

From: [Bonham, Jeanette](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: 72 Islington Against 30 Parker Street
Date: Tuesday, August 8, 2023 6:44:14 AM

Good morning,

I called on Friday am and again this am. I have not been called back in regard to the memorandum I got for 30 Parker street.

I have many of these notices and what is blatantly apparent is we are building a Houston TX right here in Portsmouth. Too much building and concrete and not enough land. We already have big issues with storm run off and too much water. We pump into a dry well 24/7 out of our carriage house and when we talk to the city, they tell us it is our problem. Yet, we have been told since 2008 that the city is aware of the high water table and are discussing what to do about it, yet, nothing has been done. The most recent example is the new building going up near the new garage that several years ago David D. questioned the water table being too high and it was not approved (for many reasons), yet, suddenly it is now going up. Another five story building got approved around the corner from the garage. It is 2023 and nothing has been done in regard to this situation, yet, we continue to build more hotels.

I am writing about the Parker street variance. However, an even bigger problem is all but one of these items request variances from section 10.521 where permission is being requested (and in 95% of the instances, granted) to take up more land. We are against giving variances to everyone who requests one, which is what the city is doing in 95% of the requests. I have collected all the letters we have received over the years. Letting the Waldwick's be 1.5 feet where 10 feet is required and 2 feet where 20 feet is required is outrageous. They will have no lawn and 3.5 total feet of drainage/ vs. 30 feet. This is a perfect example of what I stated at the beginning of this email, the fact that we are turning any open land into building and concrete.

Jeanette Bonham

Notice of Confidentiality: **This E-mail and any of its attachments may contain Lincoln National Corporation proprietary information, which is privileged, confidential, or subject to copyright belonging to the Lincoln National Corporation family of companies. This E-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this E-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this E-mail is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this E-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this E-mail and any printout. This email and its attachments may collect your personal information to improve Lincoln's products or to provide you with services related to its products. For more

From: [Bonham, Jeanette](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: Abutter Notice for 72 Islington Street
Date: Monday, October 9, 2023 7:33:43 AM

30 Parker Street-

I called for the last abutter notice for this location and am assuming that since it appears mostly (98%) of all the 10.521 variances are approved that the one we got for Oct 17th meeting will be approved also.

We wrote a letter to the city back in 2008 and asked David D. what was being done about the high water table. At that time we were told that the city was looking into it. The structure that originally was not approved next to the foundry garage and now is approved; one of the broadcasted meetings had David D. noting the high water table.

We consistently yield in this city to developers. We at every area, approve land to be consumed by buildings and concrete, yet, we do nothing about the high water table and tell our city tax payers that water on their land is their issue.

This is yet another example of this in the Creeley Family Trust and Bobby and Angela Braswell requests (the same notice) where they want to consume more land...one for zero feet where 20 feet of yard is required.

Please advise that you were in receipt of this message.

Jet Bonham

Notice of Confidentiality: ****This E-mail and any of its attachments may contain Lincoln National Corporation proprietary information, which is privileged, confidential, or subject to copyright belonging to the Lincoln National Corporation family of companies. This E-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this E-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this E-mail is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this E-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this E-mail and any printout. This email and its attachments may collect your personal information to improve Lincoln's products or to provide you with services related to its products. For more information, please see our [privacy policy](#). Thank You.****

From: [Linda Brown](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: 550 Sagamore Ave request
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:31:08 PM

Zoning Board of Adjustment,

I am contacting you in opposition to the request of the Frances Mouflouze Trust to construct two duplexes in a single residentially zoned lot.

I request that the city adhere to the ordinance as written that it remain a single residential lot, one house per acre of land. Adding more residential dwellings than what it is zoned for will be detrimental to the neighborhood by adding to additional traffic on an already overburdened Avenue, it also will add to the difficulty we are experiencing entering and leaving our driveways. Most of my neighbors have lived in their houses for several years, when we bought them we did so because we did not want to live in a space any closer to surrounding dwellings than we presently are. Although we do live on a very busy road we all have lovely private back yards that we take great pride in. To change the zoning just to increase financial gain upon selling a property for development purposes does not pose a hardship and the zoning should remain as is.

Thank you for your time, I will see you at the meeting on October 27th.

Sincerely,
Linda Brown

Sent from my iPad

To: Members of the Portsmouth Zoning Board of Adjustment

From: Daphne Chiavaras

Date: 10/17/23

Re: 30 Parker St. request for variances

After careful thought, and as a direct abutter to 30 Parker St, I am writing to address two specific variances that I reviewed criteria and believe warrant special attention in the upcoming decision process.

#4 Granting the variance would not diminish the value of the surrounding properties

#5 A variance is necessary to enable a "reasonable use" of the property.

- I would like to express my concerns about the proposed property structure being only 2' away from my property line given ordinance requires 10'.
The height of the proposed shed structure is not clearly outlined in the plans, however, the height appears to be 4' higher than my property fence at 11' wide and at only 2' away from my property line.
The mass of the proposed structure raises issues about the potential negative impact on the value of my property in regard to a sense of being boxed in and overall openness from my yard.
- My property is situated at a lower elevation on the hill. Given the drainage patterns, water naturally flows in my direction. The placement of the downspout on the proposed structure is in close proximity to my fence. This could lead to increase water flow/ice to my property. I would like to see alternative draining solutions be addresses to ensure that the proposed construction does not adversely impact my property.
- I understand my neighbors need for storage and although the ordinance requires a 10' setback, I think it is reasonable that the proposed structure be 2-3' away from my property line, and would like to see the proposed structure no higher than the current existing structure.

Dear Zoning Board,

In 2022, my husband, two children and I visited many houses in hopes of finding a home in Portsmouth. We visited so many houses, looking for a home that was close enough to downtown our teenagers would have the freedom to walk there, and yet that still had the character of being in a single-family home neighborhood. It was literally a dream come true when we found 546 Sagamore Ave, and were able to buy it last December. We have loved getting to know our house and neighborhood, and hope to stay here for many years.

Given my happiness with our new home, and my affection for the neighborhood, I was surprised and taken aback when I learned that the house next door to us had applied for a variance to move from being a single family home to two duplexes, housing four different families on what is supposed to be a single family lot. One of the primary draws for my family and I in buying this house was that it was in a single family community. I have nothing against multi-family homes - I have lived in several, and enjoy the community of the Sagamore Apartments across the street from us. However, Sagamore Avenue is a large street and I can state with authority that living on the side of Sagamore Ave without the apartments and multi-family dwellings is quantifiably different than living on the side with single-family dwellings. One only has to cross the street to see and feel the difference between the two - there are cars frequently going in and out of the parking spaces in the apartments, lights from inside and outside the homes, and a significant increase of noise compared to the single-family side of the street. With multi-family homes, there is an inevitable increase in traffic, both human and vehicular on every front, since more people create more activity.

My family chose to move to 546 Sagamore specifically because we did not want to have the multi-family experience in our backyard. We were (and are) looking for a place where the character of single family homes is part of the neighborhood. Our kitchen, den and bedroom windows all look out directly at 550 Sagamore Ave. I cannot imagine how having four families as next door neighbors instead of one family will not negatively impact my own family's living experience with the inevitable increase in foot traffic, cars, lighting, and noise that would accompany this change in zoning and in the character of our street.

When we were choosing where to live on the Seacoast, my family visited several different cities and towns. One of the reasons that we settled on Portsmouth is because it embraced a multitude of housing opportunities, from single family dwelling zones to multi-family, rural areas and commercial. My family chose to buy in a single-family zone less than a year ago with the expectation that we were, in fact, going to be living in a single family zone. I am grateful for this opportunity to respectfully request that the Zoning Board consider what kind of impact granting this variance might have not only on the character of Sagamore Avenue, but on those of us who bought homes in good faith that we would be part of a single-family home neighborhood. Thank you for your time and your consideration.

Sincerely,
Christana Wille McKnight
546 Sagamore Avenue
Portsmouth NH 03801

Margaret Hodges
357 Richards Avenue
Portsmouth NH 03801
(603) 431-2545
mhodges_62@comcast.net

29 September 2023

Zoning Board of Adjustment
City of Portsmouth

RE: Support for 337 Richards Ave. project

Dear Board Members,

My name is Margaret Hodges. I, with my husband Kevin, are the owners of the property located at 357 Richards Avenue. Our property directly abuts the Creeleys to the south on Richards Avenue.

We have reviewed the Creeley's updated plans for a proposed one-car garage addition and related improvements. We are in support of their variance requests and believe they are consistent with the spirit and intent of the zoning requirements. We also feel that the proposed design is architecturally and historically sensitive to both the existing property and the neighborhood, and we anticipate no reduction in our ability to enjoy our own property as a result of the Creeley's actions.

I thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Margaret Hodges

Margaret Hodges
357 Richards Avenue
Portsmouth NH 03801

From: mimic315@aol.com
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: re zoning variance 337 Richards Ave.
Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 2:20:31 PM

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I live across Lincoln Ave. from Sean and Andrea Creeley and have reviewed the proposed changes to their property at 337 Richards Ave. I have no objections to the changes they propose to make; in fact, I think the proposed changes are sensible. After all, a recognizable main entrance and a garage big enough to fit a family car are not extreme changes.

The Creeleys have been respectful of the wishes of the neighbors whose property directly abuts theirs and have kept their planning focused on answering needs of the current property. The proposed changes maintain the character of their house and the neighborhood in which it sits. Please grant their request for a variance.

If you have questions for me, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Mary McIver
315 Richards Ave.
Portsmouth, NH
603-431-6823

Robert Newby



+16035029826

bob_newby@comcast.net

183 Miller Avenue Portsmouth NH 03801

October 7, 2023

City of Portsmouth
Attn: Stefanie Casella, Planner
Zoning Board of Adjustment
1 Junkins Avenue
Portsmouth, NH 03801

RE: Variance Application of Sean and Andrea Creeley, Trustees of the Creeley Family Trust
337 Richards Avenue, Tax Map 130, Lot 2

Dear Stefanie et al:

My wife and I reside a short distance from 337 Richards Avenue. We regularly walk by the property and occasionally visit with its owners, Sean and Andrea Creely, their children, and their dogs. We consider ourselves blessed to have Andrea and Sean as our neighbors. They are part of our neighborhood's fabric.

I have thoroughly reviewed Derek R. Durbin's July 24, 2023 letter submitted to you on behalf of the Creeley family. (A copy of that letter with its supporting documents is attached to this email, in order to avoid any possible confusion.)

I want to voice my unqualified support for Sean's and Andrea's application for a variance regarding the replacement of their garage as outlined in Attorney Durbin's letter. My support is unqualified.

This garage replacement, along with the other improvements they are planning for their property, will do nothing but positively add to our neighborhood's character and visual appeal. It will have no negative effect whatsoever.

Accordingly, I strongly encourage the Zoning Board of Adjustment to grant the Creely's application without modification, and to do so in a timely manner.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Newby