

**From:** [Kimberli Kienia](mailto:Kimberli.Kienia)  
**To:** [Kimberli Kienia](mailto:Kimberli.Kienia)  
**Subject:** FW: TAC Meeting February 1 at 200 pm  
**Date:** Thursday, January 27, 2022 11:53:00 AM

---

**From:** Joseph Gross [<mailto:jhg1955@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 27, 2022 11:08 AM  
**To:** Peter M. Stith <[pmstith@cityofportsmouth.com](mailto:pmstith@cityofportsmouth.com)>  
**Cc:** Westwind Homeowners Association <[WestwindHomeownersAssociation@groups.outlook.com](mailto:WestwindHomeownersAssociation@groups.outlook.com)>  
**Subject:** TAC Meeting February 1 at 200 pm

Mr. Stith:

My name is Joseph Gross and I am the President of the homeowner's association comprised of the seven residences located at 1177 Sagamore Avenue. As such we are abutters to the proposed development located at 1169/1171 Sagamore Avenue, just north of us and just south of the residences at 1163 Sagamore Avenue. I have been in contact with Bill Bowen who gave me your name and contact information. I plan on attending the February 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and would like a chance to address the board if that is appropriate.

Our concern with the proposed development primarily centers around potential increased water runoff. We are worried that increased runoff from the new homes will negatively impact the residences that directly adjoin the new development. We are also concerned that increased runoff from 1169/1171 will cover Sagamore Avenue creating a serious hazard in winter during freezing temperatures. The area in question is unlighted and the road curves increasing the risk of an icy roadway at that point.

I am not an engineer and quite frankly find the three engineering studies confusing, certainly not written in plain English for consumption by the casual reader. As I understand it, Mr. Bowen's association hired Ambit Engineering, the developer hired Jones & Beach and the City hired Altus. I do have a lifetime of experience with hired experts. I know that one does not enjoy a long lucrative career by giving clients advice they don't want to hear. So, disregarding Ambit and Jones & Beach, would it be possible for our water concerns be put to Altus either before or at the meeting? If their opinion is that we have nothing to worry about then I would submit my concerns are moot.

We also have more general concerns about the loss of tree cover negatively impacting our view (and thereby the value) from our homes and what sort of landscaping/fencing will be used to delineate the property line between our properties and 1169/1171.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter,

**RE: 0 Borthwick Ave**  
**Meeting: TAC 04-05-22**

Dear Members of the Technical Advisory Committee,

March 30, 2022

**Least impactful:**

This project seems out of place, since Portsmouth Regional Hospital((PRH) **was allowed to build on a large wetland** and is claiming now the parking is 32% lower than required. *A second or even third layer could be added to the vast expanse of parking which already exists.* The layering would be in line with the Master Plan. As a major cooperation, sitting in the middle of a wetland, one would think coming up with a better parking solution with the least impact and most convenience for staff, patients and guests would be at the top of the list.

**The numbers:**

Numbers are always interesting. The most interesting is the lot is stated as being 9.09 acres, 395,745 sf. However, all the drainage reports show 351,712 sf. What happened to the other 44,033 sf of land?

It can be appreciated that the proposal seems to respect the 100' wetland buffer on the rear of the property by *not building on it*. However, the amount of unnatural run-off will likely have a negative impact on this highly functional wetland. Section 2 (2-1 drainage analysis) shows existing curve numbers(CN) of 65 and 68 (range 30 to 100) as well as established trees and thick underbrush all parts of a balanced wetland system. ***How many other new developments in that area have added or are planning on adding their run off to these valuable wetlands?***

**Rate vs function:**

Farmers best understand soils and how they work regarding water better than most. They don't look at the curve number but at the Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC). This tells them how long it will take water to run through their soil, whether it holds water and how often to water. Low CEC soil such as sandy ones need to be watered fast, twice a day, an hour at a time or less. **Soils with clay or organic content have a higher CEC and move less than an inch of water an hour.** Such land would be watered slowly, for 6 hours or more at a time, every 3 of 4 days. [https://www.canr.msu.edu/news/what\\_is\\_your\\_soil\\_cation\\_exchange\\_capacity](https://www.canr.msu.edu/news/what_is_your_soil_cation_exchange_capacity)

Looking at the "Site Specific Soil Plan" (colored graphic at end) the majority of the soil on this property is clay and marine silt (tans) It shows silt loam(green) in the middle of the proposed parking lot. The land is relatively flat with most slopes in the 0-8% range and the majority under 15%. Section 3 (3.1 drainage analysis) states the detention system will drain down at longer than 24 hours. However, looking at the majority of soil on this land (clay, marine silt) under existing conditions, drainage based on CECs could take a long time to clear a single rainfall event. ***The capacity of the underground retention systems is the concern.*** It does not seem to decrease existing drainage but seems to increase drainage into the wetlands at a far greater rate than currently exist. The "post" curve number average is 79.4 (range 30-100), some of post CN are in the 90s comparing the 2 year pre and post conditions (included at end). Flows greater than the 2 year storm events will bypass the treatment units. Based on normal New England weather it seems a lot of the water will go untreated into the wetland at a much higher rate than existing which was filtered through trees, brushes, grasses and slowly absorbed by clay and marine silt. ***Does this meet MS4 regulations?***

Section 4 (4-3 drainage analysis) states "the post-development flows have been minimized to the greatest **extent practical.**" Walking through the current PRH parking lot on any rainy day one can experience practical vs what is really necessary by wading through LARGE puddles to get to the building. The placement of sidewalks as well as raised planting islands just add to the water issues. The systems should reflect what is "really" necessary and not be allowed to pour untreated water directly into wetlands after typical NE high rain events. It seems expected 2 yr events will overflow unfiltered right off the bat.

**Safety and alternatives:**

This proposed parking lot is over 1000' to the hospital. **For a fast walker it would take about 4 minutes under good walking conditions.** The likelihood of anyone walking that distance on a cold, windy, rainy or snowy day is not very high. Patients and staff alike from Jackson Gray drive to the hospital even those who walk on their lunch break. The PRH parking lot is not very safe due to the inconvenient sidewalks; most walk between the cars, over the planting areas, in a straight line. The path of least resistance for the proposed lot would be parallel to the PRH parking lot on the far right, next to the marsh, in a straight line. **Creating a parking garage/carport at the existing PRH, as all the local hospitals have, could create staff parking and possibly paid secure shared parking.** A larger retention system which does NOT bypass filtration units during higher than normal 2 yr rainfall events **could be helpful to preserve what will be left of the existing balanced wetland system** if a separate parking lot continues to move forward.

Respectfully,  
Elizabeth Bratter  
159 McDonough St  
Property Owner

**P0616-005\_Pre**

Prepared by Tighe & Bond

HydroCAD® 10.00-20 s/n 03436 © 2017 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type III 24-hr 2-Year Rainfall=3.69"

Printed 3/22/2022

Page 4

Time span=0.00-24.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 481 points  
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN  
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

<b>Subcatchment PRE 1.1:</b>	Runoff Area=31,588 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.01" Flow Length=251' Tc=14.7 min CN=68 Runoff=0.59 cfs 2,658 cf
<b>Subcatchment PRE 2.1:</b>	Runoff Area=320,124 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.85" Flow Length=750' Tc=27.0 min CN=65 Runoff=3.75 cfs 22,591 cf
<b>Link PA-1:</b>	Inflow=0.59 cfs 2,658 cf Primary=0.59 cfs 2,658 cf
<b>Link PA-2:</b>	Inflow=3.75 cfs 22,591 cf Primary=3.75 cfs 22,591 cf
<b>Link PA-3:</b>	Primary=0.00 cfs 0 cf

**Total Runoff Area = 351,712 sf Runoff Volume = 25,249 cf Average Runoff Depth = 0.86"  
100.00% Pervious = 351,712 sf 0.00% Impervious = 0 sf**

**P0616-005\_Post**

Prepared by Tighe & Bond

HydroCAD® 10.00-20 s/n 03436 © 2017 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type III 24-hr 2-Year Rainfall=3.69"

Printed 3/22/2022

Page 4

Time span=0.00-24.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 481 points  
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN  
Reach routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method - Pond routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method

**Subcatchment POST 1.1:** Runoff Area=19,738 sf 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.19"  
Tc=6.0 min CN=71 Runoff=0.59 cfs 1,949 cf

**Subcatchment POST 2.1:** Runoff Area=160,095 sf 85.19% Impervious Runoff Depth>3.02"  
Tc=6.0 min CN=94 Runoff=12.07 cfs 40,276 cf

**Subcatchment POST 2.2:** Runoff Area=107,939 sf 0.58% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.96"  
Tc=6.0 min CN=67 Runoff=2.46 cfs 8,614 cf

**Subcatchment POST 2.3:** Runoff Area=56,484 sf 73.62% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.72"  
Tc=6.0 min CN=91 Runoff=3.95 cfs 12,800 cf

**Subcatchment POST 3.1:** Runoff Area=7,456 sf 1.21% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.37"  
Tc=6.0 min CN=74 Runoff=0.26 cfs 852 cf

**Pond POS1:** Peak Elev=34.44' Inflow=0.37 cfs 17,231 cf  
Primary=0.37 cfs 17,231 cf Secondary=0.00 cfs 0 cf Outflow=0.37 cfs 17,231 cf

**Pond UDB 1: 66" CMP** Peak Elev=36.93' Storage=27,860 cf Inflow=12.07 cfs 40,276 cf  
Outflow=0.37 cfs 17,231 cf

**Pond UIB 2: 36" CMP - POS2** Peak Elev=26.30' Storage=11,976 cf Inflow=3.95 cfs 12,800 cf  
Discarded=0.01 cfs 822 cf Primary=0.00 cfs 0 cf Outflow=0.01 cfs 822 cf

**Link PA-1:** Inflow=0.59 cfs 1,949 cf  
Primary=0.59 cfs 1,949 cf

**Link PA-2:** Inflow=2.74 cfs 25,845 cf  
Primary=2.74 cfs 25,845 cf

**Link PA-3:** Inflow=0.26 cfs 852 cf  
Primary=0.26 cfs 852 cf

**Total Runoff Area = 351,712 sf Runoff Volume = 64,492 cf Average Runoff Depth = 2.20"**  
**49.19% Pervious = 173,023 sf 50.81% Impervious = 178,689 sf**



SOUTH BY 100'  
SCALE

**Proposed  
Satellite  
Parking Lot**

Portsmouth Regional  
Hospital

Portsmouth,  
New Hampshire



**SITE SPECIFIC SOIL GROUPS, HYDROLOGIC SOIL GROUPS (USDA) LEGEND**

SOIL TYPE	HYDROLOGIC SOIL GROUP	USDA
ANIMAL	A	U
WOODBRIDGE	B	U
SCITTO	C	U
PAKTON	D	U
CHITFIELD	E	U
SCIO	F	U

  

SOIL CLASS DELINEATIONS	PERCENT
A	0-2%
B	2-5%
C	5-15%
D	15-25%
E	25-35%
F	35-50%

*Clay & marine silt*  
*Sandy loam & fine sandy loam*  
*silt loam*

*Majority of Slopes under 15%*

*tans*  
*blues*  
*green*

- NOTES:**
1. HYDROLOGIC SOIL GROUPS FOR DISTURBED SOILS WERE BASED ON MOST AVAILABLE DATA.
  2. FIELDWORK FOR THIS MAP WAS CONDUCTED BY LEONARD A. BOND, PH.D., SPECIAL PUBLICATION NO. 5, 2005, "VALLEY FOR W. SOILS, SSNNE".
  3. THIS DETAILED SITE SPECIFIC SOIL MAP CONFORMS TO THE STANDARDS OF THE NATIONAL SOIL SURVEY OF AMERICA.
  4. THIS MAP HAS BEEN PREPARED TO COMPLY WITH SOIL MAPPING STANDARDS FOR MAP AND 47.
  5. TERRAIN ELEVATIONS OF PLANTING AND INSIDE SOIL MAPPING OF LEGEND, AND INTERPOLATIONS.

**SITE SPECIFIC SOIL PLAN**  
SCALE: AS SHOWN  
**1 OF 1**

Joseph Gross

RE: 404 Islington St (Martin Hill Inn)  
Meeting: TAC 05-03-22

Dear Members of the Technical Advisory Committee,

April 26, 2022

404 Islington Street still has some things that may need to be clarified. It seems the original Special Exception received was for a Bed and Breakfast 2. A Bed and Breakfast must provide 2 spaces plus 1 space for every room. It must be owner occupied.

Based on what is presented this is NOT going to be an owner occupied facility and is likely going to be an Inn. **Was a Special Exception to become an Inn already received?** If not, wouldn't a Special Exception be needed BEFORE a Conditional Use Permit, since a Special Exception has very specific conditions which must be met, including parking.

An Inn needs 1.25 spaces per guest room plus 1 space for every 100 sf of restaurant. Therefore 13 spaces plus whatever restaurant size they have, if they will still be providing breakfast.

On Plan C2 (pg 558) of the Meeting Packet seems to only show 9 spaces on-site. Are the two spaces out front assigned to the Inn? There doesn't seem to be any indication of that when driving by. There is a bus stop which occupies the next two spaces traveling east on Islington. The proposed "shared" parking at 501 Islington St is 2 blocks away, which is quite a distance to go with suitcases or custodial gear. The public parking lots listed are quite a distance from this lot, close to 8 blocks or more. It is difficult to imagine someone would drop off their suitcases, drive their car to a public lot 8 blocks or more away, find a place to park (especially in the summer), Pay to park there and then Uber or walk their way back.

The goal should be "park once" and walk or bike from there. This means the place people stay at should offer enough parking to prevent cars from constantly having to be moved. This is what existed on this lot as a 6 room Bed and Breakfast per their website.

The caretaker will need a space, the cook will need a space every morning (if breakfast will be served), the custodial company will need a space EVERY morning for at least 3 to 5 hours, the guests will need at least one space (10)- possibly two for couples who might meet each other there. *All the leftover cars will likely park in the Islington Creek or Goodwin Park neighborhoods which are presently filled to the maximum.*

**It seems, to add 3 more rooms, they will need 4 more spaces, exactly what they are short.** The lot worked out perfectly as it was, with minimal impact on surrounding neighborhoods by providing adequate parking. The expansion and the change of use does not seem to work out on this lot and will impact the two neighborhoods which abut it.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bratter  
159 McDonough St  
Property Owner