

From: [Marcia MacCormack](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: Point of View Condominium 57 Salter
Date: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 1:02:17 PM

I am the sole direct abutter to 57 Salter Street
I was given false information by Mr. Thompson regarding his intentions for this property,
(relatives wanting to be near his wife)
I was uncomfortable with the idea but having had a positive relationship with the Thompson's
for thirty years It was hard to object. This is my regret.

I was present at the BOA meeting giving him permission to convert the office to residence.
Once again Mr.Thompson spoke of sick and elderly relatives.

Since then he expanded the parking area to accommodate at least 8-10 cars.
When he moved a shed blocking a view I had of the River, I asked why ?
To "build miniatures in the shed" he said

Soon afterwards he told me he sold the big house for "a price he couldn't refuse "
(2.4 million) keeping a beautiful, valuable piece of waterfront with dock rights.

A Gardner working for the Thompson's tells me the property will be converted to
condominiums.
I checked at the Planning office and was told " the city would never allow condominiums
down there"

DES shuts the project down due to violations in converting the building to a residence, which
they hadn't been informed of.

Mr Thompson tells me the only solution is to move the building forward away from the River.
I spoke with Mr.Cracknell at Planning who said " we don't want a lawsuit over this "
I find out from reading a letter Mr. Thompson's lawyer wrote that it had always been their
retirement plan to sell the big house and use the small building to live in.
These are changes that warrant honest discussion not vague obfuscations

This property, in a significantly historic area, is being overdeveloped.
Salter Street is a narrow, congested dead end.
No turning has ever been allowed at the end of the street (57)
Thus, cars back into other peoples driveways and property in an effort to avoid backing on to
Marcy Street.

I plan on attending the BOA meeting and would like answers please on these questions:

- 1: What were the reasons for granting the original variance
2. Who is responsible for DES approval
3. What exactly does a condominium association mean, can the big house become
condominiums
4. Will the BOA consider the impact of increased vehicles
- 5: Who is MrCracknel referring to when he said "we don't want a lawsuit"

6: What would the cities position be on short term rentals in that location
(we've had that situation before on the street)

Sincerely

Marcia MacCormack
53 Salter Street

**DANIEL POSTERNAK
KRISTIN POSTERNAK
57 SALTER STREET
PORTSMOUTH, NH 03801**

June 27, 2023

City of Portsmouth Planning Board
c/o Peter Britz, Planning Director
CITY OF PORTSMOUTH
1 Junkins Avenue, 3rd Floor
Portsmouth, NH 03801

RE: Margot Thompson and Edward Thompson – Application for Zoning Variances
57 Salter Street, Tax Map #102, Lot #32


Dear Zoning Board of Adjustment Members:

We are owners of Unit 2 of the Point of View Condominium Association located at 57 Salter Street, Tax Map 102, Lot 32 in the City of Portsmouth. We have owned and resided in our home since October, 2020, which is located on the same lot as the Thompsons' Unit 1 building. We reviewed the Thompsons' application for zoning variances and discussed this matter with the Thompsons. We understand that the Thompsons' application for variances will be submitted to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for review and consideration by the Board at the June 27, 2023 meeting.

We support their Application for Zoning Variances and ask that the Portsmouth Zoning Board of Adjustment grant the requested variances.

If you have any questions, Dan can be reached at dan@roundaboutdiner.com. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Daniel Posternak



Kristin Posternak

cc: Stephanie Casella, City of Portsmouth, Planner II slcasella@cityofportsmouth.com
Edward Thompson, 57 Salter Street, Unit 1 ept1955@aol.com
Margot Thompson, 57 Salter Street, Unit 1 mlt2360@aol.com
Eric Weinrieb, P.E., Altus Engineering eweinrieb@altus-eng.com

IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREAS (TO PROPERTY LINES)		
STRUCTURE	PRE-CONSTRUCTION IMPERVIOUS (S.F.)	POST-CONSTRUCTION IMPERVIOUS (S.F.)
MAIN STRUCTURES	846	1,665
STAIRS/LANDING/RAMP	90	29
GARAGE/SHED	562	0
CONCRETE SURFACES	117	0
PAVED DRIVEWAY	644	263
WALKWAY	0	45
PATIO	0	200
	0	0
	0	0
	0	0
	0	0
TOTAL	2,259	2,202
LOT SIZE	3,864	3,864
% LOT COVERAGE	58.5%	57.0%

PSNH 44/2Y -
8 E/P 12

EXISTING BUILDING COVERAGE: 1,408 S.F./3,864 S.F. = 36%
 PROPOSED BUILDING COVERAGE: 1,665 S.F./3,864 S.F. = 43%
 PROPOSED OPEN SPACE: 1,662 S.F./3,864 S.F. = 43%
 BUILDING HEIGHT TO CONFORM TO ORDINANCE.

Dear Members of the Zoning Board of Adjustments,

June 25, 2023

These are just some items noticed when reviewing this presentation. Sorry I couldn't figure out how to move the first snipped graphs down to put my salutation in the proper place.

Essentially the 90 sf ramp was removed and 644 sf driveway was cut in half and filled with building (see impervious surface areas above)

Where will the HVAC systems go with these tight set backs? Not needed in the 1800s or before zoning.

<u>Dimensional Requirement Category</u>	<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Net Result</u>
Front Yard Setback	5 ft	0.0 ft / 1.8 ft	3.0 ft	More Conforming by 3 ft
Side Yard Setback (South)	10 ft	2.1 ft	5.2 ft	More conforming by 3.1 ft
Side Yard Setback (North)	10 ft	0.2 ft	3.8 ft	More conforming by 3.6 ft
Rear Yard Setback	20 ft	5.3 ft	20.2 ft	More conforming by 14.9 ft ¹
Building Coverage	35%	36%	43%	Less conforming ⁴

See Enclosure 3.

The location of the front door and the lack of front steps to the sidewalk are truly nonconforming and NOT in the character of the neighborhood. ALL THE HOUSES ON THAT SIDE OF THE STREET ARE IDENTICAL. Door on left (recessed) and bay or large window on the right with front steps to the sidewalk. . All have been updated except 281. Please view Google Map or Street View to see all the houses on Cabot (311, 303, 295, 287), to get a better perspective than what was provided. 41 Salem Street was asked to add faux front doors and steps to their buildings, to go with the character of the neighborhood. The front door shown is in the design of the neighborhood BUT the location is NOT, therefore not in the character of the neighborhood. **The vertical siding is definitely not in the character of the neighborhood either. All have clapboard style or the 1950 asphalt style siding.**



It is wonderful (!) the front is currently shown to be similar to the other of the houses on Cabot St. Many people walk this neighborhood because it has many of the original factory houses built for the many employees of different status. We are always grateful when people present houses that try to fit in, perhaps a simple addition of a faux door and front steps and changing the vertical siding to clapboard style or even shakes would be more in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Not being able to see the pocket garden because a garage has been added is sad enough. The removal of 2 spaces for guests and the location of the master bedroom could become issues when the restaurant opens.

Building Photo



(<https://images.vgsi.com/photos2/PortsmouthNHPhotos/000119635.jpg>)

Sincerely, Elizabeth Bratter, Property Owner 159 McDonough St.

June 12, 2023

Dear BoA Committee,

This is to state my approval for the variance request for Karyn Denicola at 281 Cabot. As an abutter, I am happy that the property will be renovated and am in agreement with the requested variances.

Please approve this request.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Meister
287 Cabot Street