

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

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m.

**March 4, 2015
to be reconvened on March 25, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board Representative William Gladhill; John Wyckoff, George Melchior, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig; City Council Representative Esther Kennedy; Alternates Vincent Lombardi, Richard Shea

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

ALSO PRESENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 4, 2015
2. February 11, 2015

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **29-41 Congress Street, LLC, owner, and Bennetts Store of Portsmouth, LLC, applicant**, for property located at 41 Congress Street, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install exterior lighting, replace awning, replace trim on front façade) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 10 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay District.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented.

2. Petition of **Michael R. and Denise Todd, owners**, for property located at **262-264 South Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow an amendment to a previously approved design (install granite steps with iron railing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 111 as Lot 5 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be **approved** as presented.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)

3. (Re-hearing) Petition of **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace windows, siding, roof, and trim) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 120 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business A and Historic Districts.

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

- 1) Because of its unique location as a gateway to the City, a majority of the Commission felt the building (c. 1980) was a significant building of the time period in which it was built. A majority of the Commission felt that the details (especially the wood cedar shakes siding) that made up the original building design were meaningful and were a character-defining element of the building. Moreover, a majority of the Commission felt that the approval of significant modifications to the building (i.e. to allow Azek (vinyl) trim and significant window alterations) was a reasonable compromise to help address the long-term maintenance issues presented by the Applicant without the use of vinyl siding;
- 2) A majority of the Commission felt it was inappropriate to use two different products (wood cedar shakes and vinyl cedar shakes) on the exterior of the building as it would be noticeable – especially over time as the material weathered – and also seen by many people visiting the building as the City’s Visitor Center; and
- 3) No new information was presented in the application, nor was any evidence presented at the hearing that indicated that the Commission had erred in their earlier approval (with stipulations) of this project.

Findings of Fact: The proposed application, as presented, **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, as presented, **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

4. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Mara Witzling and Peter Cass, owners**, for property located at **33 Hunking Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct two story rear addition, one story addition with porch at right side and rear, entry deck and front bay addition, right side dormer, attic dormer) and allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace existing doors, windows, and exterior finishes, replace fencing) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 38 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

5. (Work Session/Public Hearing) Petition of **Timothy and Alexandra Lieto, owners**, for property located at **454 Marcy Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (install two windows, a skylight, and relocate front entry door) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 101 as Lot 77 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 a half screen shall be used.
- 2) That a simulated window sill will be used and the trim and casing will match the existing windows.
- 3) That the skylight location may be adjusted as needed to support preservation of the timber-frame roof system.
- 4) That the Advocates plaque will be relocated on the front facade.

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. WORK SESSIONS

A. Work Session requested by **Nobles Island Condominium Association, owner**, for property located at **500 Market 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 120 as Lot 2 and lies within Central Business A and Historic Districts. *(This item was postponed at the January meeting to the March meeting).*

The Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the April meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good
Administrative Clerk