

**REGULAR MEETING  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
AGENDA**

**7:00 P.M**

**June 18, 2002**

**Please Note:** Due to the length of Agenda, Public Hearings on applications #1 through #13 will be held on **Tuesday, June 18, 2002 and applications #14 through #16 will be held on the following Tuesday, June 25, 2002** at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers, Municipal Complex, 1 Junkins Avenue, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

Meeting of May 21, 2002

**II. Public Hearings**

- 1) Petition of Susan Turner, owner,** for property located at 111 Wibird Street wherein Variances from Article III, Section 10-302(A), Article II, Section 10-206(4); and, Article IV, Section 10-401(A)(2)(c) are requested to allow a 21' x 28' one story addition to the rear of a single family dwelling with: a) a 7' left side yard where 10' is the minimum required, and b) a second dwelling unit on an 8,748 sf lot where 15,000 sf of lot area would be required for two dwelling units. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 134 as Lot 46 and lies within the General Residence A district. Case # 36-02
- 2) Petition of Victoria Smith and Robert Bowser, owners,** for property located at 692 State Street wherein the following are requested: 1) a Variance from Article II, Section 10-206 to allow a dwelling unit in an accessory structure (garage) for a total of two dwelling units on the lot, and 2) a Variance from Article III, Section 10-302(A) to allow: a) two dwelling units on a 4,644 sf lot where 7,000 sf of lot area is required, b) a 2' rear yard where 20' is the minimum required, c) a 1' left side yard where 10' is the minimum required; and, d) 43% building coverage where 35% is the maximum allowed. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 6 and lies within the Apartment district. Case # 6-1
- 3) Petition of Ron and Lois Lawrence, owners, Marilyn Morrissey and Steve Little, option holders,** for property located at 524-526 Islington Street wherein a Special Exception as allowed in Article II, Section 10-207(4) is requested to allow a professional office building in the district and a 5 unit apartment building after combining 2 apartments on the first floor for the professional office. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 156 as Lot 3 and lies within the Mixed Residential Business district. Case # 6-2
- 4) Petition of Ann E. Beattie, owner,** for property located at 2 Sagamore Grove Road wherein the following are requested for a 20' x 20' one story detached garage: 1) a Variance from Article II, Section 10-208 to allow an accessory detached garage for a single family dwelling in a district where dwellings are not allowed, and 2) a Variance from Article IV, Section 10-402(B) and Article III, Section 10-304(A) to allow a 10' front yard where 30' is the minimum required. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 201 as Lot 3 and lies within the Waterfront Business district. Case # 6-3
- 5) Petition of Virginia Ross and Gael Boyd, owners,** for property located at 328 Aldrich Road wherein a Variance from Article III, Section 10-302(A) is requested to allow a 16' x 25' one story addition to the rear of an existing building replacing an existing deck and 4' x 24' egress stairs to the right side of the building creating 22.3% building coverage where 20% is the maximum allowed. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 166 as Lot 49 and lies within the Single Residence B district. Case # 6-4
- 6) Petition of Michael and Ann C. Bliss, owners,** for property located at 48 Thornton Street wherein a Variance from Article III, Section 10-302(A) is requested to allow a 4' x 6' one story addition to the right side and an 8' x 8' two story addition to the front of the existing dwelling creating 27% building coverage where 25% is the maximum allowed. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 143 as Lot 24 and lies within the General Residence A district. Case # 6-5
- 7) Petition of Dennis M. and Sandra Bridgeman, owners,** for property located at 1360-1362 Islington Street wherein a Variance from Article III, Section 10-302(A), and Article IV, Section 10-401(A)(2)(c) is requested to allow an 8' x 45' deck to the rear of and existing two family dwelling creating 27.6% building coverage where 20% is the maximum allowed. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 233 as Lot 99 and lies within the Single Residence B district. Case # 6-6
- 8) Petition of William K. and Amy M. Gum Jr., owners,** for property located at 71 Taft Road wherein a Variance from Article III, Section 10-302(A) is requested to allow a 14' x 26' deck with a 26' rear yard where 30' is the minimum required. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 247 as Lot 82 and lies within the Single Residence B district. Case # 6-7

- 9) Petition of Stanley and Donna Nice, owners**, for property located at 14 Suzanne Drive wherein a Variance from Article III, Section 10-302(A) is requested to allow a 5' x 14' front porch creating 20.7% building coverage where 20% is the maximum allowed. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 292 as Lot 88 and lies within the Single Residence B district. Case # 6-9
- 10) Petition of 55 Congress Street Condo Association, owner, AT&T Wireless Services Inc., applicant**, for property located at 55 Congress Street wherein a Special Exception as allowed in Article II, Section 10-208(51) is requested to allow one additional telecommunication equipment cabinet to the existing four cabinets on the roof for a total of five cabinets. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 9 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. Case # 6-10
- 11) Petition of Richard C. S. and Linda H. Harding Jr., owners**, for property located at 1808 Islington Street wherein a Variance from Article II, Section 10-206 is requested to allow a second dwelling unit in the barn attached to the single family dwelling in a district that only allows one dwelling unit on a lot. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 241 as Lot 15 and lies within the Single Residence B district. Case # 6-12
- 12) Petition of Kathryn R. Lynch and Robert J. Andelman, owners**, for property located at 3 Boyan Place wherein the following are requested: 1) an Equitable Waiver as allowed in NH RSA 64:33-a (Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirement) to allow a 13'3" front yard where 30' is the minimum required, and 2) a Variance from Article III, Section 10-302(A) to allow a 9' x 39' first floor addition onto the right side of an existing dwelling 21 ½' at the closest point and a second floor addition (1,064 sf) over the existing garage, screened porch, and new addition with a one foot front overhang with a 12'3" front yard at the closest point where 30' is the minimum required. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 207 as Lot 30 and lies within the Single Residence B district. Case # 6-13
- 13) Petition of Leonard and Ann Kovit and Mary Yager Estate, owners, Bluestone Properties, Inc., applicant**, for property located at 2236 Lafayette Road wherein the following are requested: 1) a Variance from Article III, Section 10-301(A)(8) to allow a 60' front yard where 105' is the minimum required, 2) a Variance from Article III, Section 10-304(A) to allow a 13' rear yard where 50' is the minimum required, 3) a Variance from Article XII, Section 10-1201(A)(3)(E) to allow parking and maneuvering isles be located within 40' of the front property line where a 40' setback with landscaping is required; and, 4) a Variance from Article XII, Section 10-1203(A)(1) to allow a loading zone to be within 25' of the rear property line where 50' is the minimum required. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 267 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Business district. Case # 6-14
- 14) Appeal of a decision of the Historic District Commission by Tom Kaufhold concerning the petition of 325 State Street, LLC, owner** for property located at 325 State Street wherein the Historic District Commission granted a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a three-story masonry commercial building and to construct a five-story brick, mansard roofed retail, commercial and residential building as per plans on file in the Planning Department. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 1, 6, and 7 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts. Case # 6-8
- 15) Petition of Millenium Borthwick LLC, owner**, for property located off Borthwick Avenue wherein the following are requested: 1) a Variance from Article XII, Section 10-1203(A)(2) to allow two loading areas to be provided where eleven loading areas are required, and 2) a Variance from Article XII, Section 10-1203(A)(1) to allow one of the loading areas to be located between the front property line and the building. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 259 as Lot 14-1 and lies within the Industrial district. Case # 6-11
- 16) Petition of Portsmouth Associates, LLC, owner**, for property located at 1465 Woodbury Avenue wherein the following are requested for the relocation of the brick school house building to the right side of the lot: 1) a Variance from Article III, Section 10-304(A) to allow the brick school house building to have a 14' front yard where 70' is the minimum required, and, 2) a Variance from Article XII, Section 10-1201(A)(3)(e)(2) to allow parking and maneuvering isles be located within 18' of the front property line where a 40' setback with landscaping is required. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 216 as Lot 3 and lies within the General Business district. Case # 6-15

### III. Adjournment

Members of the public and abutters should be aware that after the board renders its decision tonight, that a later request could be made to reconsider the decision and/or appeal the decision to the Rockingham County Superior Court. Please note that an abutter/aggrieved party may file a motion to reconsider if they are dissatisfied with the Board's decision. If you have any interest in finding out whether a motion to reconsider has been filed; you should contact the Planning Department thirty (30) days after the BOA decision is rendered. Thereafter, depending on the outcome of the reconsideration request, you are also invited to make inquiries at the Legal Department to determine whether an Appeal to the Superior Court has been filed.