

Subject: RE: Mill Plaza - Jan. Planning Board Meeting - Landscape Questions and Responses
Date: Thursday, January 6, 2022 at 11:30:56 AM Eastern Standard Time
From: Joseph M. Persechino
To: Rick Taintor
CC: sean@mralp.com, Ari B. Pollack (pollack@gcglaw.com)
Attachments: image006.png, image007.png, image008.png, image009.png, image010.png, image011.png, image012.png, image013.png, image014.png, image015.png

Hi Rick,

In advance of the January 12th Planning Board Meeting, please see the below responses to the questions you raised in the email below.

Responses are as follows:

1. Protection of trees:

- a. Comment: *Two conflicting tree protection details exist.*
Response: **The tree protection detail in the landscape drawings will be used.**
- b. Comment: *Show area of tree protection in northeast corner.*
Response: **Delineation of tree protection can be added to plans as a Condition of Approval.**
- c. Comment: *Address how trees will be protected on adjacent property.*
- d. Response: **We have assumed this comment is regarding the eastern property line. There is an existing stonewall which forms the property line which the contractor will not be allowed to cross, therefore the trees will be protected from damage.**

2. There appears to be three types of sidewalk tree planters proposed.

- a. Comment: *Details should be provided.*
Response: **Details will for these individual conditions are typically provided in the construction documents. Construction level details can be provided, if required, as a Conditions of Approval.**
- b. Comment: *Will engineered soils be provided in these locations.*
Response: **Engineered soils will be provided in the three types of sidewalk tree planters.**
- c. Comment: *Is enough soil volume provided?*
Response: **Adequate soil volume will be provided.**

3. Tree variety.

- a. Comment: *Consider more variety of tree types.*
Response: **Fastigate variety of red maples are specified for sidewalk conditions to accommodate narrow widths and mitigate tree canopy and building façade conflicts. The specification of a singular tree type around Building B and along Building C is a design intent to create a visual identity for the development. Other fastigate variety of trees can be shown on the planting plan, if required, as a Condition of Approval.**

4. Extent of engineered soils in the landscape islands.

- a. Comment: *Is the intent only to provide engineered soils for an 8' extent around trees in the landscape islands?.*
Response: **The extent of engineered soils noted in the details creates a volume adequate for the trees proposed within the landscape islands.**

5. Engineered soils.

- a. Comment: Provide specifications for engineered soils per TRG meeting of March 16, 2021.
Response: The engineered soils are to be CU-Soil[®], or Utelite Urban Tree Structural Soil, or equivalent. Construction level specifications can be provided, if required, as a Conditions of Approval.

We look forward to answering any additional questions on the 12th.

Thanks,

Joe

Joseph Persechino, PE

Vice President

Tighe&Bond

o. 603.433.8818 | m. 603.957.0144

177 Corporate Drive, Portsmouth, NH, 03801

w: tighebond.com | halvorsondesign.com



From: Rick Taintor <rtaintor@ci.durham.nh.us>

Sent: Monday, December 20, 2021 11:52 AM

To: Joseph M. Persechino <JMPersechino@tigheBond.com>

Cc: sean@mralp.com; Ari B. Pollack (pollack@gcglaw.com) <pollack@gcglaw.com>

Subject: Re: Mill Plaza - Jan. Planning Board Meeting

[Caution - External Sender]

Joe,

This is to follow up on my 12/10 email in which I recommended that your landscape architect attend the January meeting. To help him prepare for the meeting I have attached a list of questions and comments, most of which have been raised previously, along with a new letter from John Parry updating his December 6 comments.

Regards,
Rick

Rick Taintor, AICP
Community Planning Consultant
978-872-8230

Mill Plaza Redevelopment
Landscape Notes and Questions for January 12, 2022, Planning Board Meeting

1. Protection of existing trees:
 - (a) Two conflicting details: C-508 vs L3.0 – resolve by selecting one, or indicate where each one applies
 - (b) Show area of tree protection in northeast corner
 - (c) Address how trees will be protected on adjacent property
2. Aside from the landscaped islands in the parking lot, trees are proposed in planters along sidewalks. There appear to be three different sizes/types of sidewalk tree plantings, including: (1) larger raised planters in front of Building A; (2) smaller flush planters along south side of Building B; and (3) smallest flush planters along west side of Building B and between Buildings B and C. Details should be provided for each of these tree planting types.
 - (a) Will engineered soil be used in these locations as in the landscaped islands?
 - (b) Is enough soil volume provided for the red maples and other proposed trees?
3. Consider more variety in tree types. For example, the plan shows 24 red maples and 25 redbuds.
4. Clarify extent of engineered soil in landscaped islands. Is the intent to only provide the engineered soil under the trees (and extending 8 feet beyond the curb), or will engineered soil extend the entire length of the islands, including under other planting?
5. Per TRG meeting of March 16, 2021, applicant will provide specifications for engineered soil. (See attached meeting notes.)

**Town of Durham
Technical Review Group
March 16, 2021
Town Council Chambers**

Agenda

Colonial Durham Associates, L.P.
Durham Mill Plaza Redevelopment – Site Plan

TRG Members in Attendance

Rick Taintor, Contract Planner, chair
James Bubar, Planning Board
Audrey Cline, Code Enforcement Officer
Brendan O’Sullivan, Fire Marshal
Richard Reine, Public Works Director
Christine Soutter, Economic Development Director
April Talon, Town Engineer

Applicant’s Representatives

Joe Persechino (Tighe & Bond)
Sean McCauley

Discussion of this item began at 11:10 AM.

The TRG met with the applicant to review the 3/10/21 revised plan set. The following issues were discussed:

- Mill Road crosswalk:
 - Location and stopping sight distance.
 - Add electrical service to plans.
- Details of walls and handrails at stairs leading to pathway to Main Street.
- Water line from Mill Road to Chesley Drive:
 - DPW will determine whether this line should be 12” all the way, rather than changing to 8” in the middle of the site.
 - Town ownership of water line vs. easement.
- Separate vs. combined fire and domestic services to Buildings B and C.
- Fire Dept would like another hydrant near northeast corner of Building B.
- Sewer:
 - DPW believes that the sewer service to Building A should be replaced as part of the project. Applicant will contact Hannaford.
- Parking area at southeast corner – extend vertical granite curb to the end.
- Buffer improvement plan – confirm whether herbicides can be used in the upland buffer.
- Engineered soils in median planting islands – provide specification and confirm that it is equal to structural soils spec.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 PM.

Notes prepared by Rick Taintor, Contract Planner