Hello,

We received an abutter notice highlighting a request at 105 Thornton St. They are requesting to reduce their off-street parking capability to one spot?

While we live at 124 Burkitt St and don't seem to be actual abutters, we would vote against ANYONE in this neighborhood reducing off-street parking. The parking situation over here is ridiculous. NO ONE uses their spots and EVERYONE parks in the street.

We would vote no for this request, if we were asked.

Additionally, while we are here, we are curious why White Heron on 601 Islington was given preferential treatment and a bump-out built in front of their shop? Additionally, as that is City property, why are they being allowed to post advertisements on taxpayer property? An explanation would be appreciated.

Thank you.

Rich Brady

FS/S&P Solutions Richard.brady@staples.com

Staples

Have a question or need help? Online at <u>StaplesAdvantage.com</u>: under "Help", click "Customer Service" to chat live For Customer Care, please use the following; (E-) - <u>portsmouthsupport@staples.com</u>

See how we can help you work better

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited.

From:	Susan Frohn
To:	Planning Info
Subject:	Application for property at 869 Woodbury Ave Portsmouth
Date:	Wednesday, March 24, 2021 9:48:10 AM

To members of the Planning Committee,

We would like to take this opportunity to speak on behalf of our neighbor Shawn Dick and his petition for an Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit.

We have known Shawn and have been neighbors for 7 years. He has maintained a beautiful property on Woodbury Ave and has also been an active part of the neighborhood and community.

If you look up and down Woodbury Ave and the other streets surrounding the neighborhood, you will see a vast amount of multi-family homes and apartment buildings, some being built just less than a mile away housing hundreds of people. Not only does this unit meet the neighborhod criteria, it also has sufficient parking. By Mr. Dick adding this accessory dwelling, it is not denigrating the landscape of the neighborhood, it's actually benefiting by adding another unit for someone to live and work in our community.

We have no doubt this property will only be enhanced by adding this dwelling and know that Shawn will take the utmost pride in maintaining his beautiful residence.

We appreciate your consideration on this matter.

Best Regards, Paul and Susan Frohn 86 Meadow Rd Portsmouth, NH

Izak Gilbo

From:	Larry Booz <booz.larry@gmail.com></booz.larry@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, March 25, 2021 11:13 AM
То:	Izak Gilbo
Subject:	Northern Tier at tonight's meeting Thank you Isaac!

Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting due to travel commitments, however I would like you to consider my input via this email.

Portsmouth is at a turning point, or rather a tipping point, concerning new development and downtown hotels. The citizens have previously spoken very clearly concerning the McIntyre development. This is of similar importance. Park and green space is essential. The possibility of walking and bike trails along the North Mill Pond shows a vision of community use and preservation. Whereas, another mega hotel is just that. Do we really need another downtown hotel as opposed to downtown style townhomes in this area which would increase the sense of community?

The vision of an historic city which people come to because of its culture, restaurants, and shopping is slowly being distorted by the current design trends on the northern tier. This is the very first thing people see as they come into town. Even if you choose to allow another hotel, should this area not blend with existing buildings in downtown?

Planning has done a wonderful job in the past with respect to Bow St and the Popovers buildings, but somewhere the newer development is becoming ever more modern. I would like to call your attention to towns like Newport, RI, Newburyport, MA and many others in New England. They have allowed development, but required that development to fit in just as had been the case on Bow Street. Just because an area is outside the historic district is not an excuse for bad development. It is just as easy to design a building that fits in as to design one that does not.

To summarize, do we really need another downtown hotel? I would say we do not. However, if Portsmouth is going to be the city that yields to the whims of the developer, than at least require the developer to construct something historic. We can have a city like Newport, or we can have a hodgepodge of unconnected development. The power is in your hands.

Respectfully, Larry Booz 172 Northwest St Portsmouth, NH 03801 603-969-7540

Izak Gilbo

From:	Ted <thaddeusjj@gmail.com></thaddeusjj@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, March 25, 2021 3:56 PM
То:	Planning Info
Subject:	Raynes Avenue development

Dear Planning Board members,

I would like to address the proposed development for Raynes Avenue. As a member of the Conservation Commission, I reviewed this proposal at our last meeting. First, this development should not encroach inside the 100 foot wetlands buffer along the North Mill Pond. This project clearly does not meet six criteria needed.

Second, the Bonus Incentives are greatly flawed and should be amended. Frankly, the taxpayers of Portsmouth are getting a raw deal. Developers are giving the city undevelopable land of little value to reach the 20% of gross floor area that allows them to add an extra story. For a start, this incentive should not be based on the square footage of donated land - but based on it's economic value. Additionally, the definition of what can count for a Public Realm improvement is overly broad.

Regards,

Ted Jankowski 27 Franklin St. Portsmouth, NH