

**ACTION SHEET
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

ONE JUNKINS AVENUE, PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

December 6, 2017

to be reconvened on December 13, 2017

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. November 1, 2017
- B. November 8, 2017

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

II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL

- 1. 235 Islington Street (*postponed from the November 8, 2017 meeting*)
- 2. 40 Bridge Street
- 3. 437 Marcy Street
- 4. 138 Maplewood Avenue
- 5. 287 Maplewood Avenue

Items #1, 2, 3, and 4 were approved as presented. Item #5 was approved with stipulations.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (OLD BUSINESS)

- A. Petition of **Kristina Logan, owner**, for property located at **220 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove asbestos siding, add two windows on east elevation, move one window on north elevation, remove storm windows and install double hung windows on south side porch) 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 item was postponed at the November 1, 2017 meeting to the December 6, 2017 meeting.)*

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

1. A detail sheet shall be submitted for administrative approval for the stairs, railing and screen wall under the porch.
2. Wood clapboards will be used on the porch.
3. The porch roof shall be asphalt to match the roof on the existing house.

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

B. 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. *(This item was postponed at the November 1, 2017 meeting to the December 6, 2017 meeting.)*

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

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Petition of **Robert J. Fabbriatore Irrevocable Trust of 2012, owner**, for property located at **177 State Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (remove garage and replace with small storage enclosure) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 44 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 stipulations:

- 1) The pervious pavers shall be placed up to the property line.
- 2) The applicant has the support of the Historic District Commission for the previously approved garage design and is encouraged to seek a dimensional variance for the smaller garage.

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 **Angelina E. Smith, owner**, for property located at **73 Northwest Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove existing clapboard siding, replace with composite siding) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 141 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) The existing clapboards shall remain on the house and the proposed cementitious siding shall be applied over the 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

3. Petition of **Lori A. Sarsfield, owner**, for property located at **28 Dennett Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (remove and replace windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 140 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Residence A and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted to **postpone** review of the application to the January 3, 2018 meeting so that a site walk could be scheduled prior to the meeting.

4. Petition of **Simchik-McGovern III, owner**, for property located at **8 Bow Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (modify storefront door location, repair and restore lower paneling and sign band, remove and replace windows, enlarge side entry door, add new second floor window on side elevation) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 22 and lies within 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) The detail for the front door shall be submitted for administrative approval.
- 2) Half screen shall be used.
- 3) The window casings shall be made of wood/composite with moldings to match the existing moldings.
- 4) The existing storefront system shall be re-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

V. WORK SESSIONS (OLD BUSINESS)

A. 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. *(This item was continued at the November 8, 2017 meeting to the December 6, 2017 meeting.)*

The applicant indicated that would return for a work session/public hearing in the near future.

VI. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

1. Work Session requested by **Lucky Thirteen Properties, LLC, owner**, for property located **361 Islington Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a 90 s.f. addition, modify existing canopy with patio enclosure structure) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (new siding, and glazed garage doors) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 144 as Lot 23 and lies within the CD4-L2 and Historic Districts.

The applicant indicated that would return for a work session/public hearing in the near future.

VII. PRESENTATION

1. Design Review Toolkit – 3D Massing Model

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to support the proposed scope to update the web portal and 3D massing model. The motion passed by (7-0) unanimous vote.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

At 11:05 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Planning Department Administrative Clerk