

RE: 1 Raynes Ave

Meeting: August 3, 2021

Dear Members of Technical Advisory Committee,

Here are some things that may need to be addressed regarding 1 & 31 Raynes Ave:

The size of this development and it being on known toxic land seems to have been a main topic of concern by most boards they have come before. It is interesting there have been **NO changes in the size of this development at all so far in this process.**

The wording on page 132 regarding 1.7 Snow and Ice Management, states removal will be done in a “timely fashion”. This seems to leave a lot of room for snow to be left in piles until it can be picked up. **Snow removal and snow plowing should happen at the same time.**

Looking at the Landscape Plans (pg 98) **where is the HOTL?** It seems some of the plants will be underwater during high tide. **Will these plantings be submersion proof?** This is a brackish pond.

Page 158 seems to show the surface area of the stepped commercial area will only be about 12.5’ wide. **How far is it exactly from the edge of the building on Maplewood Ave to where the height increases? What is its actual surface area-length and width?**

The dumpster gate is very nicely landscaped. **How will a truck access the dumpsters if the area in front of it is covered in grasses and plants?**

The parking report shows there will be 25 reserved spaces (pg 16) and 25 off-site spaces. **What does reserved mean in this case?** It also seems like there are only 22 Valet parking spaces-was not able to find the other 3.

At the last TAC meeting it was made clear the **residential parking would need to be assigned to each unit and no tandem parking could be used by the hotel.** This shakes up the number slightly.

Peer Traffic Review should be read carefully and compared to the Revised Traffic Report by Tighe and Bond. **It should be noted the recommendation made in number 14 of the Peer Review should be examined by the Portsmouth Parking Director since this area has received many parking CUPs and parking variances.**

Why didn’t Tighe and Bond use the 2020 ITE 10th Edition Supplement to address bicycle and other transportation mode information now available? The traffic analysis does not seem to include any issues these changes may have on bicycle traffic or how bicycle traffic will be addressed as the trail exits from the RR by the cemetery onto Maplewood Ave . It should be noted Precision Data information is from **January 31, 2019.** It’s been my experience that not too many people ride bikes in January! The June 12, 2021 and the June 10th Raw Data is probably more realistic!

Some of the recommendations of the Peer Review; Tighe and Bond did not seem to address all of them perhaps some were combined.

4. Therefore, the trip generation for the two commercial land uses is **conservative** as presented within the TIS.

5. The vehicular traffic generated by the proposed project was distributed onto the adjacent roadway system based upon prior traffic studies and observed travel patterns. Tighe & Bond should discuss **how the projected distribution for the apartments differs,** if at all, from available Journey-to-Work data published by the US Census Bureau for persons

residing in the City of Portsmouth. This form of trip distribution is more consistent with industry standards for residential developments.

The Applicant **should review the site distributions and revise the analyses at the intersection of the site driveway / Raynes Avenue, as necessary.**

The change in traffic pattern will have an impact on several of the study area intersections. Tighe & Bond should evaluate the redistribution of the existing traffic volumes, future traffic volumes, and site generated volumes and prepare new analyses for the impacted study area intersections.

7. No off-site mitigation is proposed to be implemented. Mitigation may be found to be necessary with the reevaluation of the traffic operations with one-way traffic flow along Raynes Avenue. Specifically, the intersection of Raynes Avenue with Maplewood Avenue should be evaluated for alternative traffic control options.

9. Tighe & Bond should discuss whether two turn lanes are necessary. Provision of two lanes may not significantly improve the operation of this approach and maintaining a minimum crossing distance for pedestrians is preferred.

13. This equates to a projected peak parking demand for the hotel and apartment land uses of 147 parking spaces, eleven spaces above the 136 parking spaces provided.

16. The applicant should confirm that these spaces will be restricted per the Ordinance requirement.

Thank you for taking the time to carefully review the traffic report and other information provided in this revised plan.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bratter
159 McDonough St
Portsmouth Property Owner
August 2, 2021