

**SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**CONFERENCE ROOM A  
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

**2:00 PM**

**September 2, 2025**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer (via Zoom); Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief; Vincent Hayes; Planner I

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**ADDITIONAL**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Stefanie Casella, Planner II; Kate Homet, Environmental Planner

**MINUTES**

**I. NEW BUSINESS**

- A.** The request of **Robert M. Snover Revocable Trust (Owner)**, for property located at **58 Humphrey's Court** requesting the Subdivision of an existing parcel into two new residential lots with the associated and required site improvements. The proposed "Lot 1" is 5,003 square feet with 80 feet of frontage and the proposed "Lot 2" is 5,002 square feet with 104.81 feet of frontage. The creation of the proposed lots would require the removal of the existing structure. Said property is located on Assessor Map 101 Lot 47 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. (LU-25-108)

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Derik Durbin (Durbin Law Offices), John Chagnon (Haley Ward) and the property owners, Robert Snover and Darcy Davidson, came to present this application. Mr. Chagnon briefly went over the proposed plans and the updates that had occurred since the previous meeting and then went through and addressed the staff comments received.

The Committee then discussed the topography of the lot, the proposed driveway locations, the lot area calculations, the City right of way, the historic aspect of the neighborhood, the historic lot lines and historic records of Humphrey's Court.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairman Stith opened the public hearing and multiple residents and abutters spoke.

Ben St. Jean of 54 Humphreys Court came to speak to the application and noted his concerns about this project shoehorning a lot that is too small and cited historic lot lines from a parcel map from 1937 which shows the lot radius at the edge of the street. In addition, he felt this project is being proposed with little consideration of the neighbors and it is not consistent with the neighborhood. He noted his belief that this construction could have an impact on his property and home, which could box in his home and reduce airflow between buildings. Mr. St. Jean said that he understands that the existing property could use a renovation but believes that this proposal does not conform with zoning. He requested that the committee reject this application.

Robin Ferrari of 44 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and noted her concerns about emergency services accessing the street, pedestrian safety, driving sight lines and blocking natural lighting in the neighborhood. She stated that she would rather see this lot have one single family home.

Bob Gunning of 43 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and brought up inconsistencies with the property line distances on the current survey compared to existing historical maps of the lot. He noted that he would like to see this investigated. He noted his belief that the lot is too small and believes that the corner of it belongs to the City by the right of adverse possession. He would like to see the City's Legal Department weigh in on this.

Jamie Baker of 75 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and noted that he does not believe that the easement corner will help the current property owner to meet their 10,000 s.f. lot area requirement. He asked the committee to deny this application or request that the applicants seek variances. He also stated that the residents of this neighborhood have hired a lawyer.

Rachel Kurshan of 33 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and noted her opposition to the subdivision and stated that she would not want a fence to go up on proposed triangular lots. She stated that it looked like the property has ledge which could impact abutting foundations if blasted. She expressed concerns over pedestrian safety and noted potential cramped conditions.

Whitney Warren of 59 New Castle Avenue came to speak to this application and he noted that his main concern was that if an easement is given that would be great but it would then cram two lots onto a small parcel. If an easement was not granted, then that would restrict the flow of traffic around that corner which could create major public safety issues.

Richard Samdperil of 22 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and noted that this proposed subdivision was not consistent with the historical subdivision of 100 years ago. He also expressed his concerns for pedestrian and traffic safety and noted his opposition to the proposed project.

Kim Sullivan of 63 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and noted that this neighborhood receives a lot of foot traffic and pedestrian traffic. She expressed concerns for the proposal and noted that it might increase vehicle traffic and therefore hinder pedestrian safety in the area.

John Arnold of Orr & Reno Law Firm, a representative of the abutters, came to speak to this application and noted that references that had been made to the general definitions of lot line and lot area are not enough. Mr. Arnold defined a boundary of a lot and noted that the front lot line is established by the boundary of the street, not the point that was shown on the plan. He noted that the zoning is not clear on how to define diagonal lot lines. He noted that the applicant should be providing proposed buildings and driveways. He suggested that the applicant should go to the Board of Adjustment to receive variances before coming back for this application. He believes that conformities such as lot depth need a closer look.

The public hearing was closed.

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Chagnon and Mr. Durbin addressed some of the comments made by the public and passed around a new plan set showing lot lines and lot distances. They discussed building lot lines and setbacks and potential for adjustments, along with the easement topic and lot areas.

Committee members then discussed amongst themselves issues with the City street being used as part of the applicant's lot, the triangular lot shapes and the opportunity to have the Legal Department weigh in on this discussion.

D. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this application until the October meeting so that staff could receive advice from the Legal Department. P. Britz seconded the motion. The Committee and applicants asked for clarification on the legal opinion being requested. The Committee voted unanimously to postpone the application.

Mr. St. Jean, one of the abutters, briefly spoke to the differing lot line distances from the historical maps to the current survey and noted that the neighbors have evidence showing these different lot distances.

- B.** The request of **PWED2 LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **921 Islington Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the reconstruction of the existing building for a restaurant use with associated site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 0172-0010172 Lot 10 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4-W). (LU-25-96)

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

John Chagnon (Haley Ward) and Megan Boland (Chinburg Properties) came to present this application. Mr. Chagnon quickly described the project and the previous work session the applicant team had done with the Committee and then handed out a hardcopy response to staff comments. Mr.

Chagnon reviewed each comment and responded to each. He then proceeded to go over the newest handout and plan sketches that addressed the latest comments.

The Committee then discussed and asked questions about the existing water lines, tree wells, catch basins, the need for an outdoor dining permit, directional signs and spillover of light shown on the lighting plan to abutting properties.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

The public hearing opened, no one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

The Committee then discussed with the applicant the need for handicapped parking spaces to be adjusted and run the length of the parking spot.

P. Britz made a motion to recommend approval of this project to the Planning Board with the following conditions:

1. A new directional sign be proposed, reviewed, approved and installed prior to the removal of any existing signage.
2. The proposed handicap parking space must run the whole length of the adjacent striped zone.
3. The tree well detail needs to be updated to a raised tree planter, not a well.
4. All improvements within the City's right-of-way will require final review, approval and inspection by DPW.
5. A third-party oversight review is required.

D. Desfosses seconded this motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The request of **Martin Husslage (Owner)**, for property located at **48-50 Langdon Street**, requesting preliminary and final Subdivision and Site Plan Review approval for the subdivision of one lot into two lots with a single-family dwelling and accessory dwelling proposed on each lot and associated site improvements. Proposed "Lot A" will have 70.62 feet of continuous street frontage and 5,664 square feet of lot area and proposed "Lot B" will have 132.5 feet of frontage and 4,264 square feet of lot area. Said property is located on Assessor Map 138 Lot 47 and lies within the General Residence C (GRC) District. (LU-25-124)

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Jason Cook and Corey Coldwell (TF Moran) came to present this application on behalf of the property owner. Mr. Cook described the existing lot conditions and the details of the proposed subdivision. He noted that Lot A and B would have single family three-story homes, each with a

driveway to access Langdon Street that would be 24' wide. He described the existing and proposed stormwater volumes and conditions and noted a slight increase in volumes. He then went on to address the comments received earlier from the Committee.

The Committee discussed the use of red oak trees, a sidewalk easement and including landscaping details on the utilities plan.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

The public hearing opened, no one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

The Committee asked about proposed grading and drainage, and the need for a stormwater connection permit.

P. Britz made a motion to recommend approval with the following conditions:

1. Please coordinate with assessing for proposed map/lot numbers.
2. Please coordinate with Jamie McCarty for ADU addressing.
3. Before a CO is issued, the ADU affidavit must be filed and the ownership must be verified.
4. Structure will be required to be demolished prior to subdivision recording. This shall be added as a note on the plan set as well.
5. Maximum allowed driveway opening width is 24 feet. Confirm driveway width.
6. Parking and Traffic Safety Committee will need to review driveway location for Lot B due to proximity to McDonough Street.
7. Extend drainage connections to the City drainage system for both lots. Current plan sheet flows stormwater over City sidewalks and can result in hazardous winter conditions.
8. Add a cleanout on sewer service to Lot B where it connects to existing sewer service.
9. Mill and pave Langdon Street curb to curb for entire length of disturbed areas.
10. Update sidewalk detail to City Standard 5.5' wide sidewalks.
11. Applicant shall change the proposed red maple trees to be planted with a species more suitable to the site constraints.
12. City requires a sidewalk easement for the extra foot of encroachment into the City right-of-way.

13. The final utility plan shall overlay the proposed landscaping on top of the existing and proposed utilities.

14. A stormwater connection permit will be required from DPW.

15. A surety bond will be required as part of this project for the sidewalk and milling and paving of the road.

The vote was unanimous.

## **II. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.