

CITY COUNCIL E-MAILS

Received: August 3, 2023 (after 9:00 a.m.) – August 7, 2023 (before 5:00 p.m.)

August 7, 2023 Council Meeting

ADDENDUM

Submitted on Thu, 08/03/2023 - 17:41

**Full Name**

Patricia Bagley

**Email**

[patbagley@aol.com](mailto:patbagley@aol.com)

**Subject**

McNabb "gift"

**Address**

213 Pleasant St

**Message**

Honorable Mayor and City Councilors,

We recently have frequented the Bagel Works and, unexpectedly, observed quite a bit relevant to the current Council discussion about High Street parking spaces.

As much as I love Portsmouth (and I do), there is nothing attractive about Market Square during Summer chaos. On Mondays in particular, trash/recycling day, while sitting inside the Bagel Works, I could not see the two outdoor diners on the street because they were obliterated by the stacked up recycling boxes on the sidewalk. This is NOT a reflection on DPW, but rather an observation that, sometimes, less is more, meaning we are trying to be Europe in Portsmouth. What is desirable about being sandwiched in (no pun intended) by recycling and jersey barriers, then parked cars, then moving traffic? Perhaps that's why there were hardly any diners present.

Traffic on Congress Street moves so slowly that sometimes I forget they are actually moving vehicles, backed up from one end to the other. Cars are joined by tractor trailers, dump trucks, cement trucks, as well as motorcycles and pedestrians trying to cross safely through this insanity.

Days other than Mondays are similar minus the trash/recycling towers. Monday is just the least attractive.

One of my observations of the two 15-minute parking spots outside of Bagel Works is how often they are utilized. They service the Doordash orders in Bagel Works ready for pickup. They service the assortment of sandwich and coffee shops nearby. They also add to our parking revenue because drivers sometimes think they can beat the 15 minutes allowed and not feed the meter. Nope, our trustworthy parking enforcers are at the ready. The situation is similar alongside Starbucks. Of course it is.

Short-term spaces are utilized a lot, and for the developer or a councilor to readily dismiss them is arrogant and insensitive to the public who depend upon them.

Mr. McNabb is making you an offer you can't refuse. All you have to do is eliminate 5 parking spaces, and, poof, a magical transformation will occur after 18 months of disruption. Plus extensions. We do remember multiple extensions along Daniel and Penhallow Street? I'm certain the impacted businesses remember.

Mr. McNabb needs those spaces gone. They are in the way of his construction. While his "gift" serves the city, no doubt a beautified pedestrian way enhances his real estate project. But did he not say this gift won't benefit him? Let's move someone else's dumpster as well. And why not shutter the High St. entrance to the garage because, you know, three entrances are overkill. To him that entrance is just an unsightly nuisance, like the J J Newbury dumpster. What happens to the tractor trailers and large trucks which deliver to businesses in that neighborhood? They arrive regularly, another observation from Market Square lunches.

Mr. McNabb doesn't want to give the Mayor the information he asked for, and where were the rest of you on this? Thank you, Mayor, for pushback.

In closing it appears that most councilors have already decided that the public won't miss these spaces, and they can be added, at some point, to those...where, exactly? Alongside the jersey barriers?

My final observation is that transparency works wonders mixed with even a small dose of humility. It's difficult to understand why it's not the chosen path. Instead we are presented the wonder of Oz, including the curtain.

Respectfully,

Patricia Bagley

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes**

**Submitted on Fri, 08/04/2023 - 23:37**

**Full Name**

Marcio von Muhlen

**Email**

[marciovm@gmail.com](mailto:marciovm@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Stop wasting money on McIntyre

**Address**

303 Thaxter

**Message**

Let a private developer pursue the McIntyre. City governments generally don't make for good developers and our history with this particular property speaks for itself. The city's energy could be better spent finding parcels to rezone to "missing middle" residential, such as the many underused retail and parking lots walking distance from downtown.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 08:14**

**Email**

[kte2325@gmail.com](mailto:kte2325@gmail.com)

**Subject**

McIntyre

**Message**

Dear Mayor McEachern,

As a City Councilor, I thought you did an excellent job, you were well informed and showed good decision making. When you became Mayor, I was quite impressed by your ability to step into your new role, face the challenges it presented and show leadership qualities. In fact, I even complimented your abilities in a letter shortly after you took office. But sadly, either knowingly or not, your desire to advance your political career is overshadowing your responsibilities to the citizens of this city.

Your latest campaign to acquire the McIntyre building is a transparent attempt to appease the higher-ups. What could be better for one's political career path than answering President Biden's call of duty by acquiring the elusive McIntyre Federal Building? But your ambition disregards the realities of what accompanies the McIntyre building and its potential ownership. Still a long shot, but if the building were obtained have you done any pro-forma analysis on associated costs? How long will the permitting process take, years perhaps? What will the carrying costs be? What's the cost of renovation and remediation. What will be the return on investment? Is affordable housing really the highest and best use for this valuable site?

Those in our community who are passionate, perhaps obsessed with obtaining the McIntyre have spent countless hours on designs and have plead their cases tirelessly to numerous City Councils. If you think the community is divided now over this property, wait until it's revealed there will be no community space, no green space, and no Post Office as part of the redevelopment. If the intent is to incorporate these wants into the new development, then who will pay for it, the taxpayer? At what cost? This is a no-win situation.

Learn from history. How many times will our City Councilors trip over themselves running to put their names on the next "big thing" for Portsmouth? We spent five million dollars obtaining land for the Foundry Garage, a parcel valued at one million dollars. When the McIntyre partnership was being debated in 2017, two Councilors wisely spoke in opposition. They stated, among other things that the city should not be in the real-estate business, and that they didn't have enough information to make an informed decision. As we all know, the Council did not listen and look where we are all these years later. Millions spent, no McIntyre and an eight-figure lawsuit. What will it take to learn our lesson?

Your decision to move forward with yet another attempt to acquire the McIntyre appears to have been made. I hope for the good of Portsmouth, your fellow Councilors will look beyond the emotion, look beyond the politics and look at the hard reality. A decision to acquire the McIntyre building will be a historic and catastrophic mistake for Portsmouth. Let's allow the building to be sold on the open market. Let's trust the land use boards to control its development which certainly will include affordable housing. And let's be satisfied with the substantial tax revenue this site will generate.

Best regards

Kyle Engle

24 Hunking street.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 09:11**

**Full Name**

Maria Sillari

**Email**

[msillari14@gmail.com](mailto:msillari14@gmail.com)

**Subject**

McIntyre conversion to affordable housing

**Address**

171 Jones Avenue

**Message**

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

Please vote in favor of Mayor McEachern's motion at the August 7th City Council meeting to direct city staff to pursue transfer of the McIntyre property from the GSA through its new program to convert surplus federal property to affordable housing.

The serendipitous timing of this new program with the continued availability of the McIntyre property is an opportunity to increase Portsmouth's affordable housing inventory and should not be missed.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Full Name**

Brian Gibb

**Email**

[bkgibb@gmail.com](mailto:bkgibb@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Monday night vote to support pursuit of the McIntyre

**Address**

348 Maplewood Ave

**Message**

Honorable Mayor & Council Members,

As you vote on whether to "direct our city staff to pursue the transfer of the McIntyre Property for the purpose of converting the commercial space into workforce housing", I'd like to remind you of things the City Manager and her staff advised you of in the May report: "city has been unable to identify an affordable housing partner who believes that the site can be readily redeveloped for such a purpose."

"the cost of redevelopment, the timing challenges to secure funding from the variety of sources that are typically accessed for such projects and the history of controversy and community disagreement, which makes securing partners and funding particularly challenging."--"An investment of approximately \$61 million would be required just to make the building suitable for municipal office use," according to city staff, and that investment would result "in a substantial increase to the tax rate." Take out the cost of purchase and that leaves \$36M in hazardous material remediation and design and renovation costs. I'll also highlight the opinion that this could result in "substantial increase to the tax rate". I was supportive of the effort to acquire the building for \$1 and turn it into a public use area. This revised purpose is ill-advised in my opinion. Please consider voting against it and let's move on from this divisive issue to more important matters. Thanks as always for your efforts and service and for listening to residents. Best, Brian

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 11:02**

**Full Name**

Dave Mitchell

**Email**

[dave@amaruq.com](mailto:dave@amaruq.com)

**Subject**

McIntyre building

**Address**

1179 Maplewood Avenue

**Message**

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

I thoroughly support the ideas presented in the Mayor's recent letter concerning the McIntyre building. Since we've decided not to drop the issue completely, I think this is the best use, and a worthwhile approach.

thanks,

Dave

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 11:05**

**Full Name**

Barbara Grazier

**Email**

[barbaragrazier@comcast.net](mailto:barbaragrazier@comcast.net)

**Subject**

McIntyre Building

**Address**

504 Middle Street

**Message**

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

Please vote in favor of Mayor McEachern's motion at the August 7th City Council meeting to direct city staff to pursue transfer of the McIntyre property from the GSA through its new program to convert surplus federal property to affordable housing.

The serendipitous timing of this new program with the continued availability of the McIntyre property is an opportunity to increase Portsmouth's affordable housing inventory and should not be missed.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes**

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 11:07**

**Full Name**

Ramona Dow

**Email**

[rdow@comcast.net](mailto:rdow@comcast.net)

**Subject**

McIntyre Bldg-Workforce Housung

**Address**

571 Dennett Street

**Message**

I am writing to encourage all of you to support our mayor's proposal to use the McIntyre Bldg for workforce housing. Portsmouth needs that desperately and I would rather see that use than high end condos or office bldgs. What a wonderful statement that would make in working towards solving Portsmouth's pressing need!

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes**

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 11:35**

**Full Name**

Susan Dewhirst

**Email**

[sdewhirst04@gmail.com](mailto:sdewhirst04@gmail.com)

**Subject**

McIntyre for Workforce Housing!

**Address**

44 Cliff Road

**Message**

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

Please vote in favor of Mayor McEachern's motion at the August 7th City Council meeting to direct city staff to pursue transfer of the McIntyre property from the GSA through its new program to convert surplus federal property to affordable housing.

The serendipitous timing of this new program with the continued availability of the McIntyre property is an opportunity to increase Portsmouth's affordable housing inventory and should not be missed.

With appreciation for your service, Susan Dewhirst

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes**

---

**Email**

[g.wiz.dozier@gmail.com](mailto:g.wiz.dozier@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Repurposing TJMcIntyre building into workforce housing

**Address**

35 Anne Avenue, #2

**Message**

Greetings, Folks,

I am a lifelong resident of Portsmouth, am 76 yo and still have lots of chutzpah left in me, willing to do my best in this Fair City before my time is up on this planet. Trouble is, 38 months ago I was furloughed from my last job, spent decades in IT, Customer Service, Graphics and Publications and Teaching and Training...but now continue to search for a decent job (age discrimination at its worst 🙄). Meanwhile I must add \$400 to my monthly Social Security check to pay my Portsmouth rent. I was born here and will die here, but during this interstitial period would like to live peacefully and simply in "workforce housing," given I fully expect to be reemployed at some point. So I speak loud and clear in favor of your efforts to acquire the McIntyre building for (at least in part) to provide some additional workforce housing for those of us in the local workforce.. There is no more fitting repurposing of the Senator Thomas J. McIntyre building than this. Decades ago I had the honor to have connected with the Senator several times, and know this would be a further acknowledgment of his positive senatorial work in our behalf. I do hope you can make this happen. Thank you.

Peace,

Gary Dozier

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 12:01**

**Full Name**

Benita Cormier

**Email**

[bcormier222@gmail.com](mailto:bcormier222@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Federal Building downtown

**Address**

155 Codfish Corner Rd

**Message**

I think we definitely need affordable housing in Portsmouth. All I see are these huge developments of Apartments and Condos for the wealthy! Our children can't afford to live in their home town! We need workers in the community that can afford to work and live here! So many businesses are suffering or going out of business as there is no workforce. Listen to the citizens that have lived here for years and need affordable housing! Thank you!

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted values are:****Full Name**

Patti Palen

**Email**

[ppalen11@comcast.net](mailto:ppalen11@comcast.net)

**Subject**

McIntyre building Affordable Housing

**Address**

46 ridges ct

**Message**

I am in Support of Mayor McEachern's efforts by this email to our City Councilors prior to Monday's meeting.

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

Please vote in favor of Mayor McEachern's motion at the August 7th City Council meeting to direct city staff to pursue transfer of the McIntyre property from the GSA through its new program to convert surplus federal property to affordable housing.

The serendipitous timing of this new program with the continued availability of the McIntyre property is an opportunity to increase Portsmouth's affordable housing inventory and should not be missed.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 13:36**

**Email**

[carissasteuerwald@gmail.com](mailto:carissasteuerwald@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Affordable housing

**Address**

Portsmouth, New Hampshire

**Message**

I am asking our City Staff to pursue the transfer of the McIntyre Property from the GSA at no cost for the purpose of converting the commercial space into workforce housing. As someone currently living and working in downtown Portsmouth, I am constantly concerned about rising rent and looking at the market for apartments is nothing short of terrifying. Affordable housing simply isn't attainable for a couple both working full time, never mind a single person. I urge you to use any and all power and resources available to turn the McIntyre Property into affordable workforce housing.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 15:32**

**Full Name**

Joanne Wolfe

**Email**

[joannewolfe@comcast.net](mailto:joannewolfe@comcast.net)

**Subject**

Support for Affordable Housing at McIntyre

**Address**

213 Gates St Apt 1

**Message**

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

I strongly support Mayor McEachern's proposal to direct city staff to pursue transfer of the McIntyre property from the GSA through its new program to convert surplus federal property to affordable housing.

This new GSA/White House program to encourage the use of excess GSA property for affordable housing is precisely directed at properties like the McIntyre building and is an amazing opportunity to increase Portsmouth's affordable housing inventory and an opportunity that should not be missed.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sat, 08/05/2023 - 21:55**

**Full Name**

Laura Montville

**Email**

[lauramontville@gmail.com](mailto:lauramontville@gmail.com)

**Subject**

McIntyre bldg and usage

**Address**

40 Brackett Rd

**Message**

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

Please vote in favor of Mayor McEachern's motion at the August 7th City Council meeting to direct city staff to pursue transfer of the McIntyre property from the GSA through its new program to convert surplus federal property to affordable housing.

The timing of this new program with the continued availability of the McIntyre property is an opportunity to increase Portsmouth's affordable housing inventory and should not be missed.

Signed,

Laura Montville

Citizen of Portsmouth

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sun, 08/06/2023 - 11:40**

**Full Name**

Trisha Anderson

**Email**

[tlr803@mail.harvard.edu](mailto:tlr803@mail.harvard.edu)

**Subject**

McIntyre rehab costs --please share with citizens

**Address**

328 Aldrich Rd

**Message**

Hello, My name is Trisha Anderson and I'm a Portsmouth resident. I appreciate the Mayor thinking out-of-the box with the McIntyre property and it's potential to be used as affordable housing, but I'd like more information for citizens to consider. 1) Specifically, do you know what it would cost the city to turn this building into affordable housing (or anything else)? It's my understanding that it would need substantial remediation and work. 2) Can you speak to the impact this cost would have on taxpayers (e.g: does the average tax bill increase by \$200 dollars? \$2000 dollars? 3) Given a finite budget, what other major initiatives or projects would be affected by investing heavily in McIntyre at this time?

I am pro-affordable housing, but am wary of this particular building given it's history and the real costs of remediation. More info is needed when determining whether this is a good move for the city. Thanks for reading!

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes**

---

**Submitted on Sun, 08/06/2023 - 18:58**

**Full Name**

Primo Tosi

**Email**

[primo40@aol.com](mailto:primo40@aol.com)

**Subject**

Transfer of city owned property on Ruth Street

**Address**

2 Ruth St.

**Message**

Mayor McEachern and City Council Members

On July 10th 2023 My wife and I sent you an email (see below) regarding the transfer of city owned property located at the end of Ruth St. The email provides a history of how the street came to be as well as how it ended up in its current condition. This property is the turnaround that was covered over during construction of the houses at the end of the street and the boulders and gardens they (previous owners) subsequently put in.

We also wanted to make the council aware that Ruth St has no storm drains. During storms water runs down the street across what's left of the turn around then down a natural trench down to the North Mill Pond. Because the original turnaround has been covered and gardens and boulders put in, the water puddles up on the turnaround until it builds up enough to run down to the pond. I've seen a couple of click and fix requests to have the problem fixed. Our concern is that if the city gives up the property in question how will you be able to fix the drainage issue now and in the future and ensure that the road drains properly and gets filtered naturally before dumping into the Mill Pond. We hope that the city maintains ownership of the property so they can provide any necessary repairs and maintenance both now and in the future.

I plan to attend Mondays city council meeting but I am hesitant to speak as I have Parkinson's disease making public speaking difficult for me. I will make myself available to answer any questions the council may have.

Respectfully

Primo J Tosi and Sue Black

Previous July 10th email containing Ruth Street history

Portsmouth City Council members,

It has come to our attention that our neighbor at 12 Ruth St. is in the process of trying to obtain a section of the turnaround at the end of Ruth St.. It is our understanding that this is being done per a state law that says if the city fails to develop a property after 20 years the property shall be returned back to the previous property owner. They say that the property is part of a paper street. I'm not a lawyer but I do know the history of this street very well.

The section of the street that was considered a paper street is the northern end of the street. That was there for a very long time undeveloped. In 1968 my parents purchased land from Emerson McCourt in order to build a house. The McCourts had the road put in and all the land around it was divided into lots. The engineering drawing called out the specifications for the size of the turnaround. These specifications were to ensure the turnaround was large enough for emergency vehicles to turn around. After the street was installed the

city allowed Mr. McCourt to name it as he was the one who had it put in. He named it after his wife Ruth and at that point the new street and the old northern section of road all became Ruth St..

When constructed the turnaround was circular and much bigger than it is today. It had drainage ditches around the circumference that drained the water runoff towards the North Mill Pond. In other words the property was developed.

The previous owner of property located on the turnaround covered a large portion of the turnaround when they filled the lot to build their house. The turnaround was not re-established and they put in gardens and installed large boulders on the property making it look like theirs.

How do I know all this? My family has lived on Ruth Street since it was built. We were the first family to have a house on the street having built it in 1969. I grew up there and my parents lived there until their passing at which time my wife and I moved in and still live there today. Before the other houses were built us kids used the turnaround as our circular race track for our mini bikes.

With all that said my wife and I feel the city did develop the turnaround and that the land should remain city property. We don't feel there is a need to alter it's current status but felt that the council should know all of the history before rendering a decision.

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sun, 08/06/2023 - 20:00**

**Full Name**

Mary Lou and Bob McElwain

**Email**

[ml259@comcast.net](mailto:ml259@comcast.net)

**Subject**

McIntyre

**Address**

259 South Street

**Message**

We are strongly opposed to the city acquiring the McIntyre after 20 plus years of indecision and mismanagement. The residents deserve to know the the total spent from day one; consultants (on design plans, legal fees, the new hire of a DC law firm) , law suits ( paid and pending) , maintenance costs, before the Council even considers a vote on workforce housing at this site. We the taxpayers need more financial information from the City Manager and the Council. Maybe it's time to bring this idea up for a citizens's vote.

And please specifically define workforce housing as it might pertain to any parcel in Portsmouth.

Thank you.Mary Lou and Bob McElwain

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Sun, 08/06/2023 - 21:58**

**Full Name**

Tom Nies

**Email**

[tnies@aol.com](mailto:tnies@aol.com)

**Subject**

Ethics Ordinance Changes

**Address**

419 Richards Avenue

**Message**

Councilors

I thank the Governance Committee for working to clarify the Ethics Ordinance. While I support most of the proposed changes to the ordinance, I do believe there are a few shortfalls that should be addressed before it is taken to a public hearing. These comments are written before the August 7 Governance Committee meeting.

Proposed revisions to Section 1.801 (Definitions) clarifies that Direct Personal Interest extends to family members (broadly defined). While this is helpful, the definition of a direct interest is silent on the employer/employee relationship: does an employee have a personal interest in matters that affect the employer? I argue that this is in fact the case, and the definition of a direct personal interest should include such relationships. Similarly, this definition should address situations where the person is an officer in an organization such as a non-profit or business.

In addition, the definition limits personal interest to financial gain. I believe this should not be so restrictive. There may be issues that do not lead to a financial gain but clearly benefit a private interest. This possibility is clearly envisioned by Section 1.802B, which requires Councilors to declare an "...other private interest...", yet the definition section does not provide any guidance on what that might be.

Section 1.802 seems to fall short on the requirements for recusal from a Council decision. The lack of guidance implies that recusal is never required as long as the interest is declared. This is a serious shortcoming, in my view, and does not promote the goal of accountable city government.



From an editing standpoint, it is unclear to me why both Section 1.802D and 1.802E are necessary. It seems that if 1.802E was edited to include the proposed changes to 1.802D, only one of these sections would be necessary.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Tom Nies

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Mon, 08/07/2023 - 02:32**

**Full Name**

Hannah Giovannucci

**Email**

[hannahgiov@gmail.com](mailto:hannahgiov@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Mayor Pursuing McIntyre For Affordable Housing From GSA

**Address**

599 Middle St Apt 8

**Message**

Hello City Council Members,

I learned of the mayor's proposal to negotiate with GSA to obtain McIntyre property at no cost for affordable housing per a federal program. I am a civil engineer in land development and transportation, so have extensive knowledge of complexity of design, permitting, and construction, along with timeline and costs. While I am in favor of affordable housing, is this City-owned McIntyre pursuit financially practical? If we pursue development of this property, what other projects are we sacrificing?

The McIntyre property is the heartbeat of the City of Portsmouth and is a high-value property. I admire the concept of artist/workforce utopia, and in my imagination as a completely redesigned property, I believe this would invigorate the City. Realistically, I envision a government-owned, aging, retrofitted McIntyre building becoming another rundown PHA property and tax burden to residents.

As you well know, McIntyre has been a very contentious project over the past 10-20 years. I feel these renewed efforts are well-meaning, but I wonder, realistically, whether this property should be left to a private developer. A developer would likely design, permit, and build this in 2-3 years. I rather collect tax revenue from developer-owned property and focus on a simpler affordable housing location, like Portsmouth-owned Lister Academy. Perhaps as an alternative, the City could persuade GSA to incorporate affordable housing as a condition of sale for future developer. The City and residents will still benefit from much needed housing.

The McIntyre project has many unknowns, particularly cost. We tax payers require more information to make an educated decision: concept designs, cost-benefit analysis, ROI, traffic impact analysis, parking study, tax increases, ownership costs, etc. I suspect we likely do not have time nor budget for any of this necessary information, while GSA is in process of auction.

I fear the City may be (again) underrating how contentious McIntyre will be, particularly with Portsmouth tax payers as stakeholders. Bureaucracy leads to higher design and permitting costs, so will it still be "affordable" by the end of construction? How long will tax payers be subsidizing housing and the development cost? PHA residents already complain of neglect with existing housing. Will McIntyre become PHA-managed?

Our local government has been struggling with matters as simple as roads. Arterial roads and connector streets to major highways have been continuously transformed by dangerous designs, like experimental roundabout, bike lanes, speed bumps, and street realignments designs? Portsmouth government does not have a solid track record and continually overspends. I understand we're almost \$20 million over budget over last 2 years alone.

I know the City of Portsmouth has the heart, but private sector usually develops better than government. The City has too many cooks in kitchen and stakeholders, including the entire Portsmouth tax-payer base. What happens upon City Council turnover? We going to redesign a million times? How much will that cost? How many more years will this development take?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Hannah Giovannucci

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting.** Yes

---

**Submitted on Mon, 08/07/2023 - 08:18**

**Full Name**

Paul Ringuette

**Email**

[paulnringuette@gmail.com](mailto:paulnringuette@gmail.com)

**Subject**

NO! McIntyre

**Address**

308 Richards Ave

**Message**

I believe fully the city should be involved in WFH, but the McIntyre location really wants me to say, WTF!

There are plenty of other locations out there that the city could invest in at, very likely, a fraction of the cost of what the McTrosity would run. Also, the city council should double its estimates of what it would cost to refurbish that site as you know there will be endless legal challenges and the cost of construction will just rise. So, what.... \$50,000,000, \$100,000,000??? Insane.....

STOP!!!!!!

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes**

---

**Submitted on Mon, 08/07/2023 - 15:47**

**Full Name**

Jim Smalley

**Email**

[jsmalleycfa@comcast.net](mailto:jsmalleycfa@comcast.net)

**Subject**

Workforce Housing at McIntyre; Zoning and Mandatory Parking

**Address**

352 Kearsarge Way

**Message**

Dear Councilors,

The mayor recently wrote an impassioned plea for workforce housing at the McIntyre given the lack of affordable housing in the city. The city incorrectly attributes the lack of affordable housing to market failure. Just last week the HDC turned down a private party's desire to put workforce housing in the Tuscan Market building, due to potentially changing the focal point of the building. A few months back, the mini units proposed for the old Statey bar, only a stones throw away from the Foundry garage, was turned down due mandatory minimum parking requirements. This isnt market failure, this is government failure. The city's zoning and multistep approval process impose supply constraints that drive up cost & reduce supply. This a government created problem.

In addition to proposing workforce housing at the McIntyre, how about Portsmouth review the current zoning that drives up cost and reduces supply and seek reduce or eliminate the city's self created problem?

A private developer recently proposed a \$3 million infrastructure gift to the city, yet there is hesitancy on the part of some councilors to accept the gift as doing so would sacrifice 5 parking spaces. Assuming the parking spaces generated \$6,000 each, \$30,000 a year, it would take 100 years, a century, to break even with the \$3 million gift. Yet the city lets the parking tail wag the dog.

I suggest getting rid of the mandatory parking minimums and make them parking maximums, with a variance required only if the developer requests more spaces than the maximum. Parking mandates are psuedo-science and also serve to drive up the cost of development.

Understanding the root cause of Portsmouth's significant contribution to and self inflicted lack of affordability should be a first step to solving the affordability crises.

Thank you,

Jim Smalley

**Please indicate if you would like your comment to be part of the public record for the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes**

---