

5. Petition of **Wenberry Associates, LLC, owner, and Zachary Gregg, applicant,** for property located at **15 Congress Street (also known as 155 Fleet Street)** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace and add windows, reconfigure misc. windows on second floor on High Street elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 12 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 following purposes of the Historic District Ordinance and Review Criteria.

6. Petition of **Portsmouth Historical Society, owner,** for property located at **43 Middle Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (add trim to rake, add gutter to rear façade, relocate utilities panel) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 2 and lies within the 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 the rake board, shown on Page 4, shall be cut off below the gutter and the shadow board and trim shall extend to the edge of the rake board.

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

7. Petition of **White Revocable Trust of 2013, owner, David E. and Kristen E. White, trustees,** for property located at **127 New Castle Avenue,** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two dormers) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 54 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

8. Petition of **Ruth R. and William A. Faribault, owners**, for property located at **35 Park Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace roof, replace shakes on dormer with clapboard siding, replace trim on dormer with composite material, remove and replace windows on second floor) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 45 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That an exterior muntin (3/4" wide to match internal grill with a beveled edge) shall be added to the replacement windows and shall be applied with commercial grade two-sided tape.

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 **William T. and Annelise Ellison, owners**, for property located at **687 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing garage) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 34 and lies within the 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 Anderson 400 Series windows and doors are used as presented.
- 2) That custom wood doors will be used on the garage.
- 3) That the siding shall be cedar clapboards.

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 **PNF Trust of 2013, owner, Peter N. Floros, trustee**, for property located at **282 Middle Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace clapboards/trim on north east end, replace front columns, changes to door and window casings/details, repairs to substrate as required) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 8 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 stipulation:

- 1) That items #1, #3, and #5 on the door improvements shall be removed from the application.

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 **Howard Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Lynda Andersson, applicant**, for property located at **33-35 Howard Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove wood gutters, replace with fiberglass gutters, replace soffits, and fascia boards) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 83 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

12. Petition of **David A. and Regina H. Schirmer, owners,** and **Richard S. Hayes, applicant,** for property located at **241 South Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (repair siding and trim, replace windows on sides and rear of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 36 and lies in the 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 Anderson 400 Series windows 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

13. Petition of **Kristen J. Campbell, owner**, for property located at **31 Cabot Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing porch) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new porch) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 136 as Lot 40 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 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

14. Petition of **Northern New England Telephone Operations, LLC, c/o Fairpoint Communications, Inc., owner**, and **Jeremy Lamothe, applicant**, for property located at **56 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (remove seven rooftop HVAC units and associated piping and screening, replace with two HVAC units and screening) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 23 and lies within the 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

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:45 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Planning Department Administrative Clerk