

MINUTES

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

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

2:00 PM

JUNE 5, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planner Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department and Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Clipper Traders, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street, Portsmouth Lumber and Hardware, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street**, and **Boston and Maine Corporation, Owner**, for railroad property located between **Bartlett Street and Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Preliminary Subdivision Approval to consolidate and subdivide five lots and a portion of another into 5 lots, a right-of-way, and a remainder of one lot as follows:

- (1) Proposed Lot #1 having an area of 20,667 ± s.f. (0.4747 ± acres) and 143.44' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.
- (2) Proposed Lot #2 having an area of 51,952 ± s.f. (1.1927 ± acres) and 80.91' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street and 386.88' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (3) Proposed Lot #3 having an area of 102,003± s.f. (2.3417 ± acres) and 809.23' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (4) Proposed Lot #4 having an area of 61,781 ± s.f. (1.4183 ± acres) and 481'± of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (5) Proposed Lot #5 having an area of 177,435 ± s.f. (4.0733 ± acres) and 297.42' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (6) Proposed Right-of-Way having an area of 69,621 ± s.f. (1.5983 ± acres).
- (7) Map 164 Lot 4 reducing in area from 13 ± acres to 4.7 ± acres and having 75'± of continuous street frontage on Maplewood Avenue, and decreasing intermittent street frontage of 234'± on Bartlett Street to 105'± of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.

Said properties are shown on Assessors Map 157 as Lots 1 & 2 and Assessors Map 164 as Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and are located within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W), Office Research (OR) and Transportation Corridor (TC) Zoning Districts. (This application was postponed at the May 1, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** the application to the July 3, 2018 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Richard P. Fusegni, Owner**, for property located at **201 Kearsarge Way**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots as follows:

1. Proposed lot #1 having an area of 7,834 ± s.f. (0.1799 acres) and 97’ of continuous street frontage on Mangrove Street and 75’ of continuous street frontage on Kearsarge Way; and
2. Proposed lot #2 having an area of 47,062 ± s.f. (1.0804 acres) and 131’ of continuous street frontage on Kearsarge Way;

Said property is shown on Assessors Map 218 as Lot 5 and is located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District where the minimum lot area is 15,000 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage is 100’.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon spoke to the application. The application is to subdivide one lot into two lots with the existing frontage. The proposal is to create a square lot in the corner for Lot 1. Lot 2 would have the existing structure on it. A variance was required for this and was granted.

TAC Comments:

- Subdivision Application Checklist should be updated to provide location of items marked as N/A that are applicable to the subdivision plan.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that there were a number of items that were not applicable for this project. Ms. Walker clarified they wanted Mr. Chagnon to review and update the list. It looked like some were applicable items that were marked not applicable. Mr. Chagnon confirmed the list would be updated.
- Provide internal drop sewer service connection to SMH. Sewer service lateral to be 6” diameter.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that was acceptable.

Ms. Walker clarified they were requesting two waivers. Mr. Chagnon responded that was correct.

Mr. Pezzullo questioned if the proposed electrical easement needed to be submitted before moving forward? Ms. Walker responded that the easements need to be identified on the plans, but they don’t have to be completed by Planning Board. Mr. Chagnon added that would be in the deed when Lot 1 was sold.

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 subdivision approval**, seconded by Mr. Roediger with the following stipulations:

1. Subdivision Application Checklist shall be updated to provide location of items marked as N/A that are applicable to the subdivision plan.
2. Provide internal drop sewer service connection to sewer manhole.
3. Sewer service lateral shall be 6” diameter.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and the City of Portsmouth, Applicant**, for property located at **97 Grafton Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval, under Chapter 400 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Site Review Regulations, for improvements to the drinking water treatment plan, including a 7,750 s.f. 1-story addition to the existing building, the addition of a generator and transformer and additional parking, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 318 as Lot 3 and lies within the within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Al Pratt, Water Resource Manager, spoke to the application. This is a municipal project that will be paid for by the Air Force. The EPA has issued an order to the Air Force to repair the aquaphor. It’s the City’s responsibility for the water at Pease. Margaret McCarthy from Weston and Sampson has been working on this with the City and has attended a TAC work session. She addressed comments submitted by the Committee members.

TAC Comments:

- New hydrant assembly on North side of project to be relocated to edge of pavement.
 - Ms. McCarthy responded that would be completed.
- Main entry gate to have Knox® key switch installed.

- Ms. McCarthy responded that was on the plans, but maybe it was not clear. It's on the utility plan. Mr. Roediger requested clarification that it wasn't a box it was a key switch. Ms. McCarthy confirmed that was correct.
- Fire alarm system to include approved off-site monitoring.
 - Ms. McCarthy confirmed that would be called out.
- Rain Garden design, specifications, and maintenance should comply with NH Stormwater Manual requirements.
 - Ms. McCarthy confirmed that would be modified.

Ms. Walker reminded the Committee that this would not move forward to Planning Board. It doesn't require vetting from the Planning Board.

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**, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following suggested design changes:

1. New hydrant assembly on North side of project to be relocated to edge of pavement.
2. Main entry gate to have Knox® key switch off-site monitoring.
3. Rain Garden design, specifications, and maintenance should comply with NH Stormwater Manual requirements.

The motion passed unanimously.

C. The application of **R.K. Portsmouth, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **100 Arthur F. Brady Drive**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots as follows:

1. Proposed lot #1 having an area of 9.145 acres and 454' of continuous street frontage on Arthur F. Brady Drive; and
2. Proposed lot #2 having an area of 14.15 acres and 143' of continuous street frontage on Arthur F. Brady Drive;

Said property is shown on Assessors Map 238 as Lot 20 and is located in the Gateway G1 District (G1) where the minimum development site area is 10,000 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage is 100'.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Victor Manougian with McLane Middleton and Paul Liversidge from Hayner/Swanson were present to speak to the application. This was a little different than a conventional subdivision. The owners are not selling the property. It will stay in the client's name. It's a bookkeeping nightmare for the client right now. The proposal is to divide the lot to match the lease with Home Depot and EMS. The client wants the lot lines to match the lease and match the taxes. The easements for the parties were not needed since they were not selling the lots. Ownership would be retained. Mr. Manougian noted that they could add a note to the plan that if the property was sold then cross easements can be recorded. Since it will be the same owner for now, the cross easements were not necessary.

TAC Comments:

- Include a bar scale on all sheets per Section IV.3/V3 of the regulations.
 - Mr. Liversidge responded that this was on the plan in the title block, and pointed it out to the committee.
- Plans are difficult to decipher and read:
 - Existing conditions should be separated out from proposed (on different plan sets).
 - Mr. Liversidge responded that there were no modifications to anything other than the new lot line. Ms. Walker noted that it was hard to figure out where the lot line was. Ms. Walker suggested removing information that is not necessary for a subdivision plan. Mr. Liversidge questioned if it would be helpful to label the lot line along the length. Ms. Walker noted that the plan should be simplified to make it easier to read.
 - Show existing building setbacks on plans.
 - Mr. Liversidge confirmed that would be updated.
 - Provide a separate set of plans showing utilities only, do not combine with easements and survey markings.
 - Provide details of how parking calculations were determined.
 - Label and add titles to all sheets, identifying what is being shown on each.
 - Please explain the "Zoning Note" that is not a typical note on the plans we have seen in the past, why is it needed?
 - Mr. Liversidge noted that the attorneys had this drafted years ago because zoning is a legal matter. Ms. Walker responded that it was not a standard note, and they may get pushback at Planning Board. Mr. Liversidge responded that they would follow up with their office as well.
- The proposed lot line would be better located to place the roadway on the main parcel.
 - Mr. Manougian noted that they wanted to move the line to match what was in the lease.
- The proposed lot line should go around the roadway guardrail and any portion of the retaining wall that is holding up the roadway as those are integral to the road.
- Plans do not appear to be complete. Show utilities serving the existing buildings. Show all necessary easements for access, utilities, etc. that are required.
 - Mr. Liversidge noted that it was difficult to read because the plan has a lot on it. Ms. Walker noted that it would be helpful to have this on multiple plan sheets to clearly

show the information. Mr. Pezzullo added that they need to know where the utilities are. Mr. Desfosses confirmed the utilities were combined. Easements would be needed at the time of subdivision.

- Subdivision line should not separate roadway from guard rail and grading area associated with roadway.

Mr. Desfosses stated that there was no way the guardrail could be on a separate lot than the road. The line has to be adjusted so that the whole road system is on the same lot. Mr. Pezzullo noted that the maintenance for roadway needed to be identified. Mr. Liversidge responded that there was a cross easement from the Home Depot lot to this. RK Portsmouth LLC is responsible for their property from the property line down. The owners of the old Home Depot site are responsible for the back. Mr. Desfosses noted that the access road had not been restriped in years. Home Depot restripes their lot, but not the access road. Mr. Liversidge responded that the roadway was an agreement of an easement. If the property was ever sold, then the roadway agreement would need to be in there. Ms. Walker noted that would go against the subdivision rules that were in place today. Mr. Liversidge questioned if the guardrail and retaining wall had to be on the same lot as the roadway. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct. It should all be on the same lot. It's all supporting the road. Mr. Pezzullo added that lease agreements and access agreements for a lease were not the same as subdivision agreements. They need the easements to cross lots. This does not meet the subdivision requirements right now. Ms. Walker noted that if they wanted to make a strong case for that then they would have to work with the Legal Department. TAC could not recommend approval today. Mr. Manougian confirmed they would further review this item.

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** to the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Barbara R. Frankel, Owner**, and **Greengard Residences, Applicant**, for property located at **89 Brewery Lane**, requesting Site Plan Review to construction of a 2-story assisted living home, with a footprint of 3,146 s.f. and gross floor area of 9,438 s.f. , with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 146 as Lot 263 and lies within the within the Character District-4 L2 (CD4-L2) district

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Lorden with MSC Engineers and Brian Wyatt spoke to the application. This application has been before TAC twice. The proposal is to tear down the existing building and put up a two-story assisted living home.

TAC Comments:

- The applicant should provide a green building statement as required by Section 2.5.3.1A.
 - If there are opportunities for green building components please describe.
 - Mr. Lorden responded that they had something from the architect. It can be submitted as a separate letter.
- The required note per Section 2.5.4.2E should be added to the Site Plan, Sheet C-2
 - Mr. Lorden confirmed that would be added.
- Sheet C-6, Note 17 - should be removed from the plan.
 - Mr. Lorden confirmed that would be removed.
- The applicant shall work with the Planning, PW and Legal Departments to determine whether the applicant should provide easement or ROW to the City for the portion of the road and or future sidewalk on the parcel.
 - Applicant should work with City to provide easement for roadway or sidewalk connection to Albany Street.
 - Ms. Walker clarified that the City was not prepared to say they were ready to take this over. They don't want to hold this up. As long as the applicants are agreeable to an access easement, then it can be handled after Planning Board approval. Mr. Wyatt responded that they have to talk about an underground electrical easement.
- The applicant must provide drainage for the lot by connecting to the storm drain located in Brewery Lane to provide overflow drainage for the rain gardens and a place to discharge seasonal sump pump flow.
 - Mr. Lorden responded that it would be the corner of Brewery Ln. and Albany St. At this point they were not sure there would be a sump pump. The rain garden only overflows on a 50-year storm.
- Post Development rate of flow shall be equal or less than Pre Development flow.
 - Mr. Lorden confirmed they would re-grade and revise as appropriate.
- Overflow from rain garden should not be directed to abutting property.
 - Mr. Lorden responded that the overall flow and volume were reduced. Mr. Desfosses noted that having rain gardens directly next to the structure will create the need for a sump pump otherwise water could get in the basement. That will create the need for drainage and the tie in. An 8-inch pipe would be sufficient.
- Rain Garden design, specifications, and maintenance should comply with NH Stormwater Manual requirements.

- Mr. Lorden clarified that a general note would be added. Mr. Pezzullo noted that this just needs to be verified and that the maintenance requirements were on the plan that is recorded. Mr. Lorden confirmed that this would be updated. They complied with the UNH regulations because they are more current.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the temporary utility easement could be removed from the plan. All the utilities are installed.

Ms. Walker questioned if the electrical easement was shown. Mr. Lorden responded that it was not yet. Eversource is not sure how they are bringing the power in yet. Ms. Walker noted that should be resolved before the application goes to the Planning Board. Mr. Desfosses questioned what was going into the building that would need 400 amps? Mr. Lorden responded an elevator.

Mr. Marsilia noted there would need to be a second egress from the basement. Mr. Lorden confirmed there is a bulkhead on the site plan, but it was not updated on the basement plans. This would be updated and marked.

Ms. Walker understood this project was time sensitive, but some more things need to happen before the application could move forward. This should come back to TAC. They could make the July Planning meeting if they come back to the July TAC. The electrical service should be worked out before this goes to Planning.

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 **postpone** the application to the July 3, 2018 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **70 and 80 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval, under Chapter 400 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Site Review Regulations, for the construction of three proposed industrial buildings: Proposed Building #1: 3-story with a 395,520 s.f. footprint and 395,520 s.f. Gross Floor Area; Proposed Building #2: 3-story with a 450,000 s.f. footprint and 450,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; Proposed Building #3: 3-story with a 186,000 s.f. footprint and 186,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; and two 4-story parking garages, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lots 1 & 2 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins and Vinod Kalikiri from Tighe and Bond, Rob Ciandella, Attorney, and Mike Mates from the Pease Development Authority were present to speak to the application. Mr. Crimmins stated they were there for subdivision and site plan approval to expand Lonza. This is the first TAC public hearing. The application has been to a work session with TAC and met with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Crimmins was meeting with the Conservation Commission next week to discuss impacts to the wetlands and buffer areas. The project itself consists of three new buildings and two new parking garages. The garages will have 700 spaces total based on the parking calculations. Part of the project will subdivide and merge parcels to create one large campus for Lonza. The result will be a 43-acre lot for the entire campus. One section of Goose Bay Drive, 2.5 acres, will be abandoned from the public right of way and become part of the parcel. A cul-de-sac will be created on the property. The existing road does not exceed the minimum length requirement. They are seeking a waiver for the length of driveway and radius of the cul-de-sac. The roadway that is left is 800 linear feet. The project will involve wetland impact. There is a 25-foot wetland buffer on the property. The site will be constructed in phases. Building 1 will be the first built and will be closest to the existing Lonza buildings. The first garage will be constructed after the first building. There will be three phases for construction. Building 2 will be in the second phase along with the garage. Building three will be last. The stream design will be the first thing constructed as part of the parcel. It is a stream restoration to Hodgson Brook. Renderings were included in the packets. There are conceptual overhead connections included in the renderings. They will be looking to staff for a height minimum for those. The site had been previously developed. Many of the wetlands didn't exist 25 years ago. There will be one primary driveway off of Corporate Drive. It will tie into the proposed garages. It will be gated. One gate will be for entry and one gate will be for exit and the middle gate can be switched over for peak times. There will be two other entries into the site that will also be gated. There are sidewalks throughout the site to connect the buildings and garages. There will be bike racks near the garages. The storm water management design includes a gravel wetland, a rain garden and two other gravel wetlands. The storm water management has been designed with the phasing. There are no details for the utilities yet, but utility yards are outlined. There are grading and planting details for the stream. The stream restoration will be part of the mitigation to the wetland impact. Right now the stream is underground. The Utilities plan shows service connections coming off Corporate Drive. At this time the first building does not need increased capacity. Down the road improvements will likely be needed to Pease. Eversource is aware of that. The natural gas is similar. They have capacity to support the first building, but to support more then it will need to be expanded. There is a lighting plan included. There is a drainage memorandum in the package was included. AOT approval will be needed.

The traffic memorandum was prepared and presented by Traffic Engineer Vinod Kalikiri. This will be similar to what Lonza has on the International Drive side. Mr. Kalikiri did a detailed traffic study that looked at volumes, flows and parking lots. The added traffic in the future was considered. Mr. Kalikiri was able to use real data to analyze the traffic. This is within the PDA and there is a transportation master plan that covers the entire PDA. It is consistent with the master plan. The employee traffic patterns for the existing Lonza site were used. All of the traffic will not be coming in at 8 and leaving at 5. The traffic patterns are spread out among different shifts. The distribution of the

trips throughout the day was looked at. This is all being done in context of PDA master plan. Mr. Eby has been in touch with project team.

Ms. Walker clarified that the study was based on the existing facility. Ms. Walker questioned if they analyzed how many people bike, car pool or use public transportation. Mr. Kalikiri responded that the traffic cams accounted for vehicles, buses, bikes and pedestrians. The analysis is focused on the capacity of the intersections, but the data has all of the information. Ms. Walker questioned where the nearest bus stops were. It would be good to call those out and make sure there is pedestrian access to them.

Mr. Marsilia clarified that the two new garages would be same type that are on the site now. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was the expectation. Mr. Marsilia noted that building one showed stair towers for a five-story building but it's a three-story building. Mr. Crimmins responded that this was just a rendering. The heights will be higher than the three stories.

Ms. Walker questioned how much more detail will be part of the phased approval. Mr. Crimmins responded that Lonza just got the money approved to start designing building 1. There were no design details for that yet. Ms. Walker responded that was information TAC needed to have to make a technical review.

Mr. Roediger clarified that the heights of the building will be bigger to match the stair towers. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would match the existing buildings. Mr. Crimmins responded that the Lonza team would take that back to the concept team to get clear timelines.

Mr. Crimmins noted that they have included everything needed from a site plan perspective.

Mr. Roediger noted that the minimum height for the overhead passage was 13.6 feet. The more height the better. Mr. Roediger expressed concern that there were no yard hydrants anywhere in the plan. The plan needs sufficient yard hydrants conveniently located for fire safety. Generators may be required.

Mr. Roediger clarified whether or not the gates were coming out after the project was done. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were not. They are for the property for employees. Mr. Roediger questioned if the roadways would be maintained year round to keep them open and available. The access for fire stinks unless the gates are maintained all the time. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would look at it again.

Mr. Desfosses expressed concerns about the increased gas and electric main sizes. Mr. Desfosses noted that the Mr. Kalikiri did not talk about where cars were coming from. The stream design seemed very uniform. Mr. Britz noted that the intention is that is the design going in, but it's all flood plain. It will meander within the path. Then it will look more natural.

Mr. Kalikiri noted that the traffic analysis was based on general employee traffic to this facility. Three quarters of the traffic was oriented toward the northerly westerly side and one quarter of the traffic is the east side. The majority of the traffic going to the garages would be using the Goose Bay Drive in

and out. Mr. Desfosses noted that he would like to see what the splits of the traffic coming in and out of Pease looked like.

Mr. Eby noted that the trip generation rates were used, but how were they determined? Mr. Kalikiri responded that he did the trip rates using an employee camera and square footage and used the higher of the two.

Mr. Eby noted that one intersection was not addressed. Mr. Mates responded that the PDA was committed to making any improvements necessary for the safe passage of traffic. The master plan is done every ten years. The PDA does periodic traffic counts to check trends. This particular intersection was studied in June 2016. At this point every direction is a level of service of C or better. Only two turning movements were an F. That still does not meet the warrant for a new signal. The direction they received was to continue to monitor the intersection until a new signal was required. Mr. Desfosses stated that he would need to know what phase it would be triggered.

Mr. Eby requested clarification on the figures of traffic coming out of another driveway. Mr. Kalikiri responded that was a typo. It would be updated.

Mr. Eby noted that the bike counts were done in January, but that should be looked at again.

Mr. Britz added that it would be nice to see if some sustainability components were integrated in the project. Mr. Britz requested clarification on the culvert transition. Mr. Crimmins responded that it would be a head wall into existing pipes.

Mr. Britz noted that the stream restoration is a great mitigation project.

Mr. Pezzullo noted that the plan was just showing one sewer connection. They may need another if it requires an industrial discharge permit.

TAC Comments:

- What is the vertical clearance under the Proposed Overhead Building Connectors identified on sheets C-106 and C-107?
- Parking garages will require dry standpipe systems.
- No yard hydrants are shown on the site plan. Hydrant(s) will need to be added to provide water for the parking garages dry standpipe systems as well as hydrants to supply the fire department connections for buildings 1, 2, and 3.
- Are the construction gates permanent installations? All gates will require Knox® padlocks.
- This project needs to be reviewed by an outside party in regards to stormwater and its interface with Goosebay and Corporate Drive drainage.
- The traffic evaluation did not include the intersection of Corporate Drive and International Drive, which will be the most impacted by the project. Figure 10 in the traffic evaluation shows

vehilces using the Lonza Driveway at Corporate Drive, but none of the other figures show traffic at this location. Which ones are 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

Ms. Walker noted that there was still a lot of work to be done. They can start working on the storm water peer review.

Mr. Roediger moved to **postpone** to the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

F. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **70 and 80 Corporate Drive**, requesting Subdivision Approval, under Chapter 500 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Subdivision Regulations, to merge Map 305, Lots 5 & 6 (17.10 acres), Map 305, Lot 1 (13.87 acres), Map 305, Lot 2 (10.18 acres) and a discontinued portion of Goosebay Drive to create Map 305, Lot 6 (43.37 acres). Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lots 1 & 2 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

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 moved to **postpone** to the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

G. The application of **Jon and Diana Guilbert, Owners**, for property located at **15 Thornton Street**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots as follows:

1. Proposed lot #1 having an area of 9,074 s.f. (0.2083 acres) and 144.17' of continuous street frontage on Thornton Street; and
2. Proposed lot #2 having an area of 7,762 s.f. (0.1782 acres) and 101.50' of continuous street frontage on Thornton Street;

Said property is shown on Assessors Map 160 as Lot 1 and is located in the General Residence A (GRA) district where the minimum lot area is 7,500 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage is 100'.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon spoke to the application with owners John and Diana Guilbert. The Proposal is to subdivide one lot into two lots. The second plan sheet is the existing conditions and demolition plan. Some elements will be removed as part of the subdivision for example the pavement, existing railroad line and the out building. The application also includes a proposed building for lot 2. The property is bordered by Dennett Street and Thornton Street. The proposal is to just bisect the lot with one line. The lots meet all the requirements of the ordinance other than existing structure setbacks. A variance was applied for and was granted on May 22, 2018.

TAC Comments:

- The sight line easement at the corner of Dennett could be helpful, but the hedge row is an existing problem that limits sight lines today and must be addressed whether or not this application is approved. The proposed driveway should not be within 50 feet of the intersection of Dennett Street.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that currently the city sidewalk encroaches on the property with a hedge. The applicant has proposed a sidewalk easement to allow for it to remain in place. The sight distance easement would allow for clear visibility down Dennet St. It was clearly stated in plans that the existing hedgerow would be removed.
- The driveway for proposed lot 1 is less than 50 ft. from the intersection and should be narrowed or moved to comply.
 - Clarify what is meant by “multiple sections of the Portsmouth codes” allow driveways to be closer than 50’.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the plans showed a driveway that is 30 feet from the intersection. Mr. Chagnon asked that TAC consider that. There was a comment in the letter that the code allows for driveways to be 30 feet. The safety improvements at the intersection would allow for that driveway length. There is an existing landscaped area that provides a privacy area. Traffic on Thornton St. is very minimal.

- A sewer easement over lot 2 will be needed to service lot 1.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed the plans were revised to reflect this.
- A waiver should be requested for Section VI.2.B Lot Sizes as Lot 2 does not comply with the 10% extra width requirement.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the ordinance states it requires a width of 70 feet. Ms. Walker clarified that the width has to be 110 feet for street frontage. A waiver is needed. Mr. Chagnon responded that he would get the waiver.
- Clearly label the lots on the plan set.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.
- Add variance approval date.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was updated.
- Setback lines on Subdivision Plan are too difficult to decipher, show proposed utilities and contours on a separate plan sheet and clearly label the setback lines for both lots.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was updated. It was not shown as well on the subdivision plan because it's right on the setback lines. Another sheet would be added to clearly show everything.
- Dimensional requirements listed on Subdivision Plan should show required and proposed dimensions for both lots.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the lot 2 building coverage was less than 25%.
- Proposed water service for new home should be located adjacent to proposed sewer connection (10' separation).
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that location would be moved.
- Basement shall have no open sanitary sewer connections.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was added to the plan in a note.
- No discharge onto City property of sump pump water, if groundwater is encountered, a stormwater pipe will need to be constructed to the nearest stormwater pipe.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was added to the plan in a note.

Ms. Walker noted that the site plan regulations were 50 feet for the driveway. Mr. Eby thought that 30 feet back was fine.

PUBLIC HEARING

(Inaudible) questioned if the driveway was coming out on the Thornton Street or the extension. Ms. Walker responded that two driveways were being proposed and they both would be coming out on the extension.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend subdivision approval**, seconded by Mr. Eby with the following stipulations:

1. The driveway for proposed lot 1 shall be moved to be 30 ft. from the intersection with Dennett Street.
2. A sewer easement over lot 2 shall be provided to service lot 1.
3. A Planning Board shall be required for Section VI.2.B Lot Sizes as Lot 2 does not comply with the 10% extra width requirement.
4. Proposed lots shall be clearly labeled on the plan set.
5. Add variance approval date to plan.
6. Setback lines on Subdivision Plan are difficult to decipher, suggest showing proposed utilities and contours on a separate plan sheet and clearly label the setback lines for both lots.
7. Dimensional requirements listed on Subdivision Plan should show required and proposed dimensions for both lots.
8. Proposed water service for new home shall be located adjacent to proposed sewer connection (10' separation).
9. Basement shall have no open sanitary sewer connections.
10. There shall be no discharge onto City property of sump pump water, if groundwater is encountered, a stormwater pipe will need to be constructed connecting to the nearest stormwater pipe.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

H. The application of **Westwind Townhomes of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located at **1177 Sagamore Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots as follows:

1. Proposed lot #1 having an area of 33,378 s.f. (0.7663 acres) and 121.75' of continuous street frontage on Sagamore Avenue; and
2. Proposed lot #2 having an area of 22,628 s.f. (0.5194 acres) and 102' of continuous street frontage on Sagamore Avenue;

Said property is shown on Assessors Map 224 as Lot 13 and is located in the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) district where the minimum lot area is 7,500 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage is 100'.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering and the applicant Peter Fregeau spoke to the application. The application is to subdivide the lot. The lot received approval to expand the construction to 7 units. The lot needs to be subdivided for a temporary amount of time then it will be recombined. The lots meet all the setback requirements. The grading plan showed updates to allow for a fence.

TAC Comments:

- Lot 2 and lot 1 sewer flows must stay separate until they combine into the City owned manhole that is located on the side of Sagamore Avenue (See attached sketch).
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the request is that the applicant performs significant changes to the sewer system. That was discussed in the workshop and they felt that they didn't need to make changes to the site because the property will be recombined. It is understood that when the property is subdivided it's subdivided. It is understood that there may be concern about this being subdivided and never be recombined. This could be designed on paper, then have a window of time to either recombine the lot or the sewer updates could be constructed. Would that be acceptable? Mr. Desfosses responded that they couldn't even let them use it until it's recombined. Mr. Fregeau responded that the intention is to divide the lot and establish a Westwind 2 Condo Association and then remerge the Condo Associations. Everything is moving forward from a construction standpoint. The merge can't be done instantly because the condo documents have to be done, but the hope is that they can be merged within the 30-60 day window. Ms. Walker noted that making this CO dependent meant that no one would be able to move in until that is done. Applicant responded that was not an issue. The site would not be occupied until it is complete.

Mr. Chagnon noted that the rest of the comments relate to this issue. They understand the comments and the level of detail needed to move forward.

- Modify existing manhole on side of Sagamore as necessary to lower grade for sidewalk (no higher than 6" above existing roadway) and provide additional pipe inlet in shelf for Lot 2.
 - Mr. Desfosses noted that the sewer manhole was too high. Ms. Walker questioned if that was that part of a site plan approval or this approval. Mr. Chagnon noted that this comment came up today. Mr. Chagnon clarified that the comment was to lower the manhole cover so that a sidewalk can go in. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct. Mr. Chagnon responded that he would look at it. Ms. Walker noted that it might be logistically easier to put it through the site plan amended approval. Mr. Chagnon responded that it should be attached to this. Ms. Walker noted that this could probably be resolved in time for Planning Board. The Legal Department needs to give advice about the subdivision of the lot.
- Move stonewall back out of sidewalk easement or remove entirely.
 - Mr. Fregeau responded that it was moved a foot. It was 8 feet from the inside edge of the curb. Now it is 9 feet 2 inches. If the easement is 10 feet, then it is still within the easement. It can't go any closer.
- Leave grade even with roadway.

- Sanitary sewer flows must be separate from the two proposed lots until flow enters City’ sewer system.

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 **recommend subdivision approval**, seconded by Mr. Roediger with the following stipulations:

1. Modify existing manhole on side of Sagamore Avenue as necessary to lower grade for sidewalk (no higher than 6” above existing roadway) and provide additional pipe inlet in shelf for Lot 2.
2. Applicant shall work with the City to enter into a binding agreement to ensure no sewer connection or Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued until after the lots have been re- merged.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

I. The application of **Dorothy Kiersted and Theresa Sessions, Owners**, for property located at **50 Lovell Street**, requesting Site Plan Review to demolish the rear deck on the existing house and the existing garage; to retain the existing building as a single family residence with a footprint of 1,001 s.f. and Gross Floor Area 3,095; to construct a three story, two unit residence with a footprint of 1,660 and Gross Floor Area of 4,634 s.f.; to construct a three story single residence with a footprint of 1,165 and Gross Floor Area of 3,360; with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 147 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residential C (GRC) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Doug LaRosa from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. The project proposes to create three new units, a duplex and a single-family home. It includes demolishing an existing garage and shed. Municipal water and sewer will service the site. The drainage will be tied into the existing system. It is at the bottom of the watershed. The site receives water from all of the abutters except one. The building elevations and floor plans for the duplex and single family home were provided. The project proposes to put 1-2 feet of fill across the site. The drainage will go from Middle St. back to Lovell St. There will be a rain garden at the bottom of the slope. A small landscape model is proposed along the Carriage Drive side. The end of the driveway will be porous pavement. Analysis shows a decrease in runoff using the University of Cornell data. It is a very small site. There is one portion of the site with parking in front of the existing unit. Mr. LaRosa proposed pushing the single and duplex back 8 feet to

allow for tandem parking and remove parking in front. There are five test pits across the site. The water tables were high between 26-34 inches.

TAC Comments:

- The required note per Section 2.5.4.2E should be added to the Site Plan, Sheet C-2.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed this would be added.
- Non-compliant Fire Department access requires all new buildings be equipped with an automatic sprinkler system.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that a residential D sprinkler system would be added to the duplex and the single family. Mr. Roediger noted that the problem was the access. The easy solution is to add a sprinkler.
- New buildings shall not have basements.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that a note would be added.
- Concrete infill is not allowed in SMH's.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that the detail would be corrected.
- All surrounding properties to the south and east drain onto this lot, do not block drainage.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that the proposed spot grades would be clarified.
- Label transformer.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that would be labeled.
- Water and sewer utilities lot shall be installed to City Standards and all connections shall be witnessed and inspected.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed this was all in the notes.
- The area of Lovell St effected by utilities shall be milled down and repaved with a 1.5" overlay one year after installation.
- Match pipe crowns in all SMH's. SMH must meet State Standards including booted connections. SMH in Lovell St will need City Std cover.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that this would be added in the details.
- Proposed sewer line is too close to drainage, provide 4' separation.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that he would follow up on that. Mr. Desfosses requested a detailed cross section under the porous pavement above the sewer. It should show the underlying utilities. Where they are and how they are placed.
- There will need to an onsite electric meter for the lighting.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed this would be outlined in the plans. The owner preferred to revise the lighting, so they are controlled by photoelectric meters. They will come on and off with dawn and dusk. They will be individual to the building.
- Rain garden cross section shows 6" pipe underdrains, plans call for 4".
- Provide detail for outlet structure.
- Water department will need easement for access to valves, testing and leak detection.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed the easement would be provided.
- Show DMH detail, no doghouse manholes.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed this would be updated.

- Confirm methodology regarding soil types for drainage areas including areas offsite.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that the test pits showed that it was not Group A soil it’s Group C. The drainage analysis shows that it’s the same pre and post. Mr. Desfosses noted that the site would be intercepting flows from other lots. The pipes need to be sized appropriately. The drainage study should assume everything is Group C. Mr. Pezzullo questioned what storm the pipes sized was sized for. Mr. LaRosa responded a 10-year storm. An excessive amount of drainage comes off the site, and then goes through the rain garden. For large storms it would come into the system and then overflow after a certain amount. It would go the path it goes today, or come into the rain garden through the porous pavement and out to the City water. There is no need to increase the size of the pipe.
- Recommend that stormwater drainage design be reviewed by outside third party peer review.
- The applicant has submitted a waiver from section 2.4.3.1A. This section is intended for applicants to take the opportunity to consider sustainable choices in their applications. While it is not a requirement that green building components be included in a project there is a requirement they be considered.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be addressed.
- Driveway corner radius should not extend past the extension of the property line, in front of the abutter’s property.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that was fine.

PUBLIC HEARING

John Rando represented the Board of the Old Parish Condo Association and spoke in support of the application. They had a couple meetings with Ambit and the builders. The issues have mostly been addressed. The lighting is far less intrusive than streetlights. When this went to Planning the site was dense. Moving the building back 8 feet would make access much more manageable.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** to the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Pezzullo. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:30 pm, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee