

**SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**CONFERENCE ROOM A  
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

**2:00 PM**

**OCTOBER 3, 2017**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planner Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

.....  
**I. OLD BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **181 Hill Street**, (“Lot 6”), requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an existing building and the construction of a 5-story mixed use building (including residential units, a retail bank, office use, retail sales and a two level parking garage) with a footprint of 17,973 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 81,498 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17-2 and lies within the CD5 District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the September 5, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Mike Penny and Tracy Kozak spoke to the application. All of the comments from the last TAC meeting have been addressed in the plans. The team is amenable to the comments that were received about the submittal today as well. The stop sign can be removed. There will probably be one placed inside the garage. The curb can be rounded. The team is working to get back on the site and put in monitoring wells to be more definitive about what the ground water is doing there. This will help waterproof the building. Waterproofing has been added to the design, but the sump has been left off for now. That will be added as a contingency if needed. The goal is to eliminate the contingency with the results of this study. Ms. Kozak clarified on the agenda the building is listed as a 5-story building, but it’s a 4-story building with a penthouse. The building is not in the HDC. The other lots are, but this lot is not. Ms. Walker responded that she would double check the location. Mr. Penny added that the applicants are completely aware that they will need a system for the discharge. All the comments are totally manageable, and the applicants appreciated receiving them.

Mr. Britz clarified that if the waterproofing doesn’t fail, then water will rise up around the building. If it does fail, then water goes through the system is that correct? Mr. Penny confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Pezzullo questioned where the sub slab system would go. Mr. Penny responded that it would be directly underneath the slab at the lowest point of the garage. It is showed in the details in the plans. Mr. Pezzullo questioned if the elevation of the slab would be 7.6. Mr. Penny confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Walker corrected the agenda description to a 4-story building with a penthouse. The lot is not in the HDC but is in CD5.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Desfosses recommended approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby with the following stipulations:

- A) Prior to Planning Board Approval:
  - 1) Applicant shall remove proposed stop sign coming out of garage as shown on Site Plan.
  - 2) The curb at each end of the private road shall be rounded.
  - 3) Sheet 5 – Any water or sewer pipes designated as “CIP” outside of the building should be revised to “PVC” and notes shall be adjusted as well.
  - 4) A note shall be added to Site Notes on Sheet C1.1 that any damage during construction by applicant to curbing constructed by the City shall be repaired by applicant.
  - 5) Correct error noted in Drainage Study p.3.
  
- B) Subsequent to Planning Board Approval:
  - 6) A peer review of geohydrologic study and drainage design shall be required to evaluate groundwater rates and ability of detention system to accommodate groundwater flow now and into the future. Based on the results of the peer review to be coordinated with DPW, the permanent foundation dewatering system discharges to City’s drainage system may require a storm drain permit and a capacity use surcharge.
  - 7) The construction groundwater dewatering discharge shall require a temporary dewatering discharge permit. DPW shall determine if the groundwater needs to be sampled/tested for both the temporary and permanent connection to the City’s drainage system to determine if any treatment is required prior to discharge.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue** (previously 30 Maplewood Avenue), requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 5-story mixed-use building with a footprint of 17,410 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 53,245 ± s.f., including 22 dwelling units and 13,745 ± s.f. of retail use, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 2A and lies within Character District 4 (CD4), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the September 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone the application to the October 31, 201 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....  
C. The application of **Goodman Family Real Estate Trust, Owner, and Aroma Joe’s Coffee, Applicant**, for property located at **1850 Woodbury Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Review for a 785 ± s.f. restaurant/take-out building and 195 ± s.f. attached patio, with drive thru service and a walk-up window, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 239 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Business (GB) District. (This application was postponed at the September 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone the application to the October 31, 201 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....  
D. The application of **Islington Commons, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **410, 420, and 430 Islington Street**, requesting Site Plan Review to remodel three existing buildings into 4 units (Building #1 with 1,490 ± s.f. footprint and 2,273± s.f. gross floor area, Building #2 with 1,130± s.f. footprint and 1,942± s.f. gross floor area, Building #3 with 2,048 ± s.f. footprint and 6,531 ± s.f. gross floor area); and construct 4 duplex buildings for 12 proposed units (Building #4 with 1,998± s.f. footprint and 4,109± s.f. gross floor area, Building #5 with 1,955 ± s.f. footprint and 4,063 ± s.f. gross floor area, Building #6 with 2,240 ± s.f. footprint and 4,900 ± s.f. gross floor area, Building #7 with 2,002 ± s.f. footprint and 4,549 ± s.f. gross floor area), with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 145 as Lots 34, 35 and 36 and lie within the Character District 4-L2 (CD4-L2) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the September 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone the application to the October 31, 201 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....  
Mr. Cracknell moved to take New Business Item A out of order, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

E. The application of **James A. Mulvey Revocable Living Trust, Robert J. Bossie Revocable Trust and Peter Brown Living Trust, Owners**, for property located at **150 Spaulding Turnpike**, requesting Site Plan Approval to create a truck sales outlet with vehicle display, vehicle storage, including 9.780 ± s.f. of pervious bituminous concrete pavement, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage, and associated site improvements.. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 236 as Lots 34, 35 & 36 and lie within the General Business (GB) District. (This application was postponed at the September 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

### **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Attorney Bernie Pelech and Paul Connolly, of NE Civil Works, spoke to the application. The applicants presented a month ago and there were some comments and requested changes to the plan. Those have been made and submitted. This application has also been presented to the Conservation Commission who received the plan favorably. The memo from TAC was received this morning. Based on the September 5th TAC work session, the plans have been revised to address the comments. The first comment was to provide a six inch perforated PVC under the pervious pavement as opposed to four inch. That revision has been made. Another request was to provide photos of the culvert. Those photos have been submitted. The photos show that the culvert is clean and clear as it exits the catch basin. Mr. Desfosses made a comment mentioning an older pipe that is there. It is unclear where it comes from and is a big pipe, but has nothing to do with the proposal at hand. There is an existing 3-quarter inch pipe along Farm Lane and a quarter inch pipe that runs to the other building. A notation was added to the plans that both existing services will be shut off and disconnected at the coordination stop. The sewer locations are shown on an inset on the plans. The existing 3 inch forced main runs off the property to farm lane. The pump station existing for the facility is in the bulkhead next to the building. It will be removed as part of the demo and then will be connected to the back of 150 Spaulding. The plan includes providing curbing on Farm Lane. The existing heights are shown on sheet number 2 of 9. There are four older style luminaires on the existing building mounted at 14 feet high. The proposed mounting heights are three at 20 feet and 2 building mounts at 11 feet high. The applicants are currently working with the DOT and Turnpikes to discuss the driveway cut. Turnpikes was not sure what to do but requested the plans, and they have been mailed to them. The calculations for the sizing of the pumps have been completed. Some elevations still need to be added to the pump plan. This application went through the Conservation Commission on September 13, 2017. They recommended approval on their site review. Since that meeting the landscape plan changed to show a conservation mix at the rear of the site. The possibility of adding a rain garden was investigated, but there is an existing water service there today. It could expose that pipe to risk of freezing. Mr. Desfosses commented that have encountered this before and it could be made successful. Mr. Connolly responded they could take another look. The only other option was rain barrels, but they don't work well in the winter.

Mr. Desfosses questioned how the number 150 gallons a day came about. Mr. Connolly replied that it's just the slug of what's there. Mr. Desfosses expressed concerned that there will not be that level of flow. Mr. Connolly responded that it should not have much flow at all. Mr. Desfosses commented that this pipe is oversized. Mr. Connolly responded that it could be reduced to a two inch but it would still be oversized. Mr. Desfosses recommended adding a pump to make sure there are no slumps. Mr. Pezzullo questioned how far past the site is this? Mr. Connolly replied that it's 350 feet in total. From the edge to the property on it's about 150 feet. A possibility could be to put a septic tank in front for the forced main to pump out gray water. Mr. Desfosses commented that they could take a look at it.

Mr. Pezzullo noted that the catch basin has multiple pipes going into it. What are they connected to right now? Mr. Connolly responded that one is from the downspouts on the backside of the 150

Spaulding building. The other two pipes run toward another building that has creative piping. There is a combination of roof drains, gutters, exterior sumps and interior sumps. Mr. Pezzullo commented that type of runoff doesn't typically need to be treated. However, there is some new pavement proposed that may go into wetland without treatments. If a rain garden was added on the south side of the property it could treat the water a little better. Ms. Walker clarified that would be in addition to the rain garden in the corner? Mr. Pezzullo responded that was correct. An easement may be needed because it's including surface runoff. That's why drainage calculations were requested. That surface drainage is going off onto a side street into wetlands. Now it would be shifting that flow to the neighbor's property. An analysis should be done on that of pre and post flow. Mr. Connolly confirmed that could be done.

Mr. Pezzullo referenced that storm water has specific requirements to actually design the different layers of the system. That should be included in the drainage calculations. There are certain layers and thickness and volumes to accommodate certain storms. Maintenance for the porous pavement and how do it would be installed needs to be included. It's a big area and there are certain construction procedures that let you do this, but if it's not correct then it could impact the ground too much. Mr. Connolly responded that a noted can be added that DPW is coordinated with when the pavement goes down. The UNH calculations can be added into the plans.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Roediger questioned how important is the driveway permit from DOT. Ms. Walker replied that it is typically post approval.

Mr. Roediger motioned to postpone this application to the October 31, 2017 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Pamela Thatcher, Owner**, and **Charlie Seefried, Applicant**, for property located at **180 Middle Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 3-story four unit residential building with a footprint of 2,606 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 9,348 ± s.f., and a proposed 2-story one unit residential carriage house with a footprint of 959 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 1,918 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 127 as Lot 8 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) District and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Peter Weeks, representing the owner, and Alex Ross, of Ross Engineering, spoke to the application. There were three outstanding issues from the last meeting the location of the utility pole, the use of materials in the driveway that would impact drainage, and the landscaping. Mr. Weeks would be happy to sit down with someone to review the landscaping plan and make improvements to it before the next TAC meeting. Terrence Parker designed the landscaping plan. There is a handout to discuss the comments on the memo about changing the pole location. Eversource wanted between 18-20 thousand dollars to move the pole 9 inches. Ms. Walker questioned how much clearance is there now. Mr. Ross responded that it shows the existing utility pole and just over 6 feet 3 inches from the fence to the pole. It's an odd set up the actual pavement from Middle Street is 11 feet away from the fence. It's a low traffic volume in that area. The fence will work fine where it is. The HDC would like that streetscape element to remain as is.

Ms. Walker clarified that it's 6 feet 3 inches from the pole to the fence. Mr. Ross confirmed that was correct. Ms. Walker noted that the issue is if a conduit was added to the pole then it would reduce the sidewalk to less than 5 feet. Mr. Ross responded that they are working with Eversource to locate it on another side of the pole to not narrow the sidewalk. Mr. Desfosses noted that the only issue is narrowing the sidewalk. In 2004 when Port Street was rebuilt it created the grass strips. Then in 2007 the sidewalks were widened and the pole was never moved because it worked. Ms. Walker noted that the applicants would come back with a proposal that doesn't impact width.

Mr. Cracknell provided another option. If there's a little landscape strip between that and the sidewalk, then the landscape could be eliminated and make that all sidewalk. Ms. Walker noted that there would be an issue with getting rid of the landscaping and sidewalk plowing would be impacted. The HDC should be included on the conversation on that.

Mr. Desfosses noted there are utilities that face the pole and some on the other side so it may limit the options. Only two conduits fit on the pole. One is Comcast and the other is power, so it may be necessary to bring a primary down the pole and go to a transformer somewhere.

Mr. Roediger questioned if there was a possibility to scale down along the north fence line as it begins to approach the sidewalk, so that someone sitting in a vehicle coming out of the driveway has a clear view of the sidewalk. Ms. Walker questioned if the applicants were proposing to replace that fence. Mr. Ross responded that the fence would remain. Mr. Cracknell did not think that it's impossible for the fence to be modified for the last section or two or create spaced pickets to help create visibility. It's a focal house and there is a lot of focus on the characteristics. Mr. Eby added that if the height can come down to 3.5 feet, then people could see over it. Mr. Cracknell noted that one section would create the sightline 2-3 sections may make sense architecturally.

Mr. Weeks noted that recording the storm water management in the condo documents was a good idea. It may be a good idea to bring in landscape architect in to explain the plans. The rain garden maintenance on the plan can be included. Ms. Walker commented that the applicants should provide the landscape plans to the Planning Department in advance.

Ms. Walker questioned if Mr. Eby got what he needed for the parking space. Mr. Eby noted that it's just a difficult turn. Mr. Weeks offered that the applicants would provide more information.

Ms. Walker questioned if Mr. Cracknell anticipated any more issues with HDC. Mr. Cracknell did not think so.

Mr. Pezzullo requested the storm water management plan in the summary plan include the flows and discharge points.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Britz moved to postpone the application to the October 31, 201 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Provident Bank, Owner**, for property located at **25 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 3-story mixed use building with a footprint of 9,355 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 36,597 ± s.f., including retail and parking on the first level, office use on the second level and residential on the third and attic level, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 2 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Eric Weinrieb, of Altus Engineering, and Steve Wilson, representing the owner, spoke to the application. The building is on 25 Maplewood Avenue and an iconic looking building. Part of the due diligence included having an existing conditions survey done on the site. This application is in process of getting some zoning approval on the site to allow the ground story to be 10 feet in height. This application has received HDC approval in September. The lot is 1124 square feet and is nearly all impervious today. The only green spaces on the parcel are some strips around the property. The proposal is to add some planters around the edges of the building. The first floor will have 19 parking spaces and banking space. The second story will be corporate offices for the bank. The third and fourth floors will be condos. Each unit will have its own street addresses. Mr. Wilson added that ultimately the postmaster and the assessor would make that decision. Mr. Weinrieb added that is the intent. Mr. Desfosses noted to just make sure there are available addresses. The grading on Hanover Street and Maplewood Avenue will come up the alleyway. The applicants have been approached by the Planning Department to change the grade in the alleyway. There are some things that can be

accommodated, but time is of the essence. Mr. Wilson did not think the plan precludes some change in grade. The alley way could be graded over to the existing parking. Ms. Walker noted that the issue that is being raised is that if there will ever be underground parking it would be opposite sloping. Right now it's so conceptual, so it can't be required to grade it that way for a potential future project. Mr. Weinrieb appreciated the brief report from Planning. It is less than 100 vehicle peak hours, so no further action is required. No specific activities needed for the de-watering. A storm water connection permit will be obtained for note two about grading that de-watering shall be done according to requirements and will be flowing the discharge from the city. This connection already exists and building a new building will require a new connection. Why is there an extra charge? Mr. Pezzullo responded that it might apply.

Mr. Weinrieb commented that there's a note saying that drainage calculations were not provided, and was not sure that they are needed. Mr. Wilson noted that it is currently all captured. The flat roof would be smaller, but it would not be creating new water. Ms. Walker questioned if drainage calculations were required to determine discharge. Mr. Pezzullo responded yes, it's involved with the de-watering. Mr. Weinrieb noted there was an earlier report that states that there was no ground water detected. Mr. Wilson added that the applicants are currently updating this with this project. They are not anticipating hitting ground water at all. If that shows something different, then the Committee will be the recipients of that report anyway. Mr. Pezzullo responded that until that is known we can't say there is an impact or not for the drainage. Based on the plans there may be temporary dewatering, but nothing permanent is anticipated. Mr. Weinrieb responded that was correct.

Mr. Weinrieb clarified that this building will not have a restaurant. The bricks will be delineated more clearly on the plans. It was decided to do all brick sidewalks and not use concrete. The City requires all site plans to be recorded and hatching is hard to show the plans, so more detail will be added to the plan. The landscape architect will stamp the final landscape plan. The light in front will be replaced. The applicants met with Mr. Desfosses on site and he now understands the intent of that, and will be making some adjustments.

Ms. Walker pointed out that note 17 should say no restaurants are allowed. Mr. Pezzullo added that the ordinance states an outside grease trap would be needed for a restaurant. It won't be allowed unless that's installed. Mr. Wilson responded that the note would be fixed. It won't preclude that from future owners. Someone would have to come back to the committee to add a restaurant.

Ms. Walker asked if there was anything still needed on the handhold near the tip down. Mr. Desfosses responded that they are still working on this.

Ms. Walker questioned if the roof drain was addressed. Mr. Weinrieb responded it was.

Ms. Walker questioned if anything needed to be included on the curbing on Hanover. Mr. Desfosses responded no.

Ms. Walker questioned if the building was going to have an evaporative snowmelt? Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that was correct and was noted on the plans as utility note number 8. It is under the general notes. Mr. Britz clarified that it's not on the plans. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the vision is that

when recording the plans the site plan, general notes and landscape plan would all get recorded, so everything would be accounted for. Ms. Walker questioned if it could be added to the grading and drainage plan. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that it could.

Mr. Eby clarified that the applicants narrowed the last parking spaces down to 9 where it used to be 10. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that was correct.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following stipulations:

- A) Prior to Planning Board Approval:
  - 1) A note shall be added to the Demolition Plan/Demolition Notes that the existing City wayfinding sign on Maplewood Ave shall be removed prior to start of construction and provided to City for storage during construction. City Planning Department notification and approval shall be required prior to removal of the sign.
  - 2) Revise Note 17 on Sheet GN-1 under Site Notes to specify that no restaurants shall be allowed without providing an exterior grease trap.
  - 3) Provide delineation of the brick, concrete, and landscaped areas and other surface treatments on the site plan. This may be provided as a separate exhibit and does not need to be on a recordable plan sheet.
  - 4) Landscape Plan shall be stamped by a registered landscape architect
  - 5) Applicant shall add the location of the evaporative trench to the grading and drainage plan
  
- B) Subsequent to Planning Board Approval:
  - 1) Details of temporary and permanent (if applicable) groundwater dewatering design shall be submitted to DPW for final approval.
  - 2) Any required stormwater connections to the City’s drainage system shall require a stormwater connection permit. A capacity surcharge fee may apply based on further investigation by the applicant in consultation with the DPW.
  - 3) Applicant shall coordinate with DPW on final traffic signal and pedestrian control locations and designs and related electrical conduit layout.
  - 4) Subject to final approval by DPW, the applicant shall either replace the light in front of LaCarreta or keep it functional by replacing the electrical run.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Bluestone Properties of Rye, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **135 Congress Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct an addition to the rear of the existing building, with a footprint of 1,424 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 2,943 ± s.f., for restaurant expansion and function space, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 5 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone the application to the October 31, 201 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Roman Catholic Bishop of Manchester, Owner**, and **Stonegate NH Construction, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **2075 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of two 3-story, 24-unit residential buildings, both with a footprint of 14,640 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 58,495 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 268 as Lot 7 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone the application to the October 31, 201 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:39 pm, seconded by Mr. Brit. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee