

From: [JAMI BARNES](#)
To: [Planning - Info - Shr](#)
Subject: TAC Meeting 7/7-Abutter concern
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 9:50:40 AM

You don't often get email from jamihbarnes@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am writing to express my concerns about the plans to subdivide 20 Central Avenue. We reside at 22 Central Avenue and share property lines. We already have a wet basement(as do other abutters) due to water drainage and runoff. The previous owner of 20 Central Ave told us that the lot was not buildable as it was too wet. We are very concerned as to how this issue will be addressed or mediated. We would also like to know how this lot will house 2 other residences. I have a business attached to my home and am concerned how this will impact us. My husband and I will be attending the meeting tomorrow but wanted our comments in the record. Thank you-Jami Barnes

Jami Barnes
Independent cabi Stylist

603.608.8319
jamibarnes.cabionline.com

View the current Collection at jamibarnes.cabionline.com for the latest styling tips, trends, and outfit idea.



From: [Stephan Cleaves](#)
To: [Planning - Info - Shr](#)
Subject: Abutter: TAC Meeting on July 7, 2026
Date: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 11:31:06 AM

You don't often get email from srcleaves@mac.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To the Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee, c/o Planning Department:

We are the owners of 165 Union Street (Karen Van Gundy and Stephan Cleaves) and a direct abutter to 238 Austin Street. We write regarding the application of Alea LLC for preliminary and final subdivision of 238 Austin Street (Assessor Map 135, Lot 61) into two lots, with demolition of the existing structures and construction of a single-family dwelling on each, on the TAC agenda for July 7, 2026.

We are not opposed to the subdivision. Our comment concerns a single, specific site condition: an established stand of Japanese knotweed (*Reynoutria japonica*) on 238 Austin Street that is actively encroaching onto our property across the shared boundary. Japanese knotweed is listed as a prohibited invasive species by the New Hampshire Department of Agriculture, Markets & Food. It spreads readily from small rhizome and stem fragments, and ground-disturbing activity — demolition, excavation, grading, and soil relocation — is among the most effective ways to fragment and disperse it. Without controls, the site work proposed here is likely to worsen the infestation on our property and on other abutting lots.

We respectfully request that any recommendation of approval include, as a condition, an invasive species management and soil-handling plan addressing the knotweed, incorporated into the project's Construction Management and Mitigation Plan or equivalent conditions of approval. We ask that such a plan provide for:

1. Treatment of the existing knotweed stand beginning in advance of any soil disturbance — noting that effective treatment is typically seasonal (e.g., fall foliar application) and may span more than one growing season, so it should be scheduled ahead of, not during, construction;
2. Containment and handling protocols during demolition, excavation, and grading to prevent dispersal of rhizome and stem fragments;
3. No relocation of knotweed-contaminated soil onto or across the shared boundary with 165 Union Street; and
4. Disposal of contaminated material in a manner that does not further spread the species.

We have been in contact with Doug Cygan, Invasive Species Coordinator at the NH Department of Agriculture, Markets & Food, regarding this infestation, and can provide documentation and photographs on request.

Thank you for considering these comments and entering them into the record of the July 7 meeting.

Respectfully,
Karen Van Gundy and Stephan Cleaves
165 Union Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801
603-319-7768 / srcleaves@mac.com

Meeting: April 7, 2026
Technical Advisory Committee
RE: 64 Bridge St (pages 307 to 338)
April 2, 2026

Dear Members of the Technical Advisory Committee,

64 Bridge St seems to show only one parking space at the rear of the building. Per the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) Other Non-residential uses need no parking. Residential Uses need the same as section 10.1112.3. Hotels and Motels require 0.75 per room, 1 per 100 sf of lounge or restaurant area and 1 per 25 sf of banquet facility.

This project is being called an Inn. However, they show a restaurant and bar as well as catering on the first floor (pg 318 of packet- Plan A1.1). On page 322 of the packet (Plan A1.5) a bar, a large sitting area usually called a lounge and two bathrooms are shown on the rooftop.

By definition this is not an Inn, it is a Hotel of less than 125 rooms. According to zoning regulations, parking for guest parking of 12.5 or more as well as a loading zone will be needed for this hotel.

Inn

A **building** offering lodging for transient boarders with up to 15 sleeping rooms. An **inn** may have a **caretaker residence** but does not have to be occupied by the owner, and shall not serve food to the public. (See also: **bed and breakfast, hotel, motel.**)

Hotel

A **building** in which the primary **use** is transient lodging accommodations offered to the public on a daily rate for compensation and where ingress and egress to the sleeping rooms is made primarily through an inside lobby or **office**, supervised by a **person** in charge at all hours. Such facilities may include, where allowed, such **accessory uses** as **restaurants, bars, taverns, nightclubs**, function rooms, places of public assembly or recreational facilities, but shall not include casino gambling, keno or other forms of gambling. (See also: **motel.**)

When looking at the page 323, Plan A3.1 its hard to say what buildings are being shown for Massing

This is 44 Bridge St to the left of 64 Bridge St..





These are the two houses across Hanover St to the right of 64 Bridge St

The question is: Does the building fit into all the zoning requirements? There doesn't seem to be a comparison of what is allowed vs what is being proposed.

This is a lot of activity 10' from a residential neighborhood with serious parking issues. A real Inn with first floor or underground parking might be a better fit for this location for which a variance would be needed to eliminate first floor commercial.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bratter
Property Owner
159 McDonough St

From: [Joseph Konopka](#)
To: [Planning - Info - Shr](#)
Subject: 64 Bridge Street
Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 4:09:02 PM

You don't often get email from joseph_konopka@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Technical Advisor Committttee:

We are writing in response to the proposed development of a new structure at 64 Bridge Street, which is adjacent to our property at 53 Tanner Street.

While we are not opposed to thoughtful development, we do have several concerns regarding the current proposal and its potential impact on our property and quality of life.

First, the proposed height of the structure is a concern. A building of this scale would significantly impact the existing sightlines from the rear of our property and may diminish its overall value. We would strongly encourage consideration of a reduced height, ideally limited to two stories.

We are also concerned about the proximity of the structure to our property line. Given the apparent mass and scale of the building, we would appreciate clarification on setback distances and how the design accounts for neighboring properties.

Additionally, we have concerns regarding the potential impact on existing trees along the property line, particularly those with branches extending between properties. We would like to understand how tree preservation and root systems will be protected during and after construction. The tree is situated in our property, so if it dies due to construction on this property, who is responsible for removing the tree and replacing it?

Finally, we would appreciate further detail on the intended use of the property. If the space is to be used for events such as gatherings or celebrations, we are concerned about potential noise levels and frequency of use, particularly during evenings and weekends.

We respectfully ask that these considerations be taken into account as the project is reviewed. We are open to development that is thoughtfully scaled and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Joseph Konopka, MD