## ACTION SHEET HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

### EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

6:30 p.m. July 6, 2016

to be reconvened on July 13, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Joseph Almeida; Vice Chairman/Planning Board

Representative William Gladhill; John Wyckoff, Dan Rawling, Reagan Ruedig, City Council Representative Nancy Pearson;

Alternates Richard Shea, John Mayer

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Vincent Lombardi

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

#### I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. June 1, 2016

B. June 8, 2016

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

#### II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

- 1. 303 Islington Street
- 2. 233 Vaughan Street
- 3. 173-175 Market Street
- 4. 114 Mechanic Street
- 5. 77 State Street
- 6. 134 South Street
- 7. 21 Dearborn Street
- 8. 39 Dearborn Street
- 9. 11 Market Street
- 10. 90 Fleet Street
- 11. 60 Marcy Street
- 12. 816 Middle Street
- 13. 200 New Castle Avenue

The Commission approved the 13 administrative approvals with stipulations to item #6 and item #12.

## III. 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 June 1, 2016 meeting to the July 6, 2016 meeting.*)

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the July 13, 2016 meeting.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS)

1. Petition of **One Middle Street, LLC, owner,** for property located at **150 Congress Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow a new free standing structure (install condensing unit on roof) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 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.

**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 Northern Tier Real Estate Acquisition and Development, LLC, owner, for property located at 172 Hanover Street, wherein permission was requested to allow an

amendment to a previously approved design (modifications to accommodate the second floor egress) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 1A 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):

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
$\square$ Yes $\square$ No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties
3. Petition of <b>Seth F. Peters, owner,</b> and <b>Michael Lipoma, applicant,</b> for property located at <b>112 State Street</b> , wherein permission was requested to allow new construction to an existing structure (construct shed addition to rear of building) and allow a new free standing structure (install condensing unit) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 112 as Lot 54 and lies within the CD 4, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.
After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be <b>approved</b> as presented.
<b>Findings of Fact:</b> 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

<ul> <li>✓ Yes □ No - Conservation and enhancement of property values</li> <li>□ Yes □ No - Promote the education, pleasure &amp; welfare of the District to the city residents and visitors</li> </ul>								
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								
$\square$ Yes $\square$ No - Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties								
IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS (REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS)								
4. Petition of <b>Olde Harbour Condominium Association, owner,</b> and <b>Kathleen Tutone, applicant,</b> for property located at <b>135 Market Street, Unit E (143 Market Street)</b> wherein permission was requested to allow new free standing structures (install two condensing units) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 34 and lies within the CD 5, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.								
After due deliberation, the Commission voted that the request be <b>approved</b> as presented with the following stipulations:								
1) The conduit shall be located internally and any exposed conduit shall be painted to match the wall.								
2) The condenser shall be mounted 2-3" above the roof surface.								
<b>Findings of Fact:</b> 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								
<ul> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ No - Assessment of the Historical Significance</li> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ No - Complement and enhance the architectural and historic character</li> </ul>								
☐ 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
	$Yes \; \square$	No -	Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
	Yes $\square$	No -	Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

5. Petition of **Robert McDowell, owner,** for property located at **379 Newcastle Avenue,** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition to an existing structure (demolish existing metal carport and garage) and allow a new free standing structure (construct new two car garage) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 4 and lies within the Single Residence B and Historic Districts.

The Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the July 13, 2016 meeting.

6. Petition of **Nina Eshoo, owner,** for property located at **37 South Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow exterior renovations to an existing structure (replace clapboards, replace wood trim with composite material, remove and replace twelve windows) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 102 as Lot 52 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) The window sills and casings shall match the historic sill pattern of the existing windows.
- 2) Half screens shall be used.
- 3) The composite trim material shall be field-painted to match the color of the siding.
- 4) The clapboard exposure shall be 3-3 ½".
- 5) All windows shall be simulated divided lights with a spacer bar. The muntin width shall match the older windows on the first floor of the facade.
- 6) If desired, 4" may be added to both attic windows.
- 7) The frames and jambs shall match the color of the window trim.

**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 residen
and visitors

The proposed application also meets the following review criteria of the Historic District Ordinance (as applicable):

В.	<b>Review</b>	Criteria:
₽,	11011011	CI Itti Itt.

✓	Yes □	No -	Consistent with special and defining character of surrounding properties
	$Yes \; \square$	No -	Relation to historic and architectural value of existing structures
	$Yes \; \square$	No -	Compatibility of design with surrounding properties
	Yes $\square$	No -	Compatibility of innovative technologies with surrounding properties

## V. WORK SESSIONS (NEW BUSINESS)

A. Work Session requested by **Ann L. and Mark M. Wilbur, owners,** for property located at **199 Middle Street,** wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolish existing two story rear addition) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct new two story rear addition, new deck, re-work existing fence and gate) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 6 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office and Historic Districts.

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the July 13, 2016 meeting.

B. Work Session requested by **Thunderbolt Realty Trust of 2011, owner**, for property located at **17 Gardner Street**, wherein permission was requested to allow demolition of an existing structure (demolition of two rear additions, removal of rear deck) and allow new construction to an existing structure (construct a two story rear addition, relocate front gate and fence) as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 103 as Lot 14 and lies within the General Residence B and Historic Districts.

At the applicant's request, the Commission voted to postpone review of the application to the July 13, 2016 meeting.

#### VI. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:20 p.m., it was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Good

Planning Department Administrative Clerk