

From: [Jonathan Paine](#)
To: [Planning - Info - Shr](#)
Subject: 92 Brewster Street
Date: Monday, March 17, 2025 10:45:58 AM

I'm writing to oppose the rear yard setback variance for the property at 92 Brewster st.

No other 3 story GRC houses in the neighborhood:

The proposed plan is a massive 3 story block of a house that will tower over the neighboring homes as a straight up 3 story wall.

Walking the neighborhood and using Portsmouth Mapgeo tool, there is not a single 3 story building zoned GRC in the neighborhood (anything north of Islington to North Mill Pond). In that area, anything GRC over 2 stories tall is accomplished using a 2 story structure with traditional roof styles such as gables and dormers on the third story.

Granting setback relief will significantly decrease neighbors light and air:

The proposal states:

“Density requirements and yard requirements exist to prevent overcrowding and to ensure adequate air, light, space, and separation between neighbors”

I agree. To grant setback relief for a property with such significant massing will have an enormous negative impact on the air, light, space and separation of all of the surrounding properties.

If the 92 Brewster homeowners would like to build a 3 story building, they are entitled to do so. But - if they are choosing to build something with such significant massing and differing in character from literally every other building in the neighborhood, I don't think they should ALSO be granted relief specifically allowing them to build it even closer to the neighbors than zoning allows.

Hardship to the neighbors significantly clearly outweighs hardship to 92 Brewster:

Cutting the rear setback from the required 20' to 10' will *significantly* decrease light and air for the surrounding properties due mostly to the significant massing of the house being proposed. The proposed building will have an undeniably negative effect on the surrounding properties' light and air.

On the other hand, the 92 Brewster building setbacks shown currently allow for a building footprint of roughly 30'x32' without any setback zoning relief. This 900+ sqft footprint is within the character of the neighborhood.

Without any setback relief, this lot allows for over 2700 sqft of living space were the owner to build a 3 story building similar to what they've proposed - just within the allowed setbacks.

This lot is buildable with no setback relief in a way that is consistent with the surrounding properties, including new/recent construction. There is no hardship to the owner pertaining to setbacks.

Variance for sqft per dwellings unit:

I do support the variance request of 2,884 sqft / dwelling unit where 3,500sqft / dwelling unit is required.

I think if the owner chose to build a house within the character of the existing neighborhood that didn't excessively detract from everyone else's light and air everyone would welcome the new addition!

Sincerely,
Jonathan Paine
91 Langdon St

Meeting: Zoning Board of Adjustments

Date: June 17, 2025

RE: 361 Miller Ave

Reason: unmentioned items and questionable size

Dear Members of the Zoning Board of Adjustments,

June 12, 2025

It would be nice to fully support the request by 361 Miller Ave to move the garage and protect the tree. It makes perfect sense to move that garage to a more convenient place. This would create a much better flow on the property and make the tree the central eye catching structure as opposed to the garage as one passes by on Miller Ave. The other advantage to rebuilding the garage is it would provide the minimum parking spaces for the 6 units (1.3 X 6=8).

However, the addition of the second floor on the garage leaves one wondering if **an ADU** is going to be added. Do rental units need bathrooms in the garage where there is supposed to be storage? What about heat? This is New England and any plumbing would need heat. There didn't seem to be any mention of an ADU in this application much less an addition of a bathroom on the second floor. Exhibit F on packet page 245 clearly shows a good size bathroom on the second floor of the garage. If the toilet is for a landscaper or repair person, wouldn't it be on the first floor? It just seems like a big expense for a 6 unit rental to add heat, hot water and plumbing for "storage".

Another question is on the bottom floor of Exhibit F on packet page 245. It shows the building is 24' long and 24' wide. The average **parking space** in a garage is between 18 to 20' in **length**. *Why are the parking spaces shown so short?* Looking at the 24' length with the 20' for a vehicle and 3 or 4' wide steps it will be quite full. Not at all as open as depicted in Exhibit F.

The final question that looms is **were the neighbors informed** (page 229 of the packet) about the bathroom on the second floor, the possibility of heat and a hot water heater being necessary and the interesting assignment of space in a 24 X 24' garage. **Would they still support these changes?**

All and all one would like to support this application **HOWEVER**, the addition of plumbing on the second floor and the very odd representation of the size of the actual use of space in Exhibit F may need to be addressed before moving forward with this application. The question of what the neighbors really were told may need to be addressed as well.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bratter

Property Owner, 159 McDonough St.