

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**June 1, 2016
to be reconvened on June 8, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; John Wyckoff, Reagan Ruedig, Vincent Lombardi; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates Richard Shea, John Mayer

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Dan Rawling

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. May 4, 2016
- B. May 11, 2016

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

II. REQUEST FOR ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

- A. 40 Bridge Street – requested by Tanner Bridge Development, LLC, approval granted on June 10, 2016

The Commission voted to grant the one year extension of the Certificate of Approval for the 40 Bridge Street application. The Certificate of Approval will now expire on June 10, 2017.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- 1. 687 Middle Street
- 2. Atkinson Street (Strawbery Banke Museum)
- 3. 591 Middle Street
- 4. 11 Portwalk Place
- 5. 796 Middle Street
- 6. 131 Congress Street
- 7. 91 Lafayette Road
- 8. 640 Middle Street

9. 40 Pleasant Street
10. 38 South Street
11. 540 Marcy Street
12. 138 Maplewood Avenue

The Commission approved Items 2, 6, 8, 9 and 11 as presented.

The Commission took the following action on the remaining administrative approvals:

Item #1 – this item was postponed to the June 8, 2016 HDC meeting for further review.

Item #3 – the Commission voted to grant the administrative approval with the following stipulation: that the conduit will match the color of the house.

Item #4 – the Commission voted to grant the administrative approval with the following stipulation: that the alteration meet the height requirement and that the louvers be painted to match.

Item #5 – the Commission voted to grant the administrative approval with the following stipulation: that the conduit be field painted to match the siding.

Item #7 – the Commission voted to grant the administrative approval with the following stipulation: that option #2, the JELD-WEN sash kit is used.

Item #10 – the Commission voted to grant administrative approval as presented.

Item #12 – the Commission voted to grant administrative approval for all the items, with the exception of the egress window request.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Stephen Lichtenstein and Karen Jacoby, owners**, for property located at **35 Wibird Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace seven windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 134 as Lot 38 and lies within the GRA and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 11, 2016 meeting to the June 1, 2016 meeting.)*

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

B. Petition of **Petra A. Huda and Kimberly A. Schroeder, owners**, for property located at **280 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear mudroom, demolish existing shed) and allow new construction (construct one story rear addition, construct new garage, install fencing) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (relocate front door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said

property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 8 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 4, 2016 meeting to the June 1, 2016 meeting.)*

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to continue review of the application at the June 8, 2016 meeting.

C. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **2 Bow Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **2 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace wood sills and lintels with granite) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 23 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts. *(This item was postponed at the May 4, 2016 meeting to the June 1, 2016 meeting.)*

This application was withdrawn by the applicant from any further consideration.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **Habanero Holdings, LLC, owner**, and **Jay McSharry, applicant**, for property located at **107 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (construct fence enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 51 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) In order to meet the spirit and intent of the application, all outdoor solid waste shall be located within the trash enclosure.

2. Petition of **NBO/TDK Family Trust Fund B, owner**, for property located at **70 New Castle Avenue**, wherein permission is 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 101 as Lot 31 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 stipulation:

- 1) That the landscaping around the HVAC units shall be evergreens and shall be planted with an initial height of at least 24 inches to screen the view from abutting properties.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

3. Petition of **HH Wholesalers, LLC, owner**, and **Jay McSharry, applicant**, for property located at **601 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to

an existing structure (install solar panels) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 164 as Lot 7 and lies within the Business and Historic Districts.

Since no one was present to speak to the application, the Commission voted to postpone the application to the June 8, 2016 meeting.

4. Petition of **Eleanor C. Bradshaw, owner**, for property located at **21 Humphreys Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove, replace and re-configure misc. windows on rear and left side elevations) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 42 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 stipulation:

- 1) Detailed drawings, including the trim, casing and materials, shall be submitted for Administrative Approval prior to issuance of the Building Permit.

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 **SJW, LTD, owner**, and **Jacqui Harmon, applicant**, for property located at **29 Vaughan Street (also known as 29 Vaughan Mall)** wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (install exhaust hood and associated venting and

ductwork) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 4 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 stipulation:

- 1) The ducts and conduit shall be field-painted to match the exterior wall.

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 **Shaines and McEachern Company, Portsmouth, LLC, owner**, for property located at **25 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new main entry with ADA lift, machine room, and stairs) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 2 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 (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. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **St. John's Church, owner**, for property located at **100 & 105 Chapel Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (remove and rebuild retaining wall and stairs, remove existing shed at 100 Chapel Street) and allow exterior renovations (resurface and re-stripe pavement) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 2, 60-63 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) The approval only includes the proposed retaining wall and stairs portion of the applications;
- 2) The proposed shed demolition and replacement portion of the application shall be reviewed under a subsequent hearing.

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) ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Planning Department Administrative Clerk