

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

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

2:00 PM

October 7, 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. OLD 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

John Chagnon (Haley Ward), Derik Durbin (Durbin Law) and the property owners, Robert Snover and Darcy Davidson, came to present this application. Mr. Chagnon handed out revised plan sets to the Committee and then described the updates made since the previous meeting. He then went on to address the latest round of Committee comments that had been sent out prior to the meeting.

The Committee then discussed and asked questions about verifying the driveway locations, interpretations of lot area and calculations of the existing and proposed lots.

Chairman Stith stated that staff will issue a formal interpretation of the proposed lot area that the applicant may choose to appeal before the Board of Adjustment if desired.

PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing opened and numerous abutters and neighbors came to speak.

Ben St. Jean of 54 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and stated that the lot sizes do not comply as proposed and that the lot would fit better in the neighborhood as a single lot. He supports renovations and demolition if needed, but not a subdivision. He would like to see open space retained along with permeability on the lot to avoid stormwater impacts on abutters. He is worried about potential lack of sunlight and air flow on his lot due to the proposed increased density. He also is worried about losing the views from his own home.

Jamie Baker of 75 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and noted concerns about the proximity of the homes to the front yard, increased noise, parking, traffic and safety issues. He would like to see more information on the proposed homes such as driveway locations. He cited issues such as sight distances, lot sizing and topographical issues which could occur with this new subdivision. He believes that the applicants are leveraging their subdivision approval on getting future variances. He would like to see the Committee recommend denial to the Planning Board so that this property does not become overbuilt.

Amy Baker of 75 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and cited a list of concerns she had over the project. This included concerns about traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety. She stated that these would be compounding issues in their historic neighborhood and she expressed concern about the current owners not living in this neighborhood and not being aware of the local traffic. Lastly, she stated her concern over the applicants submitting a late application revision/update last week for review.

Robin Ferrari of 44 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application. She noted her concerns over pedestrian safety issues in the neighborhood, lack of sidewalks and the increased risks with more development. She said that she does not believe that the corner easement should count towards lot square footage and it should not meet the buildable needs.

Rachel Kurshan of 33 Humphreys Court came to speak to this application and stated her concern that the applicants would need a second variance for Lot 1 and that consideration should be given to the likelihood of getting a variance if this lot is subdivided. Specifically, she noted the hardship argument and did not believe the applicants could argue it successfully. Additionally, the safety concerns for the public due to the corner of the road could jeopardize variances along with lack of public interest and adverse impacts to neighboring properties.

Whitney Warren of 59 New Castle Avenue came to speak to this application and cited his concerns for traffic, parking along the street and the existing cut-through traffic.

John Arnold, the attorney representing many of the neighbors, asked for clarification on the front and rear lot lines. He also cited issues he had with the proposed setbacks, lot depths and lot sizes.

He wanted to see a final determination on all the zoning analyses by staff. A discussion continued between staff and Mr. Arnold.

The public hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Stith asked for a motion to continue this application until the applicants had gone to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. D. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this application until the applicant had gone for review from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. P. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Brora LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **150 Portsmouth Boulevard** requesting Site Plan Review Approval for the construction of three (3), six (6) story multifamily residential buildings with associated site work including parking, driveway access, utility, drainage, landscaping, and lighting improvements. and reconstruction of Portsmouth Boulevard in front of the development. Said property is located on Assessor Map 213 Lot 12 and lies within the Office Research (OR) and Gateway Neighborhood Overlay (GNOD) Districts. (LU-25-114)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Neil Hansen and Patrick Crimmons (Tighe and Bond), Kimery Poldrack and Joe Geoghegan (owner representatives), and Peter (architect) came to present this application. Mr. Hansen noted that they had previously come before the Committee for a work session and then went on to explain the project proposal and related right-of-way upgrades. Mr. Hansen went through each plan page and then Peter gave a quick debrief on the proposed architectural details. They noted that a wetland conditional use permit would also be before the Conservation Commission the following day for this project. In addition, they reminded the Committee that this project would be in the new GNOD zoning district why is why they are receiving height and density increases due to a land transfer.

The Committee discussed and asked questions about the proposed multi-use path, pavement details, road gravel type, maintenance of the sidewalk and the proposed width, the proposed pedestrian steps, pedestrian access, the traffic study, local traffic signal changes, utility separations, landscaping issues, public realm improvements, community spaces and the proposed gate.

PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing opened.

Clement Madden, the Vice President of JCM Management Company, came to speak to this application. His company manages the abutting development at Osprey Landing. He noted that his group had previously sent a letter supporting this development but noting concerns for increased traffic potential. He noted that members of the Committee had already addressed increased traffic

but he wanted to reiterate another suggestion from his group that this proposal include a bicycle and pedestrian friendly path with a gate.

The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Stith told the applicants that the City would work on getting a peer review for the traffic study done and that they would review the drainage plans when updated plan sets became available.

P. Britz made a motion to postpone the applicants until the November meeting.

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

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:14 p.m.