

Izak Gilbo

From: Marcia MacCormack <marciamaccormack@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 3, 2023 12:58 AM
To: Planning Info
Subject: HDC Meeting Point of View Condominium Association

Planning and Sustainability
Peter Britt

I am opposed to all the expansions that have been and continue to be proposed at this location.

I am a direct abutter

I was not told the truth regarding the intentions the Thompson's had with this property

This is a narrow dead end with no turning available and old houses directly on the street.
No thought was ever given to the impact of increased traffic.

No thought was given to the expansion of the parking area

The City issued a building permit without DES approvals as to the change in use

Why is electrical equipment now needed in the "toy house"?

What is the current zoning for this location ?

In my view everything about this has been done with no thought given to the impact on the residents of the street only the self created hardship of Point of View Condominium Association and the City's complicity in the problem

I'm assuming that all my communications regarding this situation are included in the file

Sincerely

Marcia MacCormack
53 Salter

Izak Gilbo

From: Larry Serandos <larryserandos@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 1, 2023 8:40 PM
To: Planning Info
Cc: Larry Serandos; Ron AAABushnell
Subject: HDC Public Hearing for December 6, 2023; Petition of John Galt LLC

As the owners of the only two direct abutting buildings (22/26 Market and 21 Daniel St) we have concern regarding the addition of a rooftop addition. One concern is the affect of sunlight to the abutting buildings. Top floor of 21 Daniel is residential and we would not want to take away additional sunlight from these residences which already were negatively impacted by the newly constructed Brick Market building. Sunlight for 22/26 Market is also crucial for the dome housing the Historic Stained Glass Ceiling that makes the 1803 building (with the Bank of New Hampshire occupying the site since 1782) to be listed on the National Register of Historic places. To hinder sunlight and and darken the dome and stained glass ceiling would be a major detriment to the historic character of the Market Square area. Visitors from all over come to view the Stained Glass and without light it will be diminished.

Our other major concern is that during the construction of the Brick Market building that also abuts our two properties, not enough protection was planned and executed resulting in our two properties suffering considerable damages that required us going to court to get the repairs. We would like the City to take a more proactive approach this time, considering all the inconvenience the entire area suffered from that project, and require some sort of Guarantee Bond so that if there is damage we could collect from the bond, without litigation. The Stained Glass Dome is priceless, and even though we have a \$1 million insurance policy on it, we would not want it damaged in any way due to this request to needlessly increase the square footage of the applicant's building.

We don't believe this proposed addition adds historic value to the downtown district but rather takes away from Portsmouth's Market Square and its most historic property at 22/26 Market, the oldest Bank Building in the US.

The similar addition to the Bank of America Building at 3 Pleasant Street which is also abutting our property was out of character and was not an addition to the historic character of Portsmouth. Denying this application it in no way harms Portsmouth character. Granting it, comes at great risk to the character especially if careful study has not been done to the impact to the neighbors and the historic nature of the area.

Regards,

Larry Serandos, LBJ Properties LLC
Ron Bushnell, LCB Properties LLC