

MINUTES

CONSERVATION COMMISSION

**1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

3:30 p.m.

June 13, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Steve Miller; Vice Chairman MaryAnn Blanchard;
Members Allison Tanner, Adrienne Harrison, Samantha Collins,
Barbara McMillan;

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ted Jankowski; Nathalie Morison

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner/Sustainability Coordinator

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. May 09, 2018

Vice Chairman Blanchard requested an amendment to her statement in the previous month's minutes. After her motion for Martine Cottage Road it should read: Vice Chairman Blanchard stated she would not recommend approval. In the next paragraph it should read: Vice Chairman Blanchard said this proposal does not respect the loss of trees with regards to impacts on the water flow, water quality and impact to the watershed.

Ms. McMillan pointed out a typo on page two in the first paragraph. An "a" should be removed. Ms. McMillan noted that in the third paragraph it should say "requested clarification." The third paragraph on the fourth page should say "the pool." Finally on page 6 should clarify that it is "prime wetlands."

Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to approve the May 9, 2018 minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The motion passed with (4) votes in favor, (0) against and (2) abstention. Ms. Collins and Ms. Harrison abstained because they were not at the May 9, 2018 meeting.

II. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

- A. 390 New Castle Avenue
393 New Castle Avenue LLC, owner
Assessor Map 207, Lot 6

Steve Riker with Ambit Engineering and the owner Mark Hepp spoke to the application. This is a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and a State Wetland Application. It is a straightforward and simple request. The owner was here two years ago with a proposal to raise the finished floor. There was some landscaping and a buffer planting area installed. That has been completed. The

owner has gone through one full winter with the gravel parking and found it is difficult to maintain. The proposal is to remove gravel parking and put in porous pavement. This reduces the pervious coverage from 52.7 to 16.8. The storm water and maintenance plan for the pavement has been included.

Ms. Harrison questioned if the footprint would be the same? Mr. Riker confirmed that it would. Ms. Harrison appreciated the maintenance plan.

Ms. McMillan noted that from the pictures it looked like the road runoff came on to the pavement. Mr. Riker confirmed that was correct. Ms. McMillan noted that the sand, salt and gravel from the roadway could cause clogging issues on the porous pavement. The maintenance plan is great, but once a year will not be enough. It should be vacuumed at least two times a year. Ms. Harrison suggested that an apron could be added to help minimize clogging. Ms. McMillan added that would redirect the runoff. Mr. Riker noted that there was a catch basin on the street. There is a flow that comes down street in that direction and makes its way to that catch basin.

Chairman Miller questioned if there was a way to grade it. Mr. Riker responded that it would be hard to grade to mitigate it on the applicant's property. Chairman Miller noted that the sand would clog it. Is there a way to heighten the pavement on the property? Ms. Tanner noted that the problem with raising it is that the plow will hit it. Mr. Britz suggested grading a corner to get the runoff to the catch basin. That would keep the driveway separate. Chairman Miller stated that it would be worth talking to the paver about it.

Mr. Hepp stated that he has owned the property for six years. All of the runoff from New Castle Ave sheets off the road. There is a storm drain right there that goes right into the back channel. He could attempt to make a depression in the first foot or two in to direct the water. When changes were made last year he shrunk the driveway area. It can't be higher because of the city plow. It could be made lower. Chairman Miller encouraged them to work with the paver to see if there was something to do to minimize the impact. The more maintenance for the porous pavement the better it will be.

Ms. Harrison questioned if any other materials would perform better under the circumstances? Mr. Riker responded that pavers would be an option if the plow weren't a concern.

Ms. McMillan questioned what equipment would be used to vacuum or sweep? Mr. Riker responded that some of the larger landscaping companies have a vacuum. Piscataqua Landscaping has one. Ms. McMillan questioned if the plan said anything about not treating the pervious pavement with salt or sand? Mr. Riker confirmed that would be added. Ms. McMillan recommended maintenance for the driveway two times a year. This is a huge potentially impervious area if it fails. Mr. Hepp commented that this area was already impervious. It is packed gravel. Anything that is done would be an improvement.

Chairman Miller noted that they needed to make sure whoever does the paving has experience paving with pervious pavement.

Vice Chairman Blanchard requested clarification on the drain that goes right out into the river. Mr. Hepp responded that every drain on New Castle Ave does. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if there was any buffer screen or filter in the drains. Mr. Britz responded they didn't know. Chairman Miller questioned if New Castle Ave was a city or state road. Mr. Britz was not sure who maintained it. Mr. Britz stated he would bring it up with the Department of Public Works to see what their upgrade plan was.

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

1. That deicer is not applied to the new porous driveway.
2. That the porous driveway surface is vacuumed twice per year.
3. That the NE corner of the driveway be constructed at a lower elevation to prevent road runoff from getting over the entire porous parking.

The Commission voted unanimously **(6-0.)**

- B. 220 Walker Bungalow Road
Jon & Joan Dickinson, owners
Assessor Map 223, Lot 20

Steve Riker and John Chagnon with Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. The Dickinson's bought this property almost a year ago, and want to redevelop it. They engaged Ambit Engineering to provide a survey and develop plans for redevelopment. This is a CUP Application and State Wetland Application. Today would just be a work session. Mr. Riker welcomed feedback to make revisions. The existing conditions plan shows the existing house on the property and a detached garage. There is a paved asphalt driveway. A smaller driveway goes to the garage and one goes to the house with a paved apron around it. The existing leach field is in the front yard on the property. Chairman Miller requested clarification that the driveway that came off of Walker Bungalow Road was V-shaped. Mr. Riker confirmed that was correct and pointed out the driveway path. The property has a shared driveway with 212 Walker Bungalow Road. There is quite a bit of asphalt in the buffer. The Dickinson's are using Lindal Cedar Homes out of Maine. The green line on the plan shows the structure setbacks. There is a 30-foot front yard setback. The property lines along the road go down the middle of the street. It's a private road. The 30-foot setback is from the middle of the road back. There is a 10-foot side yard setback. The pink line shows the water main and the proposed and existing water line to the house. The septic leach field has to be 25 feet away from both water lines. The field also has to be 75 feet away from surface water. The new leach field would go in the same location it is now. There will be grading on and around the leach field. There is a limited area of where a structure can go on the property. The goal was to move it as close to the road as possible. The proposed driveway would share with the driveway to 212 Walker Bungalow Road and include a turn around.

Ms. Tanner noted that the house was huge. Ms. Tanner questioned why the house couldn't be rotated, so there would be less impervious pavement. Mr. Riker responded that they could look at that more. Mr. Chagnon added that they have to maintain setbacks and there is a rain garden there. Ms. Tanner questioned if the rain garden had to be there. Mr. Chagnon responded that rotating the house would put more of the house in the 50-foot buffer. Ms. Tanner responded that she would like to see what it looked like.

Mr. Riker stated that the rain garden would handle all of the storm water components except for one portion of garage. That will be a drip apron for that. Chairman Miller requested clarification on the spillway because it looked large. Chairman Miller questioned if it would infiltrate at the rain garden. Mr. Chagnon responded that the spillway is a feature of every pond. It would infiltrate. If it is frozen or clogged then they want to make sure there is a spillway for that. Chairman Miller responded that the spillway was just big. Mr. Chagnon stated that they could probably make it smaller. The goal is to ensure that the water passes in a safe manner for higher rainfall events. The topography of the lot and the grading of the house are higher on the street

side. The septic and tank are at an elevation based on the seasonal high water table. It is elevation 18 at the back of the house and on the water side the grades are at 12. The house provides a break in the grade. The first floor needs to get high enough to get the septic in the front. This plan allows the house to be the grade break, so no fill is needed in the backyard. The slab of the garage is 1.3 feet above the street and the finished floor is 14 inches above that. That helped dictate the rain garden location. The bottom of the rain garden is elevation 14 with a berm that goes up 12 inches with an outlet. It blended in well with the road and the top of the rain garden is at that elevation. It won't look out of place and will blend with the site. Currently the water is channeled down to the spillway into the creek. It will be a softer edge and all the site water will be treated.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned what the approximate square footage of the existing house and garage were. Mr. Chagnon pointed out the table on sheet C3. The main structure and garage is 1,819 square feet. Mr. Riker added that 2,174 square feet is what is proposed. The house itself is 1,968 square feet. The garage is 756 square feet. The existing garage is 22 by 22 so it is 484 square feet. The house is 1,400 or 1,300 square feet. Vice Chairman Blanchard asked if it would be one or two stories. Mr. Riker replied that it would be two stories.

Mr. Riker noted that there was a storm water buffer planting exhibit in the package. The majority of the shoreline is riprap. The methodology of the proposed buffer planting area was to continue with what is on 212 Walker Bungalow Road. It would be 10 feet wide with the same plant species and seed mix. The schedule and number of plants are in the plans. There is an exhibit that shows the permanent and temporary impact areas. The last exhibit shows the amount of structure and impervious surface in the 50-foot buffer. The exhibit shows that the plans tried and did pull the structure away from the 50-foot buffer. Currently there is 1,135 square feet of structure, 281 square feet of decking and 299 square feet of paved driveway in the 50-foot buffer. The proposed would have 521 square feet of structure, 472 square feet decking and no paved driveway in the 50-foot buffer.

Ms. Tanner noted that there were three trees on the existing plans that don't show up on the revised version. Mr. Riker responded that there were two spruce trees adjacent to the proposed driveway and they will have to be removed. A small retaining wall was added on the proposed plans to accommodate the grade change to get into the garage and account for the grade change to pitch the water. That's where those spruce trees are. The third spruce tree would be very close to the proposed house and deck and needs to be removed. Ms. Tanner noted that the proposed plans added buffer plantings, but no new trees. Mr. Riker confirmed that the buffer plantings included 39 plants and thought that they compensated for removing three trees. If the Commission wanted them to replace the trees, then that could be done. Ms. Tanner confirmed she would like to see that.

Chairman Miller noted that it would be good to think about how to deal with water underneath the proposed deck. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they could do stone under it.

Mr. Chagnon added that the roof is pitched entirely to the east. All of the roof runoff goes to the rain garden through a pipe. Mr. Riker clarified all but a small portion of the garage.

Ms. McMillan requested more information about the history of all the riprap. Mr. Chagnon responded that he did a plan in 1993. At the time the house had been built in the 60s and that was the original septic design. There was a wooden retaining wall along the edge. There was a permit when the walls were in disrepair and it went to riprap in 2010. Mr. Riker added that the permit included a dock and the dock was never constructed.

Ms. McMillan questioned if a stream went by there. Ms. Harrison responded that it was a high tide. Chagnon responded that there is a culvert under Walker Bungalow Road that drains the

area up to Martine Cottage Road. It does flow, but the wetland upstream buffers the flow. Mr. Britz added there was a channel, but he was not sure how often it flowed.

Vice Chairman Blanchard appreciated the challenges that an existing building and layout created and the need to redo the septic. However, the main building is really big. There is so much in the wetland buffer. There could be some management to get that down a bit. The neighbor is reconstructing on the existing footprint. The house size is big.

Ms. Collins agreed and noted that she would like to see a decrease in the overall footprint. Ms. Collins added that they should look into using more of the shared driveway for access to the garage. The garage entrance could be on the west side. Mr. Chagnon responded that the issue was that the driveway dives down as it goes. It's 3 feet below the garage. In order to come out of the garage they would have to add pavement that is not on the property. That's why driveway is laid out how it is. The shared driveway is only 10 feet wide. Ms. Collins questioned if the driveway could connect sooner? Mr. Britz clarified that it could start at the street and then angle in. Mr. Chagnon responded that there is a pole in the way and that would cause people to have to back out all the way to the street. It would be a blind blackout. Ms. Tanner noted that they could add a turn around in the front. Mr. Chagnon responded that the septic has to be raised up above the water table. It's a foot and a half higher than the driveway. The height of the septic would not allow that to work. Mr. Britz questioned if the septic could move closer to the road. Mr. Chagnon responded that it could not because of the water line. Ms. Collins questioned if it was a two-car garage? Mr. Riker confirmed that it was.

Chairman Miller noted that he did like combining of the house and garage.

Ms. Harrison noted that if there was any way to reduce the size of the deck that would help pull it back more. It would reduce the size of the footprint. They should be sure the rain garden can handle all the runoff for the roof. Ms. Harrison appreciated the planting in the area where there isn't riprap. There is a gap where more plantings could be added. Mr. Riker confirmed that it would be added. The rain garden sizing calculations are in the plan. It includes the driveway. The rain garden is now a little oversized because of the driveway.

Ms. McMillan questioned what the elevation of the outfall of the rain garden was. Mr. Chagnon responded that the top of the berm was an elevation of 15.5 and the spillway is at 15. It is 6 inches below. Ms. McMillan noted that it was losing 6 inches of storage.

Ms. McMillan questioned how did it perk? Mr. Riker responded that they utilized test pit 2 for septic design.

Vice Chairman Blanchard brought up the importance of the tree scape. There is a significant investment in the property. The tree scape is important. It is important to have the green. Attention to trees especially if some will be removed is appreciated. Mr. Chagnon responded that trees could be added. Owner Joanie Dickinson responded that between both neighbors they were planning to put green trees between both sides of the properties instead of fences. It would be a tree that is right for that area. Vice Chairman Blanchard clarified that the trees would be a screen. That is important. Vice Chairman Blanchard talked about a tree scape from the water perspective as well. Ms. Dickinson responded that she was a Rotarian and just received two maple trees from the Rotary. They will be planted somewhere on the property when they move in. Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that those would take time to grow. Ms. Dickinson responded that her husband has a green thumb and will make property look beautiful. Ms. Dickinson clarified that the second floor of the house would not be a duplicate of the first. It's a lot of open space. There would be two small bedrooms on one side and a walkway across to a little office.

Mr. Britz commented that it looked like they counted the septic and rain garden as a temporary impact. Mr. Riker confirmed that was correct. Mr. Britz was not sure they would be temporary. Mr. Riker noted that DES doesn't have a definition for temporary vs. permanent. It boils down to what the inspector wants to call it. Altering an area to make it impervious then it would be a permanent impact. If it is equipment storage or mats then it is a temporary impact. It is a tough call if site grading for a house should be temporary or permanent impact. Mr. Chagnon noted that if the grade is changed, then it would be permanent impact. Mr. Britz agreed. If the topography is going to be something different then it's permanent impact. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that could be changed. Mr. Riker noted that the city just asks for disturbance. They don't need to differentiate temporary and permanent. Vice Chairman Blanchard agreed with Mr. Britz that the rain garden and septic were both permanent impact. Chairman Miller agreed. Mr. Riker noted that both count the same as far as the fee goes. Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that the problem was there are no definitions. Mr. Riker agreed and noted that they were not trying to hide impact. Chairman Miller commented that the Commission might want to look at the definitions internally. Mr. Britz added that it would be helpful to be clear about it.

Ms. McMillan commented that a note about not using de-icing materials and sand should be added for the pervious pavement. Mr. Riker confirmed that would be added.

Ms. McMillan questioned if the Commission would want to do a site visit? Ms. Collins noted that would be helpful. Mr. Britz confirmed he would set it up.

At the request of the applicant, Ms. Tanner moved to *postpone* review of the application to the July 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0)

C. 198 Essex Avenue
Robert Westhelle, owner
Assessor Map 232, Lot 128

Chairman Miller noted that the application was pretty straightforward. It was to add a shed in the buffer.

Mr. Britz noted that he would reach out to ensure the applicant would come to the Planning Board Meeting. Chairman Miller questioned if the Commission had any questions or concerns. The existing conditions include a lawn and a low undergrowth. The application could move along unless there concerns.

Ms. Tanner questioned if the only thing there was low growth lawn. Ms. Tanner wanted to ensure no trees were coming down. Mr. Britz responded that he asked the applicant about trees and that's why the applicant added shrubs. Mr. Britz would confirm with the applicant that no trees were coming down.

Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that even though this was a small project. It's important to speak with the homeowner. This should be postponed to the next meeting, so the owner can present the project.

At the request of the applicant, Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to *postpone* review of the application to the July 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0.)

- D. 70 & 80 Corporate Drive
Lonza Biologics, owner
Assessor Map 305, Lot 1

Bradlee Mezquita from Tighe and bond, Gary Coombs from Lonza, Joel Ballestero from Streamworks, Luke Hurley from Grove Environmental, and Justin Pasay from DTC Lawyers were present. Mr. Mezquita noted that they have been at this for quite a while. The application has been before TAC for a work session, been to the Conservation Commission for a work session and have done a site walk. This month they went to TAC. Lonza is looking to do a fairly substantial project with wetland impact. There will be 55,555 square feet of wetland impact 68,062 square feet of buffer impact. They are mitigating the impact by daylighting the brook. The stream would be 45 square feet of mitigation, and the rest will be dealt with through a fund. Daylighting the stream is sufficient and in line with the Master Plan. Little has been done to the plans since the last meeting. Therefore, Mr. Mezquita did not do a full presentation but would answer any questions.

Vice Chairman Blanchard requested an overview of the what's going to happen with trees shrubs and plantings on the property. This is a significant reconstruction of a property. Mr. Mezquita responded that the whole parcel would be redeveloped. There isn't a whole lot of mature vegetation today. It is just tall grasses and shrubs. There is a clump of trees in the corner. They will be removed. As the site is developed everything in the dark green in the exhibit will be landscaped. Mr. Britz questioned if there was a landscape plan for the overall site? Mr. Mezquita responded that there was but it wasn't included in this plan set. Chairman Miller noted that it was his understanding that the clump of trees in the lower section would be removed, but the ones in the upper right would remain. Mr. Mezquita responded that there were a couple on the point and a couple on Corporate Drive that would be retained. Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that the tree scape was important. Mr. Mezquita confirmed that trees were being proposed. Chairman Miller noted that he would have liked to see that plan in the submission. The biggest impact will be to the grassland species. It's a big change. It would be nice to see something more creative to help replace some of the lost habitat.

Chairman Miller wanted to be clear that Joel Ballestero would be monitoring the stream. Mr. Ballestero responded that they won't be doing the monitoring, but have developed the plan for it. Mr. Mezquita noted that they haven't determined who will be monitoring it yet. Chairman Miller noted that on the additional indicators in the monitoring plan the habitat assessment on aquatic life jumped from 1 to 3. Is that because it's alternate years? Mr. Ballestero confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Britz noted that the stream had a very regular meander. Will that change over time? Mr. Ballestero confirmed that it would over time. In the short term there would not be much change. It's zippered and doesn't look natural. It will still be functioning even if it does not look natural. It can be easy to over engineer small streams and run the risk of failure. This will be much easier to build.

Ms. McMillan followed up on who was doing the monitoring. The plan says maybe a volunteer group could do it. When will that be decided? Will someone be paid to do this? Mr. Mezquita responded that typically it would be a contract that is set up. The operations plan outlines all the things that need to be contracted out for inspections. Mr. Britz recommended coming back a year after to report back on the functions.

Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that the landscaping plan was starting with a lot of small stuff. Mr. Mezquita responded that the trees are 12-14 feet tall.

Ms. McMillan asked about the curbing on the road at the site and the two streams on either side of the road. Mr. Britz responded that the applicant's had a pre-TAC meeting, but haven't had a full TAC. He could bring up putting in sloped granite curb or no curb to allow safe passage for animals. Mr. Britz noted that it could be a condition of this recommendation. Ms. McMillan added that no curbing would be great. Curb breaks would work too.

Chairman Miller questioned if the water was going to a big retention pond in the drainage analysis. Mr. Mezquita responded that post 2.1 was the little area down on the Goose Bay Drive side. Chairman Miller questioned if post 1.3 and 1.4 were the upper areas of the iron. Mr. Mezquita confirmed that was correct. They are on opposite ends. Chairman Miller questioned where 1.4 went. Mr. Mezquita responded that it went to a grass area to the right. Chairman Miller noted that the diagram showed almost all the water is being treated. Mr. Mezquita confirmed that was correct. This application has to go to AOT and TAC who will advise a third party review, so they will have ample review of the storm water treatment.

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned what would happen in the buildings. Mr. Coombs responded that they would be manufacturing areas similar to the existing buildings. There would be some office space.

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

1. Curb cuts would be added on both sides of Goose Bay Drive to allow for wildlife crossing.

The Commission voted unanimously **(6-0.)**

- E. 175 Gosport Road
175 Gosport Road, LLC, owner
Assessor Map 224, Lot 1
(This item was postponed at the May 9, 2018 meeting to the June 13, 2018 meeting.)

Corey Colwell and Andrew Gray from MSC spoke to the application. This project requires a CUP and State Wetland permit. There is also a shore land component. All of the applications have been submitted. This project was presented to the Commission in March and there was a site walk in April. They were prepared to attend the May meeting, however, upon review the applicant wanted to make some changes. They were there to revisit the application and show the minor revisions. The client made revisions to the patio pool house and cabana. That area has been reduced in size and moved 15-20 feet to the south. The pool deck has shrunk.

Ms. Tanner questioned if the apple tree in that area was saved. Mr. Colwell responded that it still needed to be removed.

The second change the applicant made was to the garage. It has moved north to save some trees in that area. The pavement around the garage has slightly increased. The applicant has boat trailers that would not fit in garage. They need to park them in the driveway. The fourth change is the retaining wall that was originally part of the scope of the project is no longer in scope. The state requested grading. The owner wants to leave the retaining wall as it is. The fifth change is the removal of a small rain garden that was initially proposed. There is shallow bedrock in that area and they will not be able to get the rain garden to the appropriate depth. It would result in standing water. The sixth and final revision was changing the driveway expansion from pavement to pervious pavers. Those were the minor revisions from the client.

The commission asked for an erosion and grading control plan. A silt sock was provided between the plantings and the pond. The dock shown on the existing features was based on old survey data. In the course of updating it the size of the dock was never updated. The dock that was shown previously was the old dock. The plans now show the correct dock. The dock does currently cross the extension of the property line. DES agreed with the Conservation Commission that the dock cannot cross the property line. It will be relocated to be on the property. In terms of dock slips, the dock size is far less than what is allowed. There will be two 10 by 20 floating docks. The tree replacement plan shows the removal of five trees. Three will be removed in the pool area and two in the driveway area. Landscape plan proposes adding 12 new trees and 5 red maples. Two will be near the pond and three near the garage. Seven gray dogwoods will be added between the pool and Sagamore Creek. The landscape plan shows the locations. There are also many shrubs and plants proposed. There is a significant amount of vegetation proposed for the site. The owner has added 100 trees along the property line. The owner is very pro vegetation and wants to maintain a healthy vegetated lot. The driveway cannot be made pervious. The primary purpose of the driveway is for trucks with boats to navigate. Porous pavement will not work. Regular pavement handles weight well. Last time the Commission asked about an organic landscape maintenance. The owner has reached out to Piscataqua Landscaping and will work with them to develop the plan. The main thing they want to stress is that they are improving the water quality running off the lot. The increase in vegetation combined with the bio swale will give the site a lot more treatment than what is there today.

Mr. Gray added that they are in the process of submitting this to the Shoreland and DES and they had received comment from them. This design incorporated their comments. The Shoreland permit was issued last week.

Chairman Miller questioned where the winterberries were going. Mr. Colwell responded that they are right by the existing retaining wall. Mr. Gray added that those shrubs provide one last line of shrub intake before the bio swale.

Chairman Miller questioned if there was detail on the bio swale. Mr. Gray responded that it should be in the standard detail on sheet C5.

Ms. Collins noted that the rain garden that was removed because of bedrock and questioned what that was mitigating. Mr. Gray responded that initially it was going to mitigate the roof runoff from the garage and some from the gravel driveway. The pavement sloped away from the garage and roof runoff, so it would be going a different direction. The Civil Engineer did not think that the grading required would direct enough water into the rain garden. Ms. Collins questioned where the runoff would go now. Mr. Colwell responded that it would go across the roof across the driveway into the bio swale. Ms. Collins requested clarification that all runoff from driveway and garage would be treated in the bio swale. Mr. Gray confirmed that was correct. Anything that would escape to the northeast would be taken up by the added red maples.

Ms. McMillan questioned if there was a cross section for the pervious pavers in the parking area. Mr. Gray added that they do have a pervious paver detail, but it wasn't added to the plans that were submitted.

Ms. McMillan questioned that the outlet where the drain comes from the pond will all be null and void because of the bio swale? Mr. Gray confirmed that was correct. The only thing in the pipe would be anything northwest of the driveway. Everything from the main driveway southeast would be in the bio swale. Mr. Colwell commented that there would still be water coming out of the drain from the marsh overflowing into the pond. That is the only runoff that it will receive. Ms. McMillan commented that the pipe did not look like it could handle many more years. Mr. Gray noted that it was a relatively recent structure. Mr. Colwell added that

years ago there was a gunnite swale that captured all the runoff. That point was never replaced. It's natural wetland going through that, however, if it's crushed it would at some point need to be updated. Mr. Gray noted that there are very easy access points right now and it functions adequately.

Chairman Miller questioned if the Conservation Commission should be looking at and the dock. Mr. Britz responded that the dock is allowed in the city use. The Commission should look at it from the state perspective. Chairman Miller questioned if there was a dock permit. Mr. Gray responded that it was broken out in the dredge and fill application. Chairman Miller had questions about waterfront pedestrian easement and who that abutter was. Mr. Colwell responded that the abutting owner is Dennis Donnermeyer. Chairman Miller questioned what the easement was? Mr. Colwell responded that the easement is across Mr. Donnermeyer's property. The city has an easement over that land owned by the abutter. That was granted from Tucker's Cove Limited Liability Company to the city of Portsmouth in 1999. The easement is for ingress and egress to the waterfront. Mr. Donnermeyer owns the fee and pays taxes for the property. Mr. Donnermeyer has submitted a letter saying he has no issue with the dock. Mr. Britz questioned if the application to the state has changed. Mr. Gray responded that they won't submit again until after this. Mr. Britz questioned if the ramp gets shorter? Mr. Colwell responded that it did not.

Vice Chairman Blanchard pointed out the bait shed on the map. What is that used for? Mr. Colwell responded that the footprint and location were not changing. The shed is not structurally sound, so it needs to be rebuilt. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if they would be running water, refrigeration or electricity to the shed. Mr. Gray responded that they were not. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned what the foundation was. Mr. Gray responded that it was just wood foundation on grade.

Ms. McMillan questioned if the water running off the parking areas into the treatment swale would sheet flow. Mr. Colwell confirmed that it would sheet flow. The roofline will go east to west and the back half will runoff one way. The rest will go across the pavement.

Ms. Collins asked if Mr. Britz had looked at easement language. Does it say the city can put in dock? Mr. Britz responded that it does not say anything about docks just pedestrians. It would be challenging to use as it is. It was put in there when Tucker's Cove was developed to allow pedestrian access to the water. Mr. Colwell added that the easement had no other purpose than access to the waterfront.

Chairman Miller questioned if there was a setback to the abutter across the water for the dock. Mr. Gray responded there was not. Mr. Colwell added that for wetland permits they are required reach out to someone at Pease who issues letter to the Harbor Master that states it does not interfere with navigability. Mr. Britz noted that abutters across the water way aren't notified. Mr. Gray noted that the NHB identified species of concern on the island, and they need to be 100-150 feet away from them. They meet that requirement.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend *approval* of the application to the Planning Board as presented, seconded by Ms. Collins. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0.)

III. STATE WETLANDS BUREAU PERMIT APPLICATIONS

1. Minimum Impact Expedited Application
390 New Castle Avenue
393 New Castle Avenue LLC, owner

Assessor Map 207, Lot 6

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

1. That deicer is not applied to the new porous driveway.
2. That the porous driveway surface is vacuumed twice per year.
3. That the NE corner of the driveway be constructed at a lower elevation to prevent road runoff from getting over the entire porous parking.

The Commission voted unanimously **(6-0.)**

2. Minimum Impact Expedited Application
220 Walker Bungalow Road
Jon & Joan Dickinson, owners
Assessor Map 223, Lot 20

At the request of the applicant, Ms. Tanner moved to **postpone** review of the application to the July 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Vice Chairman Blanchard. The Commission voted unanimously **(6-0)**

3. Major Impact Standard Review Application
70 & 80 Corporate Drive
Lonza Biologics, owner
Assessor Map 305, Lot 1

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

1. Curb cuts would be added on both sides of Goose Bay Drive to allow for wildlife crossing.

The Commission voted unanimously **(6-0.)**

Vice Chairman Blanchard noted that it's a large scope project. This is a step forward for the brook. Vice Chairman Blanchard appreciated the patience to help the Commission walk through the plans.

4. Standard Dredge and Fill Application
175 Gosport Road
175 Gosport Road, LLC, owner
Assessor Map 224, Lot 1
(*This item was postponed at the May 9, 2018 meeting to the June 13, 2018 meeting.*)

Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if the dock was included. Mr. Gray confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Tanner moved to recommend **approval** of the application to the Planning Board as presented, seconded by Ms. Collins. The Commission voted unanimously **(6-0)**

Vice Chairman Blanchard complimented the applicant for working with the Commission in a complicated environment with setbacks and permitting. The design, landscape and terrain is well thought out.

IV. WORK SESSION

- A. Martine Cottage Road
Carolyn McCombe Revocable Trust, owner
Assessor Map 12, Lot 14

At the request of the applicant, Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to *postpone* review of the application to the July 11, 2018 meeting, seconded by Ms. Tanner. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0.)

V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Free Invasive Plant Management on Municipal Working Lands
A Pilot Project

Mr. Britz handed out a letter and wanted to see if the Conservation Commission was interested. The program would look at those areas for invasive species and what to do to control those. The Commission does not have to respond. They could elect to have them evaluate and say no to the herbicides. An evaluation of the city lands would give a sense of where the invasive species are.

Chairman Miller noted that the Commission could take them up on the evaluation. Are there a couple properties that would make sense to have them evaluate? Mr. Britz commented that could be beneficial. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned where in the city could use that attention. Mr. Britz responded that Public Works just bought some land. The Great Bog wouldn't count because it's conservation land. Vice Chairman Blanchard questioned if Banfield Road would work. Mr. Britz responded that it was not really working lands. Mr. Britz added that he would think some more about areas that the city owns and uses. Chairman Miller noted that they have a lot of properties they call conservation but aren't actually in conservation. Pine Island could be a good piece to have evaluated to prevent spread. Mr. Britz added that he would like to see the process. Ms. Tanner suggested the area where the city dumps granite. It is loaded with invasive and has conservation land on either side.

Vice Chairman Blanchard brought up the drains off new castle. It would be good to know if it's a city or state road. Mr. Britz confirmed that he would look into it.

Chairman Miller confirmed they were fine with at least looking at areas. Mr. Britz noted that any suggestions would be good. They may not get on first round of pilot communities.

Chairman Miller noted that he reached out to Jay Diener from the Hampton Conservation Commission about the pesticide outreach education program. Mr. Diener said they had talked with Dan Burbank who is the Landscape Manager at Riverwoods in Exeter. He runs a chemical free program there.

Also, Melissa Paly, CLF's Great Bay-Piscataqua's Waterkeeper, reached out to see if the Conservation Commission would collaborate on a proposal to the Great Bay 2020 funds to fund a fertilizer/pesticide workshop and community engagement in the Sagamore Creek water shed. Vice Chairman Blanchard asked if it was for residents. Chairman Miller confirmed that was

correct. Ms. Tanner and Ms. Harrison were in favor. Mr. Britz added that he would want to talk to the city attorney who dealt with the settlement to make sure that is possible. Ms. McMillan requested that they coordinate with the UNH Cooperative Extension to prevent duplicate efforts. Ms. Harrison noted that they could recommend they are included as collaborators.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chairman Blanchard moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:14 p.m., seconded by Ms. Collins. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0.)

Respectfully submitted,
Rebecca Frey, Conservation Commission Recording Secretary