

From: [Kimberli Kienia](#)
To: [Kimberli Kienia](#)
Subject: FW: Webform submission from: Planning Board > Body Blocks
Date: Monday, October 26, 2026 2:16:50 PM

From: City of Portsmouth <webmaster@portsmouthnh.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2026 11:52 AM
To: chellman@TNDEngineering.com; Peter L. Britz <plbritz@portsmouthnh.gov>; Peter M. Stith <pmstith@portsmouthnh.gov>
Subject: Webform submission from: Planning Board > Body Blocks

Submitted on Mon, 10/26/2026 - 11:52

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Lyle Gravelle

Email

Lyle@nelcorporation.com

Subject

0 Woodworth Ave

Message

First, I would like to be on the record that I did NOT receive an abutters letter stating that the owners of 0 Woodworth Ave are looking for variances and that the meeting is for 10/27/26. My neighbor, on Leavitt Ave, made me aware of this over this past weekend. I asked others on Woodworth Ave if they had received a notice, they were not aware like myself.

Second, I have since read the request for variances, that the trust holders are requesting, and OPPOSE.

I have resided at 20 Woodworth Ave since 1996 and am aware that the neighborhood is/was comprised of mostly 80'x40' lots. It should be stated that in 2013 I purchased property from my neighbor so that I would be in compliance with the setbacks (that 0 Woodworth applicant is requesting variance for) to eventually install a garage. I am now at this stage and currently have ADU plans (developed by Amy Dutton) in for review for a

variance of my own. Why would I have gone through the process of trying to abide by the rules, set forth by the planning department, only to watch a neighbor go around these said rules?

It is my opinion that this applicant is requesting far too many variances and I feel as though it is opening a can of worms for our neighborhood. There are still several 80'x40' lots and if this is allowed, there will be several others that could potentially move forward with the same type of request.

I Lyle Gravelle (manager of Lyle Stephen Gravelle Revokable Trust) am OPPOSED.

20 Woodworth Ave
508-962-2410

bcc-email

chellman@TNDEngineering.com,plbritz@portsmouthnh.gov,pmstith@portsmouthnh.gov
v

9/14/26

Response to: **Notice of Appeal and Statement of Grounds**

Statement of Standing:

- 1) There is no relevancy to any change in neighborhood character.
- 2) We have space for six or more vehicles in our parking area. We have two vehicles that consistently park in the driveway. On occasion there is one other tenant that parks a single car. We have a tenant in one unit who does not own a car. Therefore parking is NOT an issue on our property.
- 3) A singular person who spends time on our Blossom Street property, in conjunction with our home around the corner, does not constitute adding to the “density” of the area.
- 4) Unclear how “life safety” is involved. The studio space has been inspected by the Chief Building Inspector.

Our property at 28 Blossom Street has been owned by my family since the mid 1970's. The barn space, which became my father's studio, has been used in the exact same manner for all of these decades. It has been a safe space for family and friends when needed, as well as for art, study, gatherings, and general respite.

It is crucial to point out that this is NOT about a code concern, but another of over 13 attempts by Kathy Logan to maliciously harass our family, son and our tenants over the last several years. This time she has assembled a “small mob” to support her actions. Simple proof of the above statement is made through the fact that if we were to lose in support of the “mob”, that our son (who is clearly being discriminated upon), would then sleep in our property on the other side of Kathy Logan and spend much of his time at the studio. Literally he would be on one side or the other of Kathy Logan's property and the difference to her and the “mob”, would be what?

Sincerely,

Paul and Hannah Burke

From: Scott Lupkas

Sent: Monday, September 14, 2026 2:52 PM

To: Planning - Info - Shr <Planning@portsmouthnh.gov>

Cc: Kathleen Logan; Sooky Lassen; Peter Carey

Subject: Written comment for September 15 Board of Adjustment hearing — 28 Blossom Street

Dear Members of the Board of Adjustment:

I live at 33 Blossom Street and am one of the neighbors appealing the City's determinations concerning 28 Blossom Street. I cannot attend the hearing, but I fully support our written appeal. I ask the Board to **reverse and vacate both the July 23 and August 6 determinations.**

The issue is more than what to call a room. A former artist's studio is now being used for sleeping at a property approved for three residential units. The City's designation of the space as an "R-2 non-transient sleeping unit" does not answer the basic zoning question: **What permits a separate sleeping arrangement there?** A building-code label cannot, by itself, establish that the use is allowed under the zoning ordinance.

The suggested connection to 161 South Street does not answer that question either. As our appeal explains, 161 South Street is a separate, non-contiguous property. An arrangement between occupants of two properties should not be the basis for approving a use at 28 Blossom Street that could remain after either property changes hands.

I am also concerned that the determinations leave important questions unanswered about density, parking, safety, and the approvals required in the Historic District. These are substantive issues for the Board to address openly, with notice to neighbors. They should not be bypassed through an administrative classification.

I ask the Board to vacate the determinations and require the owner to seek the necessary zoning and other City approvals before this sleeping use is authorized. I also ask the City to address the separate shed and occupancy concerns identified in our appeal through its enforcement process.

Please include this statement in the hearing record. Thank you for considering the appeal on its merits.

Regards,

Scott A. Lupkas
33 Blossom Street
Portsmouth, NH