

From: [JAH](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: 105 Bartlett Street TAC June 2, 2020
Date: Sunday, May 31, 2020 11:30:58 PM

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. The 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





Dear Members of TAC,

June 1, 2020

I have reviewed the proposed changes as best I could on such short notice; some things still need to be addressed.

#3 The Lot lines do not clearly show how much of the original Lot 157-1(Bldg C) will be going to the road and how much to the proposed new lot; nor how the proposed Lot from Cabot to beyond Langdon will exit the property.

#4 All building lengths and widths are still not provided nor the lengths and widths of structures *on the original plans*.

#32 Amenity areas in most rental complexes are usually for the tenants and their guests to use, seems odd it will be for tenants only.

Plan C-301-2 (pg 18) Shows the **Community Space Easement** from about Dover to Cabot St, none from Bartlett to Dover. This seems smaller than what is listed. It seems to meet the requirement with the proposed NEW lot size but may not with the original lot 164-4-2 (4.07+ 2.37= 18%). *It is my understanding the State of NH owns the land from the Mean High Water mark to the Highest Observable Tide mark, therefore one cannot provide an easement for said land; technically that area should be deducted from all calculations (about 15-25' wide for 2000 linear feet); shading makes it look like it was included.*

Fire Department and NMP Trail Safety:

The idea of the Fire Department using the NMP Trail as their primary access to the back of buildings B and A, seems a dangerous and unrealistic plan. First the maximum width allowed for paths within the 50' Tidal buffer is 6' as of 2020 per NHDES, making this plan unrealistic and there should be a Plan B. Imagine it's a Sunday in July; *there are families with young children* enjoying the NMP Trail. The tenants of the proposed buildings are enjoying their decks (of which there are many!). Oh no, there is a fire on one of the back decks. Clearing off the NMP Trail for EMS vehicles will take time due to children roaming freely in this family safe area; MORE IMPORTANTLY where will the people on the NMP Trail go so the trucks can get by. The area is too tight where buildings and the rain garden are. A fire truck needs a minimum of 18'. The whole NMP Trail is proposed to be a maximum of 12' wide. The rain garden could be moved.

View Corridor: The View Corridor should be lower to fit the criteria of a View Corridor. Looking up is not a view corridor.

Rain Garden:

C-103.2 shows the rain garden as POS-01 with a RIM of 10.5 and what seems to be a depth of 4.9 (C-505). Just doesn't seem like it will hold enough water at the bottom of that hill! It also shows 240' +/- feet of 12" drainage pipe running parallel to the NMP. The placement of this rain garden defeats its purpose to provide a natural alternative for drainage. The raingarden could be moved to the highly impervious "courtyard" which will have a culvert pipe running under it. Two or three rain gardens could be used as a nice balance for the courtyard. Commemorative "art" of the round house and/or RR turnstile on Building A could be substituted.

Grading:

It is my understanding under Portsmouth Ordinance 10.232.36 **grade is supposed to require a special exception when it is being used to provide drainage**, which seems to be the case. The grade was increased to meet the flooding requirements and to avoid the ground water to add underground parking. Both of these issues are directly related to drainage, *therefore a special exception should be required.*

Parking: Still do NOT meet minimum requirement, now even less.

Snow storage:

Visibility on both sides of the Ricci Lumberyard driveway will be blocked by snow storage. There doesn't seem to be enough snow storage for 2 to 4 inches of snow with only one pass of a snow plow. At LHS, how many spaces are lost to snow removal-there will NOT be enough parking spaces left. No one picks up large piles of snow during a snow storm. A more realistic solution is needed.

Thank you for your time and expertise as members of TAC!

Respectfully, Elizabeth Bratter

159 McDonough St (Property Owner)

From: [Catherine Harris](#)
To: [Planning Info](#)
Subject: TAC meeting set for 6/2/2020
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 4:56:19 PM

To TAC members,

You should have received a letter from resident Jim Hewitt(5/31/2020) addressing the 105 Bartlett Street development proposal. I would like it officially noted that I agree with everything he said in his letter.

This project, as it is currently being pitched, has no place in this environmentally sensitive area. That the developer's plans do not entirely adhere to the 100' wetlands buffer setback and also significantly alter the current terrain, among other things, should give your members an indication of their intent. their goal is for maximum density on this site.

Numerous residents from the surrounding neighborhoods have been speaking out and up about this ill conceived venture for the last three years. We're begging to be heard. If approved as presented, this development project will destroy what so many of us have spent years trying to save. The North Mill Pond deserves better from us.

Sincerely,
Catherine (Kate) Harris
166 Clinton Street

From: [patricia Bagley](#)
To: [Juliet T.H. Walker](#); [Eric B. Eby](#); [Nicholas J. Cracknell](#); [Dave Desfosses](#); [Peter L. Britz](#); [Robert T. Marsilia](#); [Planning Info](#)
Cc: [patbagley@aol.com](#); [Peter Whelan](#); [Karen Conard](#)
Subject: TAC and 105 Bartlett submission
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 7:13:32 PM

TAC members, Comment regarding tomorrow's 105 Bartlett St TAC submission.

Item 25. **TAC's comment:** Secondary access with resident-only gate should be provided out to Maplewood.

Applicant's response: Secondary access to Maplewood is not proposed as adjacent parcel in not part of this project... all vehicles will travel to/from the development via Bartlett St.

Bartlett St is already under pressure. The forthcoming Cate Street Connector will unload Route 1 traffic onto Bartlett, in addition to new traffic generated by West End Landing and West End Yards residences plus the mixed-uses in West End Yards.

How could the City allow another project to burden an already burdened, and about to be further burdened roadway? How does this benefit Portsmouth and add to anyone's quality of life?

Iron Horse Properties is attempting to shoehorn a large development where it doesn't fit, and Portsmouth residents will have to live with the traffic nightmare. This is truly unacceptable, and TAC should not sanction this plan.

Thank you for your attention, and would you kindly see that Police and Fire also receive this.