

## Izak Gilbo

---

**From:** jwsobel@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 29, 2022 9:08 AM  
**To:** Planning Info; Nicholas J. Cracknell  
**Cc:** igilbo@cityofportsmout.com  
**Subject:** HDC meeting may 4 work session with public hearing following..... 129 state street  
Request for Reconsideration

Request for reconsideration of decision within 30 days of hearing Dear HDC Chairman and Members We are requesting reconsideration as the committee approved the request by the applicant without full or adequate documentation of the expansion of the garage building bordering on Sheafe Street.

This abuttor protested the expansion on the observation of the site that the massing of the garage was too large, created a visual pinch point on the narrowest part of Sheafe st, And that the expansion reduced or eliminated the subordination of the garage addition Relative to the brick row house building to which it is attached.

The applicant failed to provide adequate survey, elevations from Sheafe Street, or Sheafe Street Streetscape drawings that would reveal the visual impact of the proposal.

Discussion by the Hdc members followed and which one member stated on the record that his decision was based on what the building ordinance allowed in terms of rear setback and he voted in the affirmative without the applicant even providing a Survey or a documented plot plan to show the extent of the expansion relative to the street.

The committees mandate is to determine massing on the basis of comparative aesthetics rather than on the basis of the city ordinance for rear set back.

Further the applicant did not provide an actual survey to show whether they proposed a Expansion that was legally compliant. No committee member knew or stated the required set back rules for this location.

Thus on either point the committee did not have adequate information to decide the matter or used criteria outside the purview of the HDC.

This abuttor believes that the proposal for expansion of garage does not meet visual criteria for massing and in particular notes that this is for a two-story structure which which further aggravates the problem of subordination to the main structure and doubles the visual impact. Therefore we ask for reconsideration of this issue using only the criteria allowed by the Hdc and based on actual survey of setbacks and elevations/viewscape drawings that adequately show the proposed expansion's visual effect on the street scape.

Finally the committee created a double jeopardy of their decision and ignored the previous Historic Commission's decisions allowing expansion of the garage on two occasions where they limited it to the existing structure. Thus the precedent decisions of the HDC taking into consideration the massing of the addition were ignored or not adequately considered.

Sincerely, Jonathan and Valérie Sobel  
49 Sheafe street  
Portsmouth, NH

Sent from JWSobel's iPad

**RE: 93 Pleasant St**  
**Meeting: HDC June 1, 2022**

Dear Members of the Historic District Commission,

May 31, 2022

All changes seem pretty innocuous. These listed just seemed like they needed a little more attention. Items represent the triangles numbers listed as changes. Page numbers are from the meeting packet.

**Item 3:** ADA Ramp: There is a bike ramp outside the building. *Is there a bike rack in the basement/underground parking area?* If so, will cyclists now have to ride down the car ramp to access the underground parking, since the ADA ramp seems to be proposed to be moved to the first floor entrance?

**Item 4:** Recessed balconies: not sure why the originally proposed entrance or something similar could not remain. Comparing P1.13 on pages 130 and 131 the “new” west porch roof will be 2” higher (37’8” to 37’ 10”), doesn’t make sense why the more formal entryway can’t remain.

**Item 6:** Elevator Overrun: P1.12 (pg 128, 129). The clapboards to the top with the extra window creates a “tower look” and almost looks like another story. Something decorative or different below the roofline or at top floor could be added to tone the height down. Originally there was a gray brick area proposed at the top.

**Item 8:** Mechanical Equipment: Shown on P1.10A (pg 123), P1.10 (pg 125) and P1.11 (pg127) seems quite visible from the edge of the roofline. Aren’t those normally recessed from the edge of the roof or minimally covered in some way.

**Comparing P1.12** on page 128 and 129. The sections marked **EL4** (darker gray area) originally proposed, it seems that one has been removed but does not seem to be listed as a change. The two tone colors originally proposed seemed to reduce the visual size of this long wall. It looks pretty expansive in the newer version.

Thank you for your time and efforts.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bratter  
159 McDonough St  
Property Owner