

**AMENDED ACTION SHEET
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

November 1, 2017

to be reconvened on November 8, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Vincent Lombardi; Vice Chairman Jon Wyckoff;
Members Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, Richard Shea, John
Mayer; City Council Representative Nancy Pearson; Alternates
Martin Ryan, Molly Bolster

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
A site walk was held prior to the meeting at 5:45 p.m. at 73 Prospect Street.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 4, 2017

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

B. October 18, 2017

It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to postpone approval of the minutes to the November 8, 2017 meeting.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL

1. 55 Market Street
2. 172 Hanover Street
3. 180 Gates Street
4. 77 Daniel Street
5. 1 Webster Way
6. 121 Mechanic Street
7. 490 Marcy Street

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve Items 1, 3, 4, 5 as presented.

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve Item 2 with the following stipulation:

- 1) *That approval is subject to any licenses or easements required by the City.*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve Item 6 with the following stipulation:

- 1) *Both accessory building will be constructed at the same locations and dimensions (including height);*
- 2) *All existing windows (including sills) will be retained and reused in the same location and profile as the existing structure. If other windows are preferred, they will be presented under a new application to the HDC;*
- 3) *Cedar siding or shingles will be used to clad both buildings;*
- 4) *The existing three tab-asphalt shingles will be upgraded to a weathered wood, architectural asphalt shingle; and*
- 5) *The existing chimney is not included in the reconstruction of the building.*

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve Item 7 with the following stipulation:

- 1) *That the doors be scored to look like wood and that the Azek trim be field-painted.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. Petition of **Kristina Logan, owner**, for property located at **220 South Street**, wherein permission is requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, remove asbestos siding, replace with cedar shingle siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 1 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts. *(This applicant has asked to postpone review of the application to the December 6, 2017 meeting.)*

The Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the December 6, 2017 meeting.

B. Petition of **110-112 Court Street Condominium Association, owner**, and **Beth Goddard**, applicant, for property located at **110 Court Street, Unit 3**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (restore five original windows, remove and replace six windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lot 39-3 and lies within the CD4-L1 and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the October 4, 2017 meeting to the November 1, 2017 meeting.)*

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

- 1) The Andersen 400 Series windows shall be used for the replacement and shall be simulated divided light and have fibrex cladding.
- 2) The window casing shall be field-applied.

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. (*Re-hearing*) Petition of **Ten Walker Street Realty, LLC, owner**, for property located at **73 Prospect Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing structure) and allow a new free standing structure (construct 4 unit residential building) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 142 as Lot 28 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 stipulations:

1. A photographic inventory and other associated historic information shall be submitted to the Planning Department and Athenaeum prior to demolition;
2. The exposed foundation shall be veneered on three sides (including the street side) with field stone to match the existing foundation; and
3. The heavy timber beams within the frame and the raised panel walls and the fireplace surround shall be salvaged and cosmetically reused within the previously-approved 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

2. Petition of **Brenda J. Bouchard Revocable Trust of 1999, Brenda J. Bouchard, owner and trustee**, for property located at **33 Holmes Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows, change window configuration on front porch, install two HVAC units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 12 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. Subject to approval from the BOA, the condenser shall be located at the rear of the structure;
2. All PVC shall be field-painted;
3. A stud-pocket shall be inserted between all paired windows;
4. The porch shall have two, 48 inch, double-hung, SDL windows with a stud-pocket under the ellipse;
5. A final shop drawing for the porch shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to construction; and
6. The existing chimney shall not be removed above the roofline.

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

3. Petition of **Blue Star Properties, LLC and Forum Group, LLC, owners**, for property located at **67 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace two windows on front elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 53 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

Because there was no one present to speak to the application, the Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the November 8, 2017 meeting.

4. Petition of **299 Vaughan Street, LLC, owner**, for property located at **299 Vaughan Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (add a roof deck/terrace and minor façade adjustments) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 123 as Lot 10 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lots 10 & 11 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) All items other than the proposed roof deck shall be approved.
- 2) The roof deck proposal shall be continued to the December 6, 2017 meeting.

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 visitor

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 (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **James C. and Amy M. Baker, owners**, for property located at **75 Humphrey's Court**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish rear addition) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new rear addition, replace/relocate misc. doors and windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

The applicant indicated they would return for another work session.

B. Work Session requested by **Simchik-McGovern III, LLC, owners**, for property located at **8 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify the storefront for ADA accessibility, remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 22 and lies within the CD5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The applicant indicated they would return for a public hearing/work session at a future meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:30 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Planning Department Administrative Clerk