

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

**SCHOOL DEPARTMENT CONFERENCE ROOM**

**6:30 p.m.**

**November 4, 2015  
to be reconvened on November 18, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; Members John Wyckoff, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; Alternates Richard Shea and John Mayer

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Dan Rawling; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy

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

.....

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. October 7, 2015
- B. October 14, 2015

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

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

- 1. 65 Washington Street (aka 43 Atkinson Street, postponed from October 7, 2015 meeting)
- 2. 195 Hanover Street
- 3. 11 Pickering Street
- 4. 401 State Street

Items #2, #3, and #4 were approved as presented by Mr. Cracknell. Item #1 was continued to the November 18, 2015 meeting.

**III. REQUEST FOR RE-HEARING – 18 Manning Street, submitted by Judith Hiller and John Wilkens**

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

- 1) The Commission determined that no new information was presented in the RFR that would materially change the decision denying the application as the other properties listed by the Applicant as not requiring half-screens was presented in the application

presented on October 7, 2015. Further, the properties were not directly applicable to this decision as the Commission treats every application individually based on the quality and character of the structure, its use and location, its historical significance, and its surrounding context.

- 2) The Commission felt that no procedural defect or error appeared to have occurred in the denial of this application;
- 3) Although the Commission respects the fact that the Applicant already installed the full-screens, the Commission felt that the Applicant had explicitly agreed to the stipulation at the original approval of the project; and
- 4) As noted in the October 7, 2015 denial, the Commission felt that that the use of full screens in this location would obscure the muntin pattern of the window.

**Findings of Fact:** 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 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

**IV. REQUEST FOR ONE YEAR EXTENSION** – request of one year extension of the Certificate of Approval for 39 Puddle Lane, granted on November 5, 2014 – submitted by Strawberry Banke, Inc.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to grant a one year extension of the Certificate of Approval granted on November 5, 2014. The Certificate of Approval will now expire on November 5, 2016.

**V. WINDOWS DEMONSTRATION – WINDOW REPRESENTATIVES**

Window representatives from the Green Mountain Window and Door Co. and LePage Millworks were present to discuss replacement windows with a historic look.

**VI. PUBLIC HEARING (OLD BUSINESS)**

A. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Joseph J. and Jennifer Almeida, owners**, for property located at **103/105 High Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify front elevation by adding a storefront, with access stairs and landing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD4-L, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to postpone the application to the January 6, 2016 meeting.

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

1. Petition of **Martin F. Kurowski and Cristina Galli, owners**, for property located at **111 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood trim with composite material, remove and replace two basement windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 53 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 **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission is requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (changes in material of a patio enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 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 purposes and objectives of the Historic District Ordinance and the Review Criteria.

3. Petition of **233 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **233 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (install free

standing sign) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 14 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 purposes and objectives of the Historic District Ordinance and the Review Criteria.

### VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

4. Petition of **Cathy G. Barnhorst, owner**, for property located at **24 Market Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace ten windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 24 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 window details will match the existing profile and plane of the existing windows.
- 2) That a spacer bar shall be used as presented.
- 3) That a half screen 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

5. Petition of **Middle Street Baptist Church, owner**, for property located at **640 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, add two patio doors on rear elevation, relocate existing rear door and window system, install replacement window in its place) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lot 20 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic District.

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

- 1) That the plans (including the window restoration and wood storm windows) presented on 11-4-15 and date stamped 11-4-15 shall represent the items reflected in this approval.

**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 **David A. Sinclair and Nicole J. Giusto, owners**, for property located at **765 Middle Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow a new free standing structure (install fencing along front and sides of property) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 148 as Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic District.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to **continue** review of the application at the November 18, 2015 meeting so that additional information could be submitted.

7. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Brick Act, LLC, owner**, for property located at **102 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct shed dormer addition, construct one and two story additions at rear of structure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 52 and lies within the CD4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

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

- 1) The proposed improvements shall be as revised (as shown on plans date stamped 11-04-15) and presented at the meeting.
- 2) The shed roofs and the roof of the two story addition shall be painted metal in a natural, dark bronze color with a matte finish.
- 3) The rear portion of the historic structure shall have cedar shingles.
- 4) Half screens 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. Petition of **Timothy K. Sheppard, owner**, for property located at **54/58 Ceres Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install two condensing units on shed roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 44 and lies within the CD4, Waterfront Industrial, and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That the side of the HVAC unit shall be recessed at least 6 inches from the side of the building.

**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 **Wright Avenue, LLC, owner**, for property located at **67-77 State Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 18 and lies within the CD5 and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) That the proposed railing system shall be a custom, heavy-gauge welded rail system.

**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. Petition of **143 Daniel Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **143 Daniel Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow amendments to a previously approved design (misc. changes) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 19 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

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:40 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.



Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good  
Planning Department Administrative Clerk