



# CITY OF PORTSMOUTH

Planning & Sustainability  
Department  
1 Junkins Avenue  
Portsmouth, New  
Hampshire 03801  
(603) 610-7216

## ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

March 27, 2026

Gregory Sheive and Diane Lamprey  
893 Woodbury Avenue  
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801

**RE: Board of Adjustment Request for property located at 893 Woodbury Avenue, Portsmouth NH 03801 (LU-26-8)**

Dear Property Owner:

The Zoning Board of Adjustment, at its regularly scheduled meeting of **March 24, 2026**, considered your application for the property located at 893 Woodbury Avenue whereas relief is needed to construct a 168 square foot addition to the rear of the structure which requires the following: 1) Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a) 27.5 foot rear yard where 30 feet are required, and b) 23% building coverage where 20% is maximum allowed. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 219 Lot 36 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. As a result of said consideration, the Board voted to **grant** the request as presented and advertised.

The Board's decision may be appealed up to thirty (30) days after the vote. Any action taken by the applicant pursuant to the Board's decision during this appeal period shall be at the applicant's risk. Please contact the Planning & Sustainability Department for more details about the appeals process.

Approvals may also be required from other City Commissions or Boards. Once all required approvals have been received, applicant is responsible for applying for and securing a building permit from the Inspection Department prior to starting any project work.

This approval shall expire unless a building permit is issued within a period of two (2) years from the date granted unless an extension is granted in accordance with Section 10.236 of the Zoning Ordinance.

*The Findings of Fact associated with this decision are available: attached here or as an attachment in the Viewpoint project record associated with this application and on the Planning Board Meeting website:*

<https://www.cityofportsmouth.com/planportsmouth/zoning-board-adjustment/zoning-board-adjustment-archived-meetings-and-material>

The minutes and audio recording of this meeting are available by contacting the Planning & Sustainability Department.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JM', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Jeffrey Mattson, Vice Chair of the Zoning Board of Adjustment

cc: Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector

Rosann Maurice-Lentz, City Assessor

# Findings of Fact | Variance

## City of Portsmouth Zoning Board of Adjustment

Date: 3/24/2026

Property Address: 893 Woodbury Ave

Application #: LU-26-8

Decision: **Grant**

### Findings of Fact:

Effective August 23, 2022, amended RSA 676:3, It now reads as follows: The local land use board shall issue a final written decision which either approves or disapproves an application for a local permit and make a copy of the decision available to the applicant. **The decision shall include specific written findings of fact that support the decision. Failure of the board to make specific written findings of fact supporting a disapproval shall be grounds for automatic reversal and remand by the superior court upon appeal, in accordance with the time periods set forth in RSA 677:5 or RSA 677:15, unless the court determines that there are other factors warranting the disapproval.** If the application is not approved, the board shall provide the applicant with written reasons for the disapproval. If the application is approved with conditions, the board shall include in the written decision a detailed description of all conditions necessary to obtain final approval.

The proposed application meets/does not meet the following purposes for granting a Variance:

Section 10.233 Variance Evaluation Criteria	Finding (Meets Criteria)	Relevant Facts
10.233.21 Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest.	<b>YES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the setbacks is to provide adequate light, space, and air between adjacent properties, but that is not really a problem in this case because the addition would not be the farthest point back in the building structure and would not infringe at all on light, air, and space for the surrounding properties.</li> </ul>
10.233.22 Granting the variance would observe the spirit of the Ordinance.	<b>YES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the setbacks is to provide adequate light, space, and air between adjacent properties, but that is not really a problem in this case because the addition would not be the farthest point back in the building structure and would not infringe at all on light, air, and space for the surrounding properties.</li> </ul>

<p>10.233.23 Granting the variance would do substantial justice.</p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Granting the variance would do substantial justice. A loss to the property owner would not be counterbalanced by a gain to the public. There would be no gain to the public in denying the variance because primarily it would involve construction of an addition outside of public view and would result in no conceivable loss to the public, therefore substantial justice would be done.</li> </ul>
<p>10.233.24 Granting the variance would not diminish the values of surrounding properties.</p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Granting the variance would not diminish the values of surrounding properties because the proposed addition is a typical one to homes of that age, and the same usage that was currently on the property would remain and would be consistent with the rest of the neighborhood.</li> </ul>
<p>10.233.25 Literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.</p> <p>(a)The property has special Conditions that distinguish it from other properties in the area. AND (b)Owing to these special conditions, a fair and substantial relationship does not exist between the general public purposes of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property; and the proposed use is a reasonable one. OR Owing to these special conditions, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the Ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.</p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The special condition of the property was related to the lot size. For the zoning area, it has an undersized square footage lot and due to that, some relief in terms of setbacks would be reasonable in order to accommodate the continued residential use of the building.</li> </ul>



# CITY OF PORTSMOUTH

Planning & Sustainability  
Department  
1 Junkins Avenue  
Portsmouth, New  
Hampshire 03801  
(603) 610-7216

## ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

March 27, 2026

Emily and Michael Glynn  
387 Richards Avenue  
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801

**RE: Board of Adjustment Request for property located at 387 Richards Avenue, Portsmouth NH 03801 (LU-26-23)**

Dear Property Owner:

The Zoning Board of Adjustment, at its regularly scheduled meeting of **March 24, 2026**, considered your application for the property located at 387 Richards Avenue whereas relief is needed for the construction of a two-story addition in place of an existing deck structure which requires the following: 1) Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a) a 4-foot left side yard where 10 feet is required. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 112 Lot 17 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District. As a result of said consideration, the Board voted to **grant** the request as presented and advertised.

The Board's decision may be appealed up to thirty (30) days after the vote. Any action taken by the applicant pursuant to the Board's decision during this appeal period shall be at the applicant's risk. Please contact the Planning & Sustainability Department for more details about the appeals process.

Approvals may also be required from other City Commissions or Boards. Once all required approvals have been received, applicant is responsible for applying for and securing a building permit from the Inspection Department prior to starting any project work.

This approval shall expire unless a building permit is issued within a period of two (2) years from the date granted unless an extension is granted in accordance with Section 10.236 of the Zoning Ordinance.

*The Findings of Fact associated with this decision are available: attached here or as an attachment in the Viewpoint project record associated with this application and on the Planning Board Meeting website:*

<https://www.cityofportsmouth.com/planportsmouth/zoning-board-adjustment/zoning-board-adjustment-archived-meetings-and-material>

The minutes and audio recording of this meeting are available by contacting the Planning & Sustainability Department.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JM', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Jeffrey Mattson, Vice Chair of the Zoning Board of Adjustment

cc: Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector

Rosann Maurice-Lentz, City Assessor

# Findings of Fact | Variance

## City of Portsmouth Zoning Board of Adjustment

Date: 3/24/2026

Property Address: 387 Richards Ave

Application #: LU-26-23

Decision: **Grant**

### Findings of Fact:

Effective August 23, 2022, amended RSA 676:3, It now reads as follows: The local land use board shall issue a final written decision which either approves or disapproves an application for a local permit and make a copy of the decision available to the applicant. **The decision shall include specific written findings of fact that support the decision. Failure of the board to make specific written findings of fact supporting a disapproval shall be grounds for automatic reversal and remand by the superior court upon appeal, in accordance with the time periods set forth in RSA 677:5 or RSA 677:15, unless the court determines that there are other factors warranting the disapproval.** If the application is not approved, the board shall provide the applicant with written reasons for the disapproval. If the application is approved with conditions, the board shall include in the written decision a detailed description of all conditions necessary to obtain final approval.

The proposed application meets/does not meet the following purposes for granting a Variance:

Section 10.233 Variance Evaluation Criteria	Finding (Meets Criteria)	Relevant Facts
10.233.21 Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest.	<b>YES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pattern of doing extensions on the back of the home is a common one.</li> <li>• The extension would not really be obvious from the front property line, so what the applicant is asking to do is in keeping with the general characteristics of the neighborhood.</li> <li>• It is a reasonable action for the circa-1900 house and the applicant's request for relief is within the allowed square footage of the lot.</li> </ul>
10.233.22 Granting the variance would observe the spirit of the Ordinance.	<b>YES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The actual amount of square footage that was going additionally into the setback would not be excessive because it would just be 6'x12' and not very impactful.</li> </ul>

<p>10.233.23 Granting the variance would do substantial justice.</p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Granting the variance would do substantial justice because there would not be anything that the general public would get out of not allowing the applicant to build onto the back end that would be more important than the benefits the homeowner would get from the more modern amenities to their home, and the addition would not be very visible.</li> </ul>
<p>10.233.24 Granting the variance would not diminish the values of surrounding properties.</p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Granting the variance would not diminish the values of surrounding properties, as it is a small imposition on the setback and a relatively short additional dimension.</li> <li>• There is some structure there now that it would expand on vertically, but it is not anything that has not already been done and it would not negatively impact the neighborhood's property values.</li> </ul>
<p>10.233.25 Literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.</p> <p>(a)The property has special Conditions that distinguish it from other properties in the area. AND (b)Owing to these special conditions, a fair and substantial relationship does not exist between the general public purposes of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property; and the proposed use is a reasonable one. OR Owing to these special conditions, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the Ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.</p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The unique characteristics relative to the requirements of the zone are that narrow and deep lots are common in the neighborhood, and the applicant's property has the same setup as the other properties do.</li> <li>• It would be at an angle and would not change things too much.</li> </ul>