

**MINUTES**

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
CONFERENCE ROOM "A"**

**3:30 p.m.**

**June 12, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Steve Miller; Vice Chairman MaryAnn Blanchard; Members; and Nathalie Morison, Allison Tanner, Samantha Collins; Adrienne Harrison; Barbara McMillan; Alternate, Jessica Blasko

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Britz, Environmental Planner/Sustainability Coordinator

.....  
**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. May 08, 2019

Ms. Tanner pointed out a spelling typo on page 4 and page 6.

Ms. Tanner moved to approve the minutes from the May 8, 2019 Conservation Commission Meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. Morison. The motion passed by a 6-1-0 vote. Ms. Harrison abstained because she was not at the May meeting.

**II. CONSERVATION ORDINANCE AMENDMENT DISCUSSION**

- A. Suzanne Woodland Esq., Deputy City Attorney

Deputy City Attorney Suzanne Woodland commented that the Conservation Commission voted in support of the Lois St. property acquisition in the May meeting. They talked about moving the property into the Conservation Ordinance. Right now the Ordinance does not allow for typical City maintenance. Deputy City Attorney Suzanne Woodland came to this meeting with revised language that would allow the City to acquire the property, put it in the Conservation Ordinance and allow the City to be able to maintain the area without coming back. At a future point the City may want to put in a turnaround area in the upland. The City would come back here for approval, but eventually would want to maintain it. The recommendation is to slightly adjust the Ordinance to allow for usual maintenance activities.

Ms. Tanner commented that she agreed with the revision. Vice Chairman Blanchard agreed.

Deputy City Attorney Suzanne Woodland confirmed that she would bring it to the City Council to begin Conservation Ordinance amendment process.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend amending the Conservation Ordinance as presented, seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

### **III. CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS**

1. 150 Brackett Road  
Daniel & Shea Cook  
Assessor Map 207, Lot 72

Homeowners Dan and Shea Cook spoke to the application. Mr. Cook commented that they did renovation work on the property about a year ago with a permit approval. The original site plan showed the steps on one side, but they were built on the other side.

Ms. Harrison clarified that the stairs had already been built. Mr. Cook confirmed they were and were put on the different end because of a miscommunication. Vice Chairman Blanchard further clarified that this was an after the fact permit. Mr. Cook confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Morison questioned if they would put crushed stone under the stairs. Mr. Cook confirmed they would add it.

Ms. Tanner commented that this location was better because it's on lawn and avoids the wooded area.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the conditional use application to the Planning Board as presented, seconded by Ms. Harrison. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

2. 145 Lang Road  
Arbor View & The Pines, LLC, Owner  
Forest Properties Management, Inc., Co-Owner  
Assessor Map 287, Lot 1

Cory Belden from Altus Engineering spoke to the application. The application is for the Harbor View Apartments property. The proposal is to replace a corroded corrugated pipe. The development was constructed in the 1980s. They are proposing to expand the property with two more apartment buildings and storm water management needs to be provided. Mr. Belden met with Mr. Desfosses on the site and they decided to direct storm water to an outfall. The existing pipe is corroded at the outfall. The current pipe will be replaced with an HDPE pipe in the same location. There is a lower friction value for HDPE so a 15-inch pipe is the same as an 18-inch corrugated pipe. This application has been to a TAC work session. Peter Britz mentioned that the property owners had put some debris piles in the wetland buffer. Those piles will be removed as part of this project. It was added to the project site plan for demolition.

Ms. Tanner commented that the wetland consultant noted that snow had been plowed into the wetland. That snow should be pushed somewhere else. Chairman Miller agreed that it would be good to clarify where the snow was being plowed and add that as a stipulation. Mr. Britz noted that the property is all under one ownership, so the stipulation could be don't plow snow into the buffer.

Chairman Miller questioned what the condition of the outlet area was. Mr. Belden responded that there is riprap rock in the area. There is no head wall. Chairman Miller questioned if there was signs of erosion. Mr. Belden responded that the erosion was not too bad. Chairman Miller questioned if there was any difference in flow rate between the pipes. Mr. Belden responded that they would be reducing flows in the system through storm water management. Chairman Miller commented that they should monitor that to make sure the riprap was adequate.

Ms. Morison questioned where the water went from the riprap. Mr. Belden responded that it goes into a man-made swale then Berry's Brook. There is a large wetland complex on site. The property is 35 acres and a lot of it is south of the development. Ms. Morison questioned if there was pretreatment up stream. Mr. Britz confirmed there was and noted that it was part of the site plan. Mr. Belden confirmed they would be doing it all for the new development.

Ms. Tanner questioned if the debris piles came from the pool renovation. Ms. Tanner questioned how the piles would be removed and what they consisted of. Mr. Britz responded that the piles were in the buffer area and it was used as a landscape area. They need to get it out of there. There is a silt fence around the outside of it. The Commission can stipulate they maintain erosion control.

Ms. McMillan questioned if there was water flowing all the time or if it was only in storm water events. Mr. Belden responded that it was only in storm events. Ms. McMillan commented that it would have been helpful to have photo of the outlet. Mr. Belden responded that the corrugated metal pipe it completely rusted out. Ms. McMillan noted that the plan showed that the new pipe was a few feet shorter at the outlet. Mr. Belden confirmed that was correct. The rock area is at the wetland so the pipe is a little short to avoid wetland impacts. Ms. McMillan questioned if there were opportunities to move it back more. Mr. Belden responded that it could not be moved back much more.

Ms. Morison moved to recommend **approval** of the conditional use application to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Harrison with the following **stipulations**:

1. That adequate erosion control is put in place during and following construction until the site is stabilized.
2. That the owner monitor the outfall location one year after the new culvert is installed and provide results to the Planning Department to insure there is no erosion occurring at the new pipe outlet.
3. The owner shall remove the debris pile near the new pipe and stabilize the site.
4. Snow shall not be plowed on unpaved areas in the buffer.

The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

3. 400 Little Harbor Road  
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Owner  
Assessor Map 203, Lot 8

Corey Belden from Altus Engineering and Jack Savage from the Forest Society spoke to the application. This project is the proposed demolition of the building at Creek Farm. Approximately 1,400 square feet of the existing house is within the 100-foot buffer. The highest observable tide line has been observed to accurately depict the buffer area. There is a small septic with the leech field in the buffer area. The vent will be removed and it will be de-boxed. They are proposing to abandon the septic in place. The tanks are out of the buffer and will be pumped and abandoned. A silt fence will be provided for erosion control during construction. After the demolition the parking and pavement will be removed. This proposal will remove 20,000 square feet of impervious area. It will be a significant reduction. The house area will be regarded back to the existing grade. It will be a grass area. Some of the existing stone foundation may remain and converted into benches. This would be determined during construction. The DES permit application will be submitted by the end of the week. The primary access to site will be through the Carriage House to the southwest of the site. There will be a public gravel walkway that connects to the existing paved areas. The DES permit will indicate that the path could possibly be turned into an ADA pathway. If so, then it would be paved to create a 6-foot wide ADA path. That area is outside of the 100-foot buffer but within the 250-foot shore land area.

Mr. Britz clarified that from the Conservation Commission's perspective the Wetland and City Permit review was the same project. Mr. Belden confirmed that was correct.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if the area would be seeded and questioned if there was a maintenance plan. Mr. Belden confirmed that it would be seeded with a grass similar to the existing area. It would be mowed regularly during the summer and maintained as a grassy recreation area.

Ms. Morison questioned if the wall and statues would be left or removed. Mr. Savage responded that those were in the formal gardens and would be left in place.

Ms. Harrison questioned if some of the lawn could have buffer plantings or a no mow area. Mr. Savage responded that the planting plans were preliminary and that could be incorporated. The goal is to make this a demo project for other residences with frontage on Sagamore Creek. It's important to maintain an area for public access across the entire area.

Ms. Tanner noted that there was a lot of knotweed on the site. Mr. Savage responded that the whole property has a lot of invasive plants. It has been inventoried. It would be almost impossible to eradicate them. The State has removed a lot of existing vegetation at Odiorne in an attempt to do that. Mr. Savage noted that they are watching that closely. The good news is that it provides some habitat to songbirds etc. Ms. Tanner commented that she was concerned it would

spread during the demolition process. Mr. Savage responded that they were not looking to grow more knotweed and would do everything they could to eliminate what was possible.

Chairman Miller questioned if there was any chance the Forest Society would not own the property in the future. Mr. Savage responded that would be highly unlikely. Chairman Miller questioned if the foundation was left in the ground would it meet the need for reconstruction in the code. Mr. Britz responded that it would not. They would need to get a new permit even if they were building from scratch.

Ms. Tanner commented that they would need to take caution around the historic tree. Mr. Savage confirmed they were very aware of that and have a company taking care of it. It is a very old tree and they are intending to take a great deal of care.

Ms. McMillan questioned if the music room would remain. Mr. Savage responded that they were assuming that the entire structure would be taken away. Ms. McMillan clarified that they would have to come back if that changes. Mr. Savage confirmed that was correct. Mr. Belden added that the music room is completely outside of the buffer, so they may not need to come back for that. Mr. Britz commented that was probably correct. Mr. Savage noted that this plan shows the total impact.

Chairman Miller commented that the Commission should only weigh in on the demolition and fill in the buffer. Vice Chairman Blanchard summarized that the Commission had discussed enhancing the buffer after the demolition, addressing the waterline in a more creative way other than mowed grass, and taking precautions around the knotweed to prevent spread. Vice Chairman Blanchard recommended that it should move forward with those considerations.

Ms. McMillan questioned if they anticipated running into any hazardous materials. There was a note about it in the plan. Mr. Savage responded that there was an investigation of that 20 years ago. Based on that there was not a lot, but they would need to do another survey. Mr. Britz questioned if they would be filling in where they remove the septic pipe. Mr. Belden confirmed that was correct.

Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to recommend approval of the conditional use application to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Tanner with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant consider a plan to incorporate plantings along the shoreline edge
2. A plan be provided for how invasive species will be controlled as part of the demolition
3. That silt fence or silt sock be installed prior to demolition and stay in place until the site is stabilized.

The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

4. 333-445 Borthwick Avenue  
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire d.b.a Eversource, Owner  
Assessor Maps 240, 240, & 234, Lots 2-0001, 2-1001, 7-3

Lenny Lord from Tighe and Bond and Ed Monroe from Eversoure spoke to the application. Mr. Lord commented that the proposal was to replace a few utility poles on Borthwick Ave. The temporary wetland impact would be 2,227 square feet and the temporary buffer impact would be 4,567 square feet. The wooden poles would be replaced with steel poles. This will ensure the reliability of the energy. There is a phragmites dominated wetland near the new switchyard that was installed a few years ago. One is a three-pole unit and the other is a single pole. Work pads will be laid around the poles during construction. There is a 12-foot wide access road to get to them. The plan will be to follow the BMP manual on utilities to minimize wetland impacts and prevent the spread of invasive plants. Tighe and Bond will be there during construction at least once a week to inspect.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if they would be using erosion control during construction. Mr. Lord responded they attached a full section out of the BMP, and would use any of those tactics as they see fit.

Ms. McMillan questioned what time of year they would be doing the project. Mr. Lord responded they would be doing it as soon as possible.

Ms. Collins questioned why there were two access entrances, one off Borthwick Ave. and one off the switchyard. Mr. Lord responded that the switchyard is the main entrance. They need to get big equipment in for the big pole. The intent is to have both options for the contractor. Mr. Monroe added that it was likely they would not use both access points. The preference would be to come from Borthwick Ave.

Ms. Morison requested clarification on the metal culverts that may be inserted into the pole hole. Mr. Monroe responded that new poles have to be set in solid foundations. Some soil conditions are better for stabilizing poles than others. They are included in the application because it will have the greatest impact. Ms. Morison questioned if those would be in place of cement or if the cement would be poured regardless. Mr. Monroe responded that typically it would be excavated, then the case on would be put in and set with material like packed gravel.

Ms. McMillan clarified that all of chapter 3 from the BMP was included, but that did not mean that they were doing all of the mitigation in chapter 3. Pages 1-2 outline the minimum that would be done, and if they run into obstacles then more may be incorporated. Mr. Lord confirmed that was correct. The application included more detail on the cleaning the mats and preventing spread of invasive species. Ms. McMillan commented that they should do the maximum to mitigate invasive species.

Ms. Collins requested clarification on the existing utility pole in the plan that would not be replaced. Mr. Monroe responded that was part of the three-pole structure that would be replaced with a one-pole structure. Ms. Collins clarified that there were no other existing poles in the area that needed replacement. Mr. Monroe responded that if there were, then it would be included in this project.

Ms. Morison commented that the application mentioned new anchors would be installed if needed, and questioned if those would be in the same footprint as the existing anchor. Mr. Monroe responded that they have a three-pole structure in place with 8-10 anchors. That will be replaced with one pole and will have new anchors. The old ones will be cut at ground level. The anchors screw into the ground, but stick out 1-1.25 inches out of the ground. They are minimal impact.

Ms. Harrison moved to recommend **approval** of the conditional use application to the Planning Board as presented, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

5. 123 Sparhawk Street  
Annemarie D'Aversa, Owner  
Assessor Map 159, Lot 4

Homeowners Tara Jenkins and Matt Newick spoke to the application. The proposal is to put a shed in the backyard. It would be 140 square feet in the buffer. The backyard is about 700 square feet total and all within the buffer. There is an old rock wall with a light elevation change. That will be removed and the area would be leveled off. There will be no elevation change near any fences.

Chairman Miller questioned how deep the rock wall went into the ground. Mr. Newick responded that it was just a rock set on the ground.

Ms. Jenkins added that the shed would be 8 feet from the neighboring fence line. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned what they would do for drainage. Mr. Newick responded that the shed would be on blocks with crushed stone underneath. There would also be a rain barrel to collect rainwater for the garden. There will be some new plants as well.

Chairman Miller requested more detail about the parcel. Ms. Jenkins responded that it's a two family home. There is a front unit and the second unit is in the back. Chairman Miller questioned how this location was chosen for the shed. Ms. Jenkins responded that there was a patio behind the back of the house with a retaining wall and steps that go down. If the shed was somewhere else then it would be in the way of the yard and steps. The chosen location is the flattest area.

Ms. Tanner questioned if there was water pooling now in the yard. Mr. Newick responded that it does right in the middle at the rock wall. Ms. Tanner questioned where the water would go once the rock wall was removed and it was level. Mr. Newick responded that it would probably just absorb into the ground. Ms. Tanner questioned what one load of organic soil meant. Mr. Newick responded that it would be 6-7 yards of loam. The intent is to skim it with loam when the rock is removed.

Chairman Miller clarified that there were no shrubs along the fence today. Ms. Jenkins confirmed that was correct. Shrubs would be added as part of this project. There is a plant list included.

Chairman Miller questioned if the steep slope down to the salt marsh started right at the fence. Mr. Newick responded that it goes back 5 or 6 feet then it slopes down.

Ms. Tanner questioned what would go between the plantings. Mr. Newick responded they would put down mulch.

Ms. Tanner commented that it was important that the runoff water did not drain to the wetland. Adding plantings would be good to help with that. Chairman Miller noted that the shed design accounted for water coming off the roof with a rain barrel in the front. The back needs to be accounted for as well. Mr. Newick confirmed that was accounted for.

Ms. McMillan commented if there was any opportunity to move the shed away from the fence and reduce the impact on the buffer, then they should do that.

Ms. Tanner recommended using silt fence if soil was going to be moved around. Mr. Newick questioned if a silt sock would be acceptable. Ms. Tanner confirmed that would be fine.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend approval of the conditional use application to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Morison with the following stipulations:

1. That the downslope edge of the yard have a silt sock installed to prevent siltation and erosion down the bank.
2. That the planting beds be mulched or covered around the new planting beds
3. That there be no more than six cubic yards of loam be brought in for fill to level the yard.

The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

#### **IV. STATE WETLANDS BUREAU PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

- A. Standard, Dredge, and Fill Application  
400 Little Harbor Road  
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests  
Assessor Map 203, Lot 8

Ms. Harrison moved to recommend approval of the conditional use application to the Planning Board, seconded by Ms. Morison with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant consider a plan to incorporate plantings along the shoreline edge
2. A plan be provided for how invasive species will be controlled as part of the demolition
3. That silt fence or silt sock be installed prior to demolition and stay in place until the site is stabilized.

The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.



**V. WORK SESSIONS**

1. 680 Peeverly Hill Road  
City of Portsmouth, Owner  
Assessor Map 254, Lot 8

Project Manager David Allen spoke to the application for the new ball fields and the Public Works yards. Yesterday some of the team went up to AOT with DES to talk about the application. The city has committed to doing significant storm water treatment for the site and West Road. Based on the meeting there are changes that need to be made to the plan. The team has decided to postpone the work session and would like to schedule a site walk with the Commission. This application would come back at a later date once the changes are incorporated.

Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to continue the Work Session to the July, 2019 meeting. The Commission also requested a Site Walk of the property, seconded by Ms. Harrison. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

2. Banfield Road  
Maud Hett Revocable Trust, Owner  
Walter D. Hett Trust, Co-Owner  
Assessor Map 256, Lot 2

Corey Colwell from TF Moran, Mike Green and Jenna Green from Green and Company, and Jim Gove were present to speak at the work session. The project is proposing an open space planned unit development off of Banfield Rd. It would be on 44.9 acres of land. The property is diagonally across from St. Patrick's Academy and next to the Girl Scout Camp. Currently there is public water, but no public sewer. Homes would be on septic. The property does have wetlands and is bisected through a utility easement. Based on the City's density calculations and amount of wetland and upland soils they could build 24 units, but this proposal is for 22 units. 54% of the lot is upland and the remainder is wetland. The wetlands have been delineated. The homes shown are outside of the 100-foot buffer. This application has been before TAC for a work session. One TAC member suggested pushing 1 to 3 of the homes into the buffer in an effort to stagger them and reduce congestion. Mr. Colwell requested the Commission's opinion on that. The street to the homes will be private. The 32-foot proposed road will be 20-24 feet wide. At TAC the Fire and Police seemed to support the thinner road. The road will cross wetland to access the homes. The impact would be the road crossings to the buffer. The team is here in the early stage to get feedback.

Ms. McMillan requested that they speak to the condition of the wetlands. Mr. Gove responded that he had not completed the functions and value assessment. The area of upland is fairly steep in places. There is a large bedrock knob. The power line goes through the wetland and uplands in several different areas. The property is next to the Girl Scout Camp and is accessed by a dirt road. The prime wetland is off site and associated with Sagamore Creek. Elwyn Brook is on the other side of the road. Chairman Miller questioned how the parcel flowed. Mr. Gove responded

that he was still evaluating that, but thought it drained to Elwyn Brook. The soils were mapped with NRCS. It is a complex of bedrock and deeper soils. There is sand over clay and poorly drained clays. The actual NWI maps show the entire area is forested. The scrub shrub is along the power line. Mr. Gove looked it up on the 2015 Wildlife Action Plan and it's not ranked. However there is supporting landscape nearby associated with prime wetland. There are no flow plains and no streams. Mr. Gove commented that based on his investigations the parcel could be broken up into 3 evaluation units. The isolated wetland does not have any vernal pool activity. There is no standing water deeper than 6 inches. The large wetland had poorly drained soils and vernal pools. There were four areas of vernal pool activity. Some had egg masses and some had wood frog tadpoles. The lower wetland has no standing water and no poorly drained soils. There is probably very little ground water recharge, but it should have discharge. There is no fish or shellfish habitat. The sediment and toxicant retention will be present. Mr. Gove thought that it was functioning to control it. It is getting sheet flow from the road. There is wildlife habitat. There is high bush blueberry and habitat food. There is no shoreline. There is a recreation area next to the site. Mr. Gove did not see a lot of utilization. There could be some education and science value. There is some visual quality and aesthetics. Mr. Gove was still evaluating the endangered species and habitat.

Ms. Tanner questioned if the houses would have basements. Mr. Colwell confirmed they would. Ms. Tanner questioned if there would be blasting because of the bedrock. Mr. Colwell responded that there would be some removal. Ms. Tanner questioned if they would put septic on the bedrock. Mr. Colwell responded that the septic would be put in the soil. There may be an opportunity to put septic systems in the open space between the roads. The initial belief the property can support septic systems, but they are not certain how many. Vice Chairman Blanchard expressed concern about the septic systems, and questioned if there was a way to combine them. Mr. Colwell responded that was a possibility worth exploring. All of that will be out of the 100-foot buffer.

Chairman Miller questioned why TAC suggested putting houses in the buffer. Mr. Colwell responded that it was just one member. They suggested staggering the houses to not have them so close together. That would put a few in the low functioning value wetland buffer. Other members felt that the houses should not go in the buffer.

Vice Chairman Blanchard commented that there were a lot of deer in that area. The added traffic and activity in that back corner is concerning. Chairman Miller commented that keeping all of the houses out of the buffer was good.

Ms. Harrison request clarification on the parking provided in the plan. The amount required is 33 spaces, but the plan proposes 88 spaces. Mr. Colwell responded that the parking was based on two cars in the garage and two cars in the driveway multiplied by 22 units. There are no other parking areas other than that.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned how many bedrooms the houses would have. Mr. Colwell responded that they were mostly 3 bedrooms. Some would have 4 bedrooms.

Ms. McMillan questioned what the wetland crossing for the roadway would look like. Mr. Colwell responded that typically a wetland crossing is an arch culvert with a natural bottom. It has not been designed yet.

Ms. Collins questioned if it would be pervious pavement in the private road and driveways. Mr. Colwell responded that they have not thought about that at this point. It would depend on the water table. Today the thought is that it would be standard pavement.

Ms. McMillan questioned why the first cluster of houses had a double roadway. Mr. Colwell responded that there is a dead end road length limit in the subdivision regulations. This double road would provide homes 2 points of access and they wouldn't have a dead end road length. Two points of access is safer than one. Eliminating it would allow for more space between the homes.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if there was conservation land near the area. Mr. Colwell responded that it was to the north of the property. It was not on this property, and does not directly abut it. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if the access would be off Banfield Rd. for this project. Mr. Colwell confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Colwell clarified that the Commission preferred that they keep all of the houses out of buffer. Chairman Miller confirmed that was correct. The team should try to stay out of the buffer as much as possible, leave as many trees as possible, and minimize the impact to the forested areas as much as possible. Vice Chairman Blanchard commented that it looked like there would be a lot of land clearing with this project.

Mr. Colwell responded that they knew the septic systems were a concern still. They will be doing test pits to make sure it will work. Chairman Miller noted that there were a lot of interesting septic systems and suggested that Mr. Colwell look into the nitrogen removal technology that was available. Vice Chairman Blanchard added that they should look at the loads for washing machines and dishwashers that work against anaerobic systems. Mr. Colwell commented that unfortunately tying into the sewer is not feasible. Ms. Tanner commented that she thought there was a sewer at the intersection of Peverly Rd. and Banfield Rd. Mr. Colwell commented that he would look into that. Chairman Miller commented that it was hard to get a sense of scale from the maps.

Ms. Morison commented that they should make sure to avoid the buffer, but pay attention to avoid clearing in the uplands as much as possible too. Ms. McMillan commented that they should look for more opportunities to include trees around the houses. They should also look at alternatives like bridges for the 90 feet of road crossing the wetland.

Ms. Harrison noted that the housing trend and interest of this generation was moving away from this type of housing. The developers should look into something more innovative and look into things that capture this audience. This could be an opportunity to make it a cool and different project.

Mr. Britz commented that they should consider multi-family buildings. It goes along with Ms. Harrison's recommendation and there may be gains from a design perspective and with the septic.

Ms. McMillan suggested that the Commission do a site walk. Mr. Colwell confirmed that could happen.

## **VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Portsmouth Open Space Plan Discussion**

Open Space Plan: <https://www.cityofportsmouth.com/planportsmouth/open-space-plan>

Vice Chairman Blanchard commented that she was interested in exploring prohibiting motorized vehicles on recreation paths in the Ordinance. Ms. Tanner questioned if they were already banned. Mr. Britz suggested that they add a definition section to clarify. Vice Chairman Blanchard confirmed that would be good.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned what the issue was on the Wetland Counsel of Appeals on Sagamore Landing. Mr. Britz responded that there were two new houses on Sagamore Landing and the most recent one had a dock application. The Commission recommended approval to the State after a lot of discussion. The neighbors are concerned because it blocks their access to the Creek. So they are appealing it.

Mr. Britz commented that there were two sessions on the Portsmouth Open Space Plan that were both lightly attended. The thing to stress to people is the wiki map. There is more work to do, but there has been a lot of good stuff so far. Chairman Miller encouraged the Commission to go to the wiki map and give a lot of input. Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that she went to the session on Tuesday night and found it very rewarding. Mr. Britz noted that this would help to determine how the City would spread out open space and decide a trails etc. Ms. McMillan commented that she had a side conversation with Steve Whitman about how one thing missing was opportunities to open green spaces in redevelopment. He suggested they talk to City Council, but Ms. McMillan thought it could start at the Commission. Chairman Miller commented that they put it on the wiki map. Mr. Britz noted that input would be seen heard and tracked. There is a high value soil mapping in the upland island in the Great Bog. Some other places have high value soils so permaculture or a food forest would be a neat opportunity. It would not work for a community garden, but it could be something that it could stand on its own. It would provide habitat for songbirds. Chairman Miller noted that the more input on the wiki maps the better.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. McMillan moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:59 a.m., seconded by Ms. Harrison. The motion passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.