

Dec 1, 2020 TAC
RE: 105 Bartlett St

Elizabeth Bratter
159 McDonough St
Portsmouth Property Owner
Nov 25, 2020

Dear Technical Advisory Committee,

The links for comparison or fact checking will be at the end of the letter. As usual page numbers are reader pages.

General Information:

Conservation Commission made it clear they will not support a 10-14' wide **fire road** in the 50' wetland buffer.

Conservation Commission has again asked structures be moved out of the **100' wetland buffer**.

The 12/1/20 submission shows a **NEW lot line** movement (12/1/20 pg 8 vs 05/13/20 pg 27) about 0.5 acres.

The lot line change will create a **land locked parcel**; almost all will be in the 100' wetland buffer. Not shown!

Building sizes are still not presented for all 3 structures (12/1/20 pg 80. How is the CD4-L1 being differentiated?

The stormwater analysis report still does NOT include the required **downstream point of analysis** within the body of water (Env-Wq 1507.06 at end).

Lighting (12/1/20 pg 14, 15) seems excessive!! How high are the various poles? Most streets 1 pole every 50'.

Grade will allow headlights and parking lot lights to shine OVER 8' high abutting fences. **Light filters are needed.**

TAC Comments and applicants answers (12/1/20 pg 27, 28)--my comments and questions:

1. **Trucks** coming into the complex taking a right from Bartlett look like they will need more room to make that corner (12/1/20 pg102). Trucks exiting look like they will be blocking those going straight from Bartlett at the proposed stop sign. Many trucks arrive at night and/or early in the morning and park and sleep back there. Will there be an area provided for this activity?
2. The updated **traffic report** does NOT show updated traffic information of the effects on the intersections of Bartlett and Cate nor Bartlett and Islington (12/1/20 pg 91) There do seem to be a lot more cars sitting at the present stop sign on Cate St at peak hours, which could become an issue in the morning with trucks leaving Ricci. The original study did was missing some actual numbers of the then proposed developments IE: West End Yard, buildings added by Pic-n-Pay and the new Borthwick complex because they were NOT available at that time. Shouldn't these be updated?
4. The purpose of **porous pavement** is to allow stormwater to drain into the soil below naturally. The treatment of stormwater and piping all of it into a tidal pond is not a justification for not using porous pavement. This entire area is going to be filled, in some areas as much as 17.5', therefore current soil analysis is not really relevant regarding porous pavement. Porous pavement very likely would work effectively, depending on the amount and the type of fill being added to this property.
5. The **soil** summary should include a list of all contaminants found; city engineers should be made aware of **contaminants** found and actual levels. This is a matter of public record. The public will use this area.
8. This is **not completed!** Comparing 05/13/20 (reader pg 27) to the 12/01/20 (reader pg 8) submissions, the buildings have changed sizes a lot. Building A was 13,094, now its 13,116. Bldg B to View Corridor was 49.5' and is now 50.55'. Bldg B shows 11' of length was removed and a reduction of 586 sf of footprint was recorded. Bldg B was 68' from the property line and now it's shown as 72.47'. How did building B move further from the Lot line? Building C *stayed the same footprint* yet a 13.19' of length was removed (260 sf?). It seems a lot of sidewalks were reduced by 2' to 3'. How big are the buildings? *Where are the fronts of the buildings?* What happened to the step down on Bldg B? Parking spaces under Bldg A have increased?? How??
9. The **Dover View Corridor** will have a grade of 17.5', plus the structural supports of the underground garage. How much higher than McDonough and Dover St will it be? Presently they sit about 6' above Ricci BEFORE grade added, it seems like the "View" Corridor will not have a view with over 11 or more feet of grade in its way.

11. 13. First it isn't likely the 14' **fire road** in the 50' wetland buffer is going to be approved by ConCom. What is **plan B** for rear access to the buildings? How would the fire truck get off the greenway, next to the proposed circle?

Lastly when **assessing stormwater** it is helpful to know that the rain garden built will be able to collect and filter stormwater. Are the sidewalks and greenway going to be pitched toward the rain garden to ensure the water will flow into it and not into the North Mill Pond? Looking at the design plan on page 22 of 12/01/20 submission the **overflow valve** is listed at 9.48. It appears to **be below the height of the filter media (10)**. *Shouldn't it be above the media to function properly?* The filter media is only 18" deep. Grasses and other plants (12/1/20 pg 26) can have roots which will grow far greater in depth than the proposed filter media. **Roots that grow into the gravel and stone area will interfere with proper movement of water into the perforated under drain.** The level of filter media could be increased to a minimum of 2.5'. The drain is shown as 6" and the 240' long pipe is 12".

The other issue with the rain garden has to do with the **elevations** listed. The explanation for only digging down 5' and then adding 17.5' of fill to add the underground garages was *there is ground water below 5'*. Should the rain garden be lowered in depth to accommodate the need for a deeper filter media it may end up **in the ground water table**, sending ground water out the 240' long pipe in the 100' wetland buffer to the North Mill Pond, defeating the whole system. It would seem to be more stormwater efficient to place smaller rain gardens throughout the project area with appropriate depths of filter media and have the perforated under drains be closer to proposed run off pipes; perhaps considering adding some other natural stormwater management technique as well.

Raingardens usually need to be monitored by someone trained in this field to be sure the lowest vegetations in the garden are still receiving proper sunlight, alive plants filter water. The other question that looms is will the tulip trees, which can grow to be 20' tall in less than 10 years, much less their large root systems, become a problem for the raingarden in the future.

One of the constraints of this property is the 100' Buffer, **which has been ignored** by the developer since day one, although it is still being brought up at meeting after meeting. They were fully aware of it when they purchased the property!! Please ask they move all structures out of the 100' buffer and then design a proper rear fire access to their over 67.5' high buildings.

Thank you for your time in reviewing this letter in regards to the Site Plan Review, parking, CUP and development application by 105 Bartlett Street.

Elizabeth Bratter

Links for comparison:

TAC December 1, 2020

http://files.cityofportsmouth.com/files/planning/apps/BartlettSt_105/BartlettSt_105_TAC_120120.pdf

Conservation Commission May 13, 2020

http://files.cityofportsmouth.com/files/planning/apps/BartlettSt_105/BartlettSt_105_CC_CUP_051320.pdf

1507.06

d) A project area that directly discharges to a stream, waterbody, estuary, or tidal water shall be exempt from (b) and (c), if the applicant has provided supporting offsite drainage calculations for the 10 yr and 50 yr, 24 hour storm in accordance with Env-Wq 1504.09, **showing that a point immediately downstream from the project site the post development peak flow rate from the site and the off-site contributing area does not exceed the pre-development peak flow rate at the point**

From: [Private General](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: TAC 12-1/20 typos
Date: Thursday, November 26, 2020 7:47:06 AM

Dear Planning Dept,

In the letter I submitted on 11/24/20 regarding 105 Bartlett St. I noticed three typos worth noting:

First Paragraph: Building sizes the page number is 8 not 80

First Paragraph: Grade (12/1/20 pg 101) not listed

#9 View Corridor (12/1/20 pg 101) not listed

Thank you, Elizabeth Bratter

From: [JAH](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Cc: [Eric B. Eby](#); [Peter H. Rice](#); [Peter L. Britz](#); [Dave Desfosses](#); [Steven E. Achilles](#); tgermain@cityofportsmouth.com
Subject: 105 Bartlett Street TAC December 1, 2020
Date: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 8:15:42 PM

Dear TAC members:

The oven at Cathartes must be on the fritz as the latest project plans are just as half baked as the ones submitted 6 months ago. Discussing these plans at TAC was a waste of time then, it is a waste of time now.

What everyone understands except Ironhorse Properties / Cathartes is that the Portsmouth Conservation Commission has stated quite clearly (twice) that the footprint of any new or reconstructed building must be located outside the North Mill Pond 100 foot wetlands buffer. Any impervious surface also must be located outside the 100 foot buffer, including the 12 foot wide paved emergency fire access road that the Fire Department has made clear needs to encircle any new or reconstructed buildings. In keeping with "Portsmouth the Eco-Municipality" principles, any contemplated nature trail along North Mill Pond will be built in the most ecologically sensitive manner possible, which means a three to four wide path constructed with wood chips.

Until the building footprint and fire lane limits have been approved by the Conservation Commission, the Planning Board, and NHDES, there is really nothing for TAC to talk about. NHDES permits haven't even been applied for. I suggest TAC make a motion instructing the applicant not to submit these plans again until the building and fire lane footprint limits are approved by City land use boards and approval / conceptual approval have been granted by NHDES wetlands, shoreland protection and alteration of terrain programs.

Regards,

Jim Hewitt

P.S. As a refresher, my May 31, 2020 comments below still apply

-----Original Message-----

From: JAH <samjakemax@aol.com>
To: Planning@cityofportsmouth.com <Planning@cityofportsmouth.com>
Sent: Sun, May 31, 2020 11:30 pm
Subject: 105 Bartlett Street TAC June 2, 2020

Dear TAC members:

I have a few comments to the recent submission, as follows:

1) These plans remain half-baked, and TAC should not even be reviewing them. This entire project depends on getting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the 100 foot wetlands buffer setback from the Portsmouth Conservation Commission, which is far from certain. TAC should table this project indefinitely until the ConCom votes on the CUP request, otherwise its a giant waste of everyone's time.

2) These plans looked like they were designed in 1950's with respect to storm water management. This design puts all storm water into closed drainage and shoots it directly into North Mill Pond with minimal treatment. What ever happened to groundwater recharge and post-development flows not exceeding pre-development flows, a basic tenet of storm water management best practices in New Hampshire for over 30 years? TAC, again, should not even review these plans until NHDES Alteration of Terrain program gives this project conceptual approval for compliance with its regulations. If Portsmouth the

"Eco-Municipality" can require a lowly homeowner to construct storm water infiltration basins like the ones on 42 Rockingham and 482 Broad St to protect the environment, certainly TAC can require the same for a massive 174 apartment project located in such an environmentally sensitive location adjacent to North Mill Pond. See attached.

3) Where are the architectural drawings with elevation views of this project ? The applicant is doing his darnedest not to show how this project is playing with existing grades in order to comply with Portsmouth's new flood plain zoning rules and sneak in an extra three quarters of a story in building height. The existing site grade is about 10 to 11 feet. The first finish floor elevation of the apartment building is 17.5 ft. This means 7 feet of fill needs to be brought in to create a giant mole hill on top of which the apartment building will be constructed. This will also create a giant wall obstructing the view corridor on Dover Street. The first floor apartment building elevation needs to be lowered to 11-12 feet (i.e., at existing grade, which will comply with the Flood Zoning Ordinance) and the underground parking constructed below that.

4) If building the underground parking can not be dug that deep into the marine clays (finish floor underground parking / basement elevation 1.5 ft +/-) then the below building parking needs to be built on a slab at existing grade (11 to 12 ft) and the apartments built above that.

5) I was not aware a footpath / nature trail, that has not been funded or permitted, could be used for a fire truck access road. I'll trust the Fire Chief's call on that. I don't believe fire access roads are permitted in the 50 or 100 foot wetlands setback buffer.

6) Portsmouth DPW is taking sea level rise seriously and is raising the access road to the Pierce Island WWTP from a low point of about 8 ft and raising it to 11 ft near the dog park. This is so that the WWTP doesn't become an inaccessible island during high water events that will occur on a regular basis in the near future. Portsmouth should require the same for this project and require the new public road from Bartlett Street (which Portsmouth tax payers will fund to maintain) to be raised to at least elevation 11 ft so this project too will not become an island inaccessible to emergency vehicles and services during high water high events.

Regards,

Jim Hewitt





From: [Private General](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: For TAC 12-01-20
Date: Monday, November 30, 2020 12:13:10 PM

Dear Planning Department,

Please forward this picture with this short note to TAC regarding: 105 Bartlett St.

Dear Technical Advisory Committee,

For the last few years 105 Bartlett St has submitted many different version of what they would like to build next to the RR tracks. They have NEVER submitted ANY design plans with permanent structures out of the 100' Wetland Buffer as Article 10 requires. All of their submissions include a lot of "noise" on each page distracting from the issue. Please find attached a very crude example of how this goal could be accomplished, maintaining units and include a fire road outside of the 50' wetland buffer, which could be used by the greenway for the approximately 600' around the buildings. Many other TAC and ConCom related issues would be resolved by this change. Just say'n.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth Bratter (property owner 159 McDonough St)

All Buildings out of 100' buffer and Fire Access to Rear



Raised 1 story 20'

November 30, 2020

Re: TAC/ Dec 1,2020/ 105 Bartlett

Dear TAC,

As a 20+ year resident of Cabot Street, I must chime in on the 105 Bartlett Project prior to your committee meeting on December 1st.

There are several concerning issues, including:

- The elevation is being raised from the current 11 feet to 17.5 feet; that grade increase will also increase the building heights by over 6'!
- Speaking of elevations, I do not believe all the plans, including elevations, have been submitted. Don't the boards, including TAC, require a complete set of plans to be submitted?
- I do not believe the conservation committee has approved this project.
- The proposed traffic count is not believable. The loss of the dog daycare and the brewery will not offset the increased traffic count in and out of the development with the daily in-and-outs of the occupants and delivery vehicles, service vehicles and the like.
- The claim that much of the current surface is impervious is just not accurate and easily proven by just walking the property.

Please send the project back to the developers to complete and address the issues.

Thank you for your consideration and attention.

Regards,

Jennifer Meister, resident since 2000
287 Cabot Street
Jenjmeister@gmail.com

From: [Catherine Harris](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: Letter to TAC for their 12/01/ 2020 meeting regarding the 105 Bartlett Street Proposed Development Project
Date: Sunday, November 29, 2020 12:57:04 PM

To The Members of the Technical Advisory Committee,
I am writing with regard to the proposed development of 105 Bartlett Street, Portsmouth.

At their most recent meeting, the Conservation Commission decided NOT to allow any structures in the 100' Wetlands Buffer Zone. I support their decision. I also support their recommendation NOT to allow a 14' wide Fire Lane within the 50' wetland buffer.

It is a fact that the growth rate in our county is so high that land conversion and development continue to eat away at our coastal habitat areas. We must hold this proposed project accountable to the same 100' setback requirements that everyone else living along the North Mill Pond are bound. It is a matter of shoreline and habitat protection.

To date, the developers have NOT shown any building plans outside that 100' buffer. I have to wonder whether they're choosing to simply ignore the decisions of the Conservation Commission in the hopes of getting their project approved as is. If so, they would be jeopardizing the health of the important natural resource that is the North Mill Pond and imperiling the varied wildlife that calls it home.

Sincerely,
Catherine Harris
166 Clinton Street
Portsmouth

From: [Juliet T.H. Walker](mailto:Juliet.T.H.Walker)
To: [Tracy A. Gora](mailto:Tracy.A.Gora)
Subject: FW: Revised letter for TAC 12/1/20 for 105 Bartlett
Date: Monday, November 30, 2020 8:17:36 AM

From: Nancy Johnson [mailto:n_johnson81@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, November 28, 2020 7:29 PM
To: Juliet T.H. Walker <jthwalker@cityofportsmouth.com>
Cc: Stefanie Giallongo <stefanie.giallongo@des.nh.gov>
Subject: Revised letter for TAC 12/1/20 for 105 Bartlett

Juliet - Please replace our letter of 11/24/20 with the following. Sorry for the inconvenience. NJ

Revised letter to Site Review, to replace our letter dated 11/24/20.

To: Site Review TAC, and Iron Horse Properties

Date: 11/29/2020

Re: 105 Bartlett St, TAC submission for 12/1/2020

From: Nancy & Brian Johnson, 81 Clinton St Portsmouth NH

The Cover Letter appears to be requesting a CUP for shared parking. We are not sure what else the developers are requesting at this time. We are bringing up the following concerns since they relate to parking on the lots.

The new buildings (A & B) are located, at least in part, within the 100 foot wetland buffer in conflict with City of Portsmouth Wetland Regulations. The parking for these buildings is predicated by each building's position relative to the North Mill Pond. The Wetland Regulations require these new buildings be shifted outside of the 100 foot buffer zone, which will require a complete revamping of the lot boundaries, and the parking, for the buildings. "New construction, ground disturbance and fill or removal of soil are not allowed in the Wetland Buffer without a City Conditional Use Permit." The request for a CUP for new buildings in the Wetland Buffer does not appear to us to be an explicit part of this Site Review Request. The new buildings are not Grandfathered, and building on the current Great Rhythm site is Grandfathered only if the footprint remains the same.

Looking at the entire expanse of the current lots, there is plenty of room for the new buildings to be moved out of the 100 foot buffer and still provide ample parking as well as fire access on all sides of the buildings, without infringing on the buffer.

The developers should have had known full well the Wetland Buffer rules associated with this property prior to purchase. They should not now, after the fact, be requesting special treatment simply because they are promising a City easement to provide for a Greenway Path along the Mill Pond.

From: [Melissa Doerr](#)
To: [Planning Info](#); [Juliet T.H. Walker](#)
Subject: TIME-SENSITIVE -- Please forward to TAC members prior to 2 pm meeting today, 12/1/2020
Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 7:13:03 AM
Attachments: [18.11.13_105Bartlett_publicconcerns.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Dear Technical Advisory Committee Members:

I am writing in regards to “The application of Clipper Traders, LLC, Portsmouth Hardware and Lumber, LLC, Owners and Iron Horse Properties, LLC, Owner and Applicant, for properties located at 105 Bartlett Street and Bartlett Street requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition and relocation of existing structures and the construction of 170 dwelling units and 10,300 sq. ft. of office space in three (3) buildings...”

In reviewing this application, I respectfully ask that you re-read the attached list of public concerns regarding this project. This is a massive and complicated development that will forever change the character, landscape, and natural environment of the North Mill Pond and its many abutting properties.

At this point, **my single greatest concern about this application is the proposed building (and intensity) in the wetland buffer.** Residents and the Conservation Commission alike have reiterated this concern over many years, months, and meetings. Please note that ConComm has not ruled on buildings in the 100 ft buffer and the Planning Board has not ruled on a Conditional Use Permit to be in the wetlands buffer. It is also my understanding that the applicant has not yet applied for NHDES Wetlands and Shore Land Permits. Given these significant, unresolved matters, *would it not be a classic case of putting the cart before the horse for TAC to approve this application today?*

Assuming you do evaluate (or consider voting on) this application today, I respectfully request that you require the following information from the developers:

1. **Building height and grade** – What exactly is the height, including grade, of the proposed structures? Will the height and grade obstruct the agreed-upon view corridors, as defined in the recent rezoning?
2. **Building dimensions** – What are the exact lengths and widths of each of the proposed structures? It is my understanding that the plans submitted do not show all the building dimensions, as TAC requires. Will the building dimensions obstruct in any way the agreed-upon view corridors?
3. **Wetland buffer** – What (if any) changes is the developer willing to make to move the structures, paving, and any other new construction out of the wetland buffer?

Thank you,
Melissa Doerr
Abutter



MEMORANDUM

TO: CONSERVATION COMMISSION, TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEE, PLANNING BOARD
FROM: JULIET T.H. WALKER, PLANNING DIRECTOR *JTW*
SUBJECT: PUBLIC CONCERNS REGARDING 105 BARTLETT ST POTENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT
DATE: 11/13/18

When 105 Bartlett Street went through the re-zoning process, a number of issues were raised by residents regarding the future development of the parcels. As many of the issues were pertinent for consideration during the land use review process, the City Council requested that a summary of the issues be provided to the land use review boards and commissions for their consideration when they are reviewing a specific development proposal for these properties. The following list is a brief summary of the topics raised:

- Protection of residential neighborhoods – Consideration should be given for limiting potential for negative impacts on residential neighborhoods abutting the project site.
- Consider further limits on height and mass of buildings beyond what the zoning currently allows. This was raised in the context of limiting impacts on neighboring residential neighborhoods.
- Protection of wetlands and wetland buffer area as well as the water quality and waterfront habitat of the North Mill Pond.
- Reduce and avoid potential impacts to properties from flooding.
- Require soil testing wherever soil disturbance is proposed to determine the suitability of the soils for the proposed land use as well as the potential for health and environmental impacts of any soil disturbance.
- Preserve open spaces and views
- Protect and restore natural shoreline habitat
- Balance economic and public benefits with potential for neighborhood impacts
- Seek ways to provide direct neighborhood access to proposed North Mill Pond path and greenway
- Analyze and mitigate traffic impacts to City's transportation infrastructure created by any new development or expansion of existing land uses on the site
- Analyze existing noise levels and any potential increase in noise levels due to new development and require mitigating measures if required

From: [Juliet T.H. Walker](#)
To: [Tracy A. Gora](#)
Subject: Fwd: For the members of today's TAC meeting
Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 10:17:02 AM

Juliet T. H. Walker, AICP
Planning Director
Planning Department
[1 Junkins Ave](#)
[Portsmouth, NH 03801](#)
[\(603\) 610-7296](#)
www.cityofportsmouth.com/planportsmouth
Twitter: @PlanPortsmouth

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abigail Gindele <agindele@gmail.com>
Date: December 1, 2020 at 10:14:01 AM EST
To: "Juliet T.H. Walker" <jthwalker@cityofportsmouth.com>
Subject: **For the members of today's TAC meeting**

Dear Technical Advisory Committee Members:

I am writing in regards to “The application of Clipper Traders, LLC, Portsmouth Hardware and Lumber, LLC, Owners and Iron Horse Properties, LLC, Owner and Applicant, for properties located at 105 Bartlett Street and Bartlett Street requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition and relocation of existing structures and the construction of 170 dwelling units and 10,300 sq. ft. of office

space in three (3) buildings...”

I and many others have submitted letters to other City boards expressing our concerns about this project. I hope those letters would have been forwarded on to this committee for your consideration. In case they haven't....

In reviewing this application, I respectfully ask that you re-read the attached list of public concerns regarding this project. This is a massive and complicated development that will forever change the character, landscape, and natural environment of the North Mill Pond and its many abutting properties.

At this point, **my single greatest concern about this application is the proposed building (and intensity) in the wetland buffer.** Residents and the Conservation Commission alike have reiterated this concern over many years, months, and meetings. Please note that ConComm has not ruled on buildings in the 100 ft buffer and the Planning Board has not ruled on a Conditional Use Permit to be in the wetlands buffer. It is also my understanding that the applicant has not yet applied for NHDES Wetlands and Shore Land Permits. Given these significant, unresolved matters, *would it not be a classic case of putting the cart before the horse for TAC to approve this application today?*

Assuming you do evaluate (or consider voting on) this application today, I respectfully request that you require the following information from the developers:

1. **Building height and grade** – What exactly is the height, including grade, of the proposed structures? Will the height and grade obstruct the agreed-upon view corridors, as defined in the recent rezoning?
2. **Building dimensions** – What are the exact lengths and widths of each of the proposed structures? It is my understanding that the plans submitted do not show all the building dimensions, as TAC requires. Will the building dimensions obstruct in any way the agreed-upon view corridors?
3. **Wetland buffer** – What (if any) changes is the developer willing to make to move the structures, paving, and any other new construction out of the wetland buffer?

Thank you,

Abigail Gindele

229 Clinton St

Technical Advisory Committee
Re:105 Bartlett St. development
Meeting Dec 1, 2020

Dear Members of TAC

I am writing in regard to the meeting scheduled today regarding the 170 residential development on the 4.71 acres of 105 Bartlett st. Due to multiple issues that have not be released for public viewing, I would ask that the committee not commit to any approvals prior to the approvals of the state NHDES, wetlands approval, and conservation committee approvals.

During the last meeting of the conservation committee the issue of the 100' setback was raised and pending the outcome of their decisions, could completely change multiple facets of the development project. This would include greenway, number of units, ability to apply to extra building heights and mass.

As of Monday Nov 30, 2020, there were no public documents in regard to the North, South, East, & West building elevations for abutters to review. I believe that this is a requirement of TAC proposals.

See TAC comments from 6/1/2020, #8 "all building dimensions should be show in order to demonstrate compliance w/ building block, height and facade." All that is shown is the footprints & a height. Where are the 4 building elevations for each of the 3 buildings?

Per traffic studies by Stephen G. Pernaw & Co. Table 1 & comments it is stated that "removal of brew & daycare uses essentially cancels out the impact of the proposed residential /commercial development." Pernaw & Co. uses the ITE publication, Sub table LUC 221. They list that when the study was done for the 1st proposed 120 unit development there would be 652 trips generated per 24 hrs. Per the ITE publication included, at the percentage rates used on an hourly basis, the traffic numbers are far larger then what the studies state.

There is no mention of the trips per the 10,300 sq ft of commerical space.

There is no mention of inclusion of the 1% yearly increase stated in the ITE publications.

There is no accounting for the # of trips generated for the increased package delivery via online shopping; i.e. UPS/ AMAZON/USPS not to mention food delivery, appliance deliveries, etc. The effect of traffic entering and turning onto the Bartlett street corridor will create unsafe situations for all involved. Cars/bicycles/ pedestrians will all have safety issues.

Per the drainage analysis on page 2-3, and (PA-1), the reports misrepresent the drainage of the 4.91 acre lot where the 3 buildings will be built Map 157 Lot 1, by using the drainage area of that 4.71 acre lot along with parts of the 1.20 acre lot (map 164 Lot 1) and 1.89 acre lot (map 157 Lot 2) in order to add to statement that " mostly

impervious surfaces in form of paved parking". The 4.91 acre lot (Map 157 Lot 1) has no less than 65% previous land, with either gravel driveways, or wooded areas.

Who will be held responsible for basements that likely will start flooding on McDonough St as the new grade elevation is raised from a maximum 13.34' (current) to more than 17.5'. Not only is the grade being raised to avoid Coastal Climate impacts (an obvious admission of rising sea levels), but also with a slope that drains not towards the pond but towards the railroad tracks. With ever increasing tropical rain events and storms that produce rains that were once considered 50 yr or 100 yr events occurring with more frequency, these coastal developments are becoming higher risk, which we as tax payers will end up carrying the burden.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely

James Beal

286 Cabot St.

Abutter McDonough neighborhood.

Hourly Distribution of Entering and Exiting Vehicle Trips by Land Use					
Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition					
Land Use Code	221				
Setting	Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)				
Time Period	General Urban/Suburban		Dense Multi-Use Urban		Center C
Trip Type	Weekday		Weekday		Wee
# Data Sites	Vehicle		Vehicle		Veh
	8		4		:
	% of 24-Hour Traffic		% of 24-Hour Traffic		% of 24-Hr
Time	Entering	Exiting	Entering	Exiting	Entering
12-1 AM	0.7	0.3	0.8	0.2	2.6
1-2 AM	0.3	0.2	1.3	0.1	0.4
2-3 AM	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.9
3-4 AM	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.4
4-5 AM	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.4
5-6 AM	0.6	2.7	2.3	1.6	0.4
6-7 AM	1.5	6.5	4.1	4.1	1.8
7-8 AM	2.8	12.1	4.2	17.7	5.3
8-9 AM	3.5	8.8	5.1	9.2	4.8
9-10 AM	2.9	5.7	2.5	5.6	5.7
10-11 AM	2.7	4.7	4.4	3.8	2.2
11-12 PM	4.5	4.5	3.1	5.7	3.9
12-1 PM	4.8	4.6	4.7	5.2	4.4
1-2 PM	4.1	4.8	5.3	3.7	3.9
2-3 PM	5.8	5.0	5.9	3.3	3.9
3-4 PM	6.7	4.9	6.2	4.4	6.1
4-5 PM	10.6	6.2	10.0	4.7	4.8
5-6 PM	12.6	7.7	8.7	4.1	8.3
6-7 PM	9.3	6.6	6.7	8.6	8.8
7-8 PM	7.8	4.8	6.7	4.4	7.9
8-9 PM	7.0	3.3	5.1	4.3	7.0
9-10 PM	5.5	2.2	4.6	3.1	5.3
10-11 PM	3.6	1.9	4.4	2.8	7.0
11-12 AM	2.0	1.1	1.9	2.8	3.5

⊗ NOTES PROPOSED 120 UNITS 652 TRIPS 24 hr.
 6-7 am 17.7% 652 trips = 115.4 exiting
 4-5 pm 10% 652 trips = 65.2 entering

From: [Jonathan Wyckoff](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Cc: [Beth Dinan](#); [Nancy Johnson](#); gatoday@yahoo.com
Subject: 105 Bartlett st
Date: Monday, November 30, 2020 5:50:11 PM

Juliet Walker, Nick Cracknell, members of the Technical Advisory Committee, and members of the Planning Board ;

As many know, I'm a life long resident of Portsmouth with many connections to the Creek neighborhood. I've been heading up an unofficial neighborhood committee for years and am a vice chair for the Advocates for the North Millpond. As such I am genuinely concerned about the scale and scope of this project which affects much of the design of the site. As a vice chair of the Historic District commission, I can say that we all know not all buildings can be converted to a restaurant, for example, as we would not allow the various appurtenances to be visible. In the same instance, just because a lot has X amount of square footage, does not mean that the lot and location can support that request. I'm going to hopefully briefly express my concerns:

As you know the traffic for Ricci lumber enters and exits off Bartlett st onto this driveway(?), not a legal road. The study by Stephan Parnaw Co, quotes a morning peak traffic of 70 vehicles and afternoon peak of 86. I believe this figure is mistaken and arrived at by a commercial square footage formula. They also did not take into consideration the number of interstate sized trucks, box trucks, and contractor trailers which are practically the norm. Parnaw Co also estimates an adjusted volume of 1025 vehicles a day, entering and exiting!! That's a staggering amount of new traffic on an ancient, poorly laid out intersection, which is trying to do so much with so little! As the big semi trailer trucks come in the drive to the back of the lumber yard and swing right to get in to discharge their load (pg 102) then continue between Area Millwork and the former Swap shop to exit. The drawings show the trucks swinging left, https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fno.no&c=E.1.QCMV95pYduxBm_MIGlzRVQobW2ei9KetneNVLQLM2phJbpMprBgRCZB0m2_GbFWNg69fmdZEAmlwajeO0vvfln5sOpIXAXU2u-ja0DK3MMul2vY0&typo=1 no, they have to turn right to somehow get over to Cate st, but there does not seem to be a sufficient turning radius, unless Area Millwork were to lose some of its frontage. Still a nightmare for one of the worst intersections in the city. I suppose an automatic red light could come on and stop the traffic from Islington st turning onto Bartlett and blindly finding a tractor trailer as they emerge from under the RR Bridge.

Also, in the same vein, is the problem of the fire trucks having to go all the way, thru a parking lot, to a sharp turn into the buffer so called greenway which will have to be paved with gravel on both sides, making a walking path of 14 feet. This was supposed to be a community space in trade off for extra height to obviously allow more units. The fire truck could make a more comfortable turn within the confines of the end of the parking lot which would mean losing 20 or so parking spaces resulting in the loss of 10|15 apartments. Considering our trade off for yet another paved space, the height limit is out of control and nothing should be approved with height of 66.5 feet. In the downtown HDC district we measure flat roofs from the High Point of the grade.

Concerning the exterior lighting, I would hope you insist on more smaller, shorter light posts with warmer Led (2700 k) dark sky compliant. We on the north side of the pond do not want another Parking garage, mall type lighting scheme.

I know the railroad brick building and the round house ruin with the complete footprint of the turntable, by the way is one of only 3 left in the state, are casually dismissed and scheduled for demolition. Anyone with the sense to look back at the history of these structures would know the less disturbance. Seventy five years of Coal ash, and another 50 years of diesel along with assorted lubricants, heavy metals and even some human waste all reside concentrated in that area. The turntable's bottom should lie 6 feet below grade as that would allow men to get below a locomotive to work. How deep would the excavation be to remove the contaminated soil? And right on the shore, in the buffer. Obviously steel shoring would have to be driven into the soil! Will the buildings need pilings driven into the soil? How are all these gigantic dump trucks going to leave the site?

In conclusion, as I mentioned earlier, not all sites are acceptable for the number of units zoning could allow. As this land sits, it is the largest, semi undeveloped lot in the downtown area until one gets to the hospital and the subsequent Great Bog. Many wild animals call this home and go back and forth to the hospital, including coyotes, deer, and a bear. Also countless shore birds including osprey, kingfishers, ducks, geese, etc nest and roost in these trees. I know this is a matter for the CCC, but I've lived on Sparhawk st since 1976 and one of my greatest joys is watching. There are more than enough problems mentioned here to make you want to take a longer look, request more information and hopefully reduce the overall size of this project so that it more comfortably fits its lot and surroundings. This is a big one! Once it's gone it's Gone!

Jonathan Wyckoff. 135 Sparhawk st.

Sent from my iPad