

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

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

2:00 PM

JUNE 4, 2019

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: n/a

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the April 30, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the April 30, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Cate Street Development, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **428 Route 1 Bypass, Cate Street, 55 Cate Street, 161 Cate Street and 1 Cate Street**, requesting Site Plan approval for the redevelopment of the properties into a mixed use development, including 22,000 s.f. +/- retail space, 22,000 s.f. +/- office space, 250 residential apartment units; Proposed Residential Building A: 4-stories, 132 units, 24,850 s.f. footprint and 141,885 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Residential Building B: 4-stories, 118 units, 21,350 s.f. footprint and 110,170 Gross Floor Area, and 23 townhouses; Proposed Townhome Buildings A: 8,640 s.f. total footprint and 25,920 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Townhome Buildings B: 11,440 total footprint and 34,320 Gross Floor Area, and 510 parking spaces with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 172 as Lot 1, Map 173 as Lot 2, Map 165 as Lot 2, Map 163 as Lot 33 and Map 163 as Lot 34 and lie within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (This application was postponed at the April 30, 2019 TAC meeting.)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Bosen from Bosen & Associates, Rick Lundborne from Fuss and O'Neil, Jeff Ghan from PCA Architects and Gregg Mikolaities from August Consulting were present to speak to the

application. Mr. Bosen commented that they had been working on this project for 18 months and have had various meetings with land use boards. This application has come to TAC for a work session and was now here to hopefully receive a positive recommendation to the Planning Board. The team has seen the list of TAC's concerns and are confident they can be addressed in the final plans.

Ms. Walker commented that with the amount of outstanding items TAC was not in a position to recommend approval to the Planning Board. It is better to go through the TAC process and get a positive recommendation. Ms. Walker requested that if the Committee had specific comments other than what was already submitted, then they should voice them. Also, if the applicants have specific questions or comments they want to walk through, then they should let them know. The zoning issues need to be reviewed or verified before this goes to the Planning Board.

Mr. Bosen noted that it would be helpful to meet with the peer reviewer for the road design. Ms. Walker confirmed that could be set up once the peer review was finalized.

Mr. Britz noted that some of the plant names did not match up with the abbreviations on the landscape plan. Mr. Lundborne confirmed that would be reviewed.

Mr. Lundborne showed the floor plans. The first floor has a trash storage room for the commercial piece with a roll up door. Most of the solid waste will be in there. There will be a cardboard compactor on the side of the building. There will also be compost storage and pick up on the side. Trash will be stored in the interior spaces for everything else. A dumpster will be rolled out to blocked off striped parking spots for Buildings A and B. The townhouses will do private curbside pickup. Ms. Walker commented that the proposed trash pick up locations should be on the site plan. Mr. Lundborne confirmed that they would be added.

Mr. Lundborne noted that all of the comments that came in last night were simple to address. They will eliminate redundancy between the development standards page and the notes.

Ms. Walker pointed out two symbols labeled T on the plan and questioned if they were existing transformers. Mr. Lundborne responded that they would be new transformers. Ms. Walker questioned if there would be screening. Mr. Lundborne was not sure. Ms. Walker commented that more detail was needed and they should be identified in the legend. Mr. Lundborne confirmed the detail would be added.

Mr. Lundborne confirmed that they would work with City Staff on the relocation of the manhole. A lot of the comments deal with easements that the team understands that needs to be figured out.

Ms. Walker noted that there were no subdivision lot lines at this point, but it looked like there is an intention to subdivide it into 3 management pieces. Mr. Lundborne confirmed that was correct. Ms. Walker noted that they would need to know more about that proposed management structure. It may be good to start the subdivision process. It's a separate application and approval from the Planning Board. That should probably be on the next TAC agenda. The

ownership and management structure should be included in the proposal to ensure it will work within the zoning.

Mr. Lundborne confirmed that they would verify that the Fire Department's Tower Truck 5 would work around the site.

Ms. Walker noted that the TAC comments would be incorporated into the minutes and the peer reviews would be on the website when they are ready.

Mr. Howe questioned if the fire pump room would only serve Building A. Mr. Ghan responded that it would serve both buildings. They are assuming that a pressurized system is needed based on historical data, but a flow measurement is required. Mr. Desfosses noted that they couldn't use one pressurized system on two different lots. Mr. Lundborne confirmed they would be on the same lot.

Mr. Lundborne requested clarification on the comment about the U-haul water service. Mr. Desfosses responded that they are not sure about the condition of those lines and where they connect.

Ms. Walker commented that any additional questions should come through the Planning Department.

TAC Comments:

- Existing manhole in front of the proposed commercial building that straddles the U-haul property line must be replaced as part of the sewer work.
- Show sewer and water easements across this lot for benefit of 406 Route 1 bypass are being provided. Applicant will also need to provide temporary water and maintain sewer for the 406 Route 1 Bypass building if occupied at the time of construction. The water main shown extending to this structure should be downsized immediately after servicing the new #400 building to ensure water quality.
- Plans should show abandoning water services/mains in Cottage St that will become defunct after line replacement
- Blanket easement to the City covering the lot must be provided to allow access to valves, meters and leak detection of public water system
- Uhaul must be provided a new domestic water service off of the new main
- For constructability reasons, a SMH will likely be needed at sta 15+00
- An agreement must be in place for the flushing of private hydrants by City Water Division
- The fire pump room shown on A1.11 requires direct access from the exterior of the building.
- Could not find the turning/movements plan specifically for Portsmouth FD's Tower 5. See attached information that would be required to demonstrate Tower 5's ability to traverse throughout the property.
- There does not appear to be a street light at the crosswalk at station 15. One should be added.
- The sight lines at each site driveway intersection with the Cate Street connector roadway should be provided, to ensure they meet with AASHTO requirements for a design speed

of 30 mph.

- In order to confirm water flow capacity and proposed water main diameter, the developer will be required to cover the cost for updating the City's water modeling system through a third party services agreement with the City's consultant – Weston & Sampson Engineering. This should be completed prior to Planning Board approval.
- The City's DPW will be conducting sewer flow metering to verify the necessary sewer main diameter. This should be completed prior to Planning Board approval.
- Location of any proposed loading and service areas need to be added to the plan set and clearly noted
- Explain the solid waste management and disposal procedures for the site and add any proposed dumpster locations. The checklist notes that there is a compactor to be added for the commercial building that should be shown on the plans for solid waste management.
- Provide table of sign details for any directional and traffic signs noted on the plans, plan set includes references to sign types but no details are included.
- Any signs other than directional or traffic should include a note indicating separate City sign permit is required.
- Confirm that the landscaping plan is not in conflict with the proposed utility plans (see Section 6.2(c) of the Site Review regulations).
- Numbering of notes on sheet CN-001 needs to be corrected – inconsistent. Information also duplicates notes listed on CS-001
- Zoning information listed on Sheet CS-001 is being confirmed by Planning staff, any questions will be raised at the TAC meeting. Remove statement "Zoning information listed hereon is based on the City of Portsmouth Zoning Ordinance dated July 11, 2016..." Various sheets reference 2016 Zoning Ordinance and should be updated to reflect the current Zoning Ordinance as amended through: March 4, 2019.
- Confirm that proposed site lighting is dark sky compliant and provide detail sheets of proposed lights.
- The plans show 1 area of snow storage for the site. Plans and/or notes should be added to address the entire site.
- Green Building Statement shall be provided per Section 2.5.3.1A.
- Utility contact info and documentation of approval from utility providers should be added per Section 2.5.3.1H and 2.5.3.2D of the Site Plan Regulations.
- Note #12, Sheet CN-001 cites the required note per Section 2.5.4.2E contrary to the checklist provided that indicates it will be added. Checklist should be updated.
- Checklist should also be updated to indicate the required landscaping notes per Section 2.13.4 are included on Sheet L1.06.
- A list of required state and federal permits should be noted per Section 2.5.3.2E.
- An easement plan should be included in the plan set that includes all existing and proposed easements, deed restrictions and non-public rights of ways.
- TEC is completing a peer review of the updated traffic study. Comments to be provided separately.
- TEC is completing a review of the applicant's response to the preliminary stormwater management peer review comments. Comments to be provided separately.
- TEC is completing a review of the applicant's response to the preliminary roadway design peer review comments. Comments to be provided separately.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone else 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. Cracknell moved to **postpone** this item until the July 2, 2019 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Kapelos Karen E Revocable Trust of 1995 & Kapelos Karen Trustee, Owner, and Raymond Bisson, Applicant**, for property located at **88 & 100 Cardinal Lane** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Lot Line Revision) between two lots as follows: Lot 247 as shown on Assessor Map 292 decreasing in area from 22,448 s.f. to 16,682 s.f. with 125' of continuous street frontage on Cardinal Lane and 140' of street frontage on Lafayette Road; and Lot 164 as shown on Assessor Map 292 increasing in area from 18,845 s.f. to 24,610 s.f. with 175' of continuous street frontage on Cardinal Lane. Said properties are located in the Single-Residence B (SRB) District where the minimum lot size is 15,000 s.f. and minimum street frontage requirement is 100'.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Ms. Walker commented that this application was not required to come to TAC. However, there have been a number of reviews for this. TAC is reviewing the access to the lot. There is street frontage but no access on Route 1. Ms. Walker requested that the applicant to talk about the existing conditions on Cardinal Lane.

Ray Bisson spoke to the application. Currently the property has a driveway coming in from Route 1. The lot was subdivided with two proposed driveways. The problem is that one of them is not very practical. The minimum square footage requirement has changed and allowed the lot to become smaller. The proposal is to shift the line, which will still provide more than 1,600 square feet over the requirement. The original subdivision application was already approved with the two driveways. Cardinal Lane is a public road with a path.

Ms. Walker questioned if the Committee felt comfortable with the access and safety in the proposed division, which would bring the driveways a little further down Cardinal Lane.

Mr. Howe questioned what the width of the road was. Mr. Bisson responded that the smallest width was 18 feet at the end, then the road narrows to a path. Mr. Howe questioned what the

existing house addresses were. Mr. Bisson responded that they were 88 and 100 Cardinal Lane. Mr. Howe questioned if there were driveways already on Cardinal Lane. Ms. Walker responded not yet. Mr. Bisson commented that they shifted the line because there is a utility pole. The new driveway will not interfere with the pole.

Ms. Walker questioned if the City could plow Cardinal Lane. Mr. Desfosses confirmed they could.

Mr. Howe commented that they may need to put in a sprinkler system for the proposed house, but that would be addressed down the road.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone else 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 approval** as submitted to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **The Wentworth Gardner & Tobias Lear Houses Association, Owner**, and **Stephen Foster, Applicant**, for property located at **49 Hunking Street** requesting Site Plan approval for a 162 s.f. addition with related utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 39 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering and Brendan McNamara from McNamara Architects spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon noted that it was a pretty simple project. A property survey was included in the packet. The project consists of replacing an old drip edge, adding a small addition in the back, and adjusting grades in the back. It is a commercial project, so a site plan review is required. The application has a CUP for additional parking on a shared lot. Variances have been granted for the use of an inn, a sideyard setback, and reconstruction of a non-conforming structure. The property is in the shoreland zone. That permit approval was received that on June 3, 2019.

Ms. Walker requested clarification on the open space calculations. Mr. Chagnon responded that the lot coverage was 28.5%. The open space is over 70% of the lot.

Mr. Eby questioned if the building was handicap accessible. Mr. Chagnon responded that it was not because it was historic.

Ms. Walker requested clarification on the utility unit. Mr. McNamara responded that it was a standard Mitsubishi unit and is 48 inches tall and 1 foot deep. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would verify the setback distance.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone else 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** as submitted to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

C. The application of **Lonza Biologics, Owner**, and **Tighe & Bond, Applicant**, for property located at **101 International Drive** requesting Site Plan Review approval to construct a building addition with a footprint of 500 s.f. and gross floor area of 500 s.f.; replacement of an existing 1,500-gallon nitrogen tank to a new 6,000-gallon nitrogen tank and upgrade of an existing concrete pad; installation of two (2) new generators with 3,312-gallon diesel fuel above ground storage tanks (AST), a transformer pad, switchgear housed in an enclosure, automatic transfer switch in an enclosure and associated retaining wall. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lot 6 and lies within the Airport Business and Commercial (ABC) Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. The application was for electrical improvements. The plan has not changed from the work session. No parking signs were added at the fence. A drainage analysis to demonstrate the water quality unit capacity was added.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone else 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** as submitted to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

D. The application of **Borthwick Forest, LLC, Owner**, for property located on **Borthwick Avenue and Islington Street**, requesting Amended Site Plan Review approval for the conversion of a ground level parking garage to office space and associated parking lot expansion and related stormwater management improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 241 as Lot 25 and Lot 26 and lies within the Office Research (OR) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. This is an amended site plan review for a previously approved office subdivision project. The previous approval was for a 55,000 square foot office building with basement parking. The new proposal is to fit out the basement of the building, so additional surface parking needs to be provided. The application is requesting a reserve parking area for additional parking. The request is to build an additional row of parking as part of the project to create 219 parking spaces. The plan also shows a reserve parking area. The developer does not think that reserve parking is needed. It would be built if and when the reserve parking was needed. That would provide 56 spaces. That could be built in the future. The plan has the same storm water management design that was previously approved. The edge of pave has not changed from the prior design. The reserve parking area is designed with two rain gardens that would collect and treat the runoff. No AOT approval is required because the reserve parking will not be built at this time. In the future if the reserve parking was needed, then they would seek an amendment from the state. There are no changes to the roadway design. The application includes some trip generation information for the previous 55,000 square foot building and the proposed 67,000 square foot building. There was a nominal increase to traffic.

Mr. Eby commented that this was for a medical building, but the trip rate was based on a general office. A medical office building would have a higher trip rate. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.

Mr. Britz clarified that the rain gardens would only be added if the reserve parking were built. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct. Mr. Britz commented that the Wetland Permit was approved based on the prior footprint. This parking is not in the buffer, but there was concern from the Conservation Commission about the impact on habitat in the area. Mr. Britz expressed concern that the Wetland Permit was approved based on another plan. Ms. Walker clarified that the reserve parking was included because it was required by zoning, but the developer did not anticipate that it was needed. The area would remain forested unless the parking was needed. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct. They would be fine to present again to the Conservation Commission if the reserve parking was ever needed.

Mr. Defosses questioned why the bike path was narrowed. Mr. Crimmins responded that originally it was going to be a 20-foot fire access, but it became 10-foot wide bike path. Ms. Walker added that was part of the Planning Board approval. It can be used as an access if

needed, but it is not an access road. Mr. Desfosses commented that the Eversource lines should be included on the plan. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.

Mr. Marsilio noted that the state requires that any facility installing a generator must submit an application to the waste management 45 days prior to the install.

Mr. Eby noted that the driveway now overlapped with the pedestrian walkway and questioned if the driveway could move back to where it was. Mr. Crimmins responded that it would not work with the grading. The path could be adjusted. Mr. Howe requested to see the turn radius with a fire truck because it could affect their ability to get to the side of the satellite building. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.

TAC Comments:

- The impacts of the additional parking on drainage needs to be reviewed by an outside 3rd party reviewer.
- Is this amendment proposing any changes to the previously approved roadway that is currently under construction?
- All plantings must be conducted using DPW approved methods
- The impacts of the additional traffic to be generated by the 17ksf of office space needs to be analyzed. An update of the previous traffic study should be provided. New traffic counts at the study intersections should be conducted, as the data in the previous study is now 4 years old.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ralph DiBernardo of 1374 Islington St. noted that the community depended on TAC expertise and he appreciated it. Mr. DiBernardo requested a reaffirmation that the water would not affect the Sherman Wells.

Ms. Walker noted that the applicants were asking for an area to be designated as a reserve parking area. There will be condition for them to go back to the Conservation Commission if needed.

Mr. DiBernardo also noted that the rain gardens needed to be maintained. They serve no purpose if they are not properly maintained.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz commented that they should recommend the Planning Board consider revisiting this project if the reserve parking lot moved forward. Ms. Walker responded that the Planning Board has to approve it to comply with zoning, but they could have conditions that prior to construction they come back to the Conservation Commission and Planning Board to verify it complies with best management practices.

Mr. Howe commented that shifting the access off the circle is significant. Mr. Britz questioned if they already looked at the turning templates with the new access design. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they had and it would work better now with the angle of the drive. Mr. Howe noted that they will now have to do a right turn and left turn to get to the building. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they could make the turns work. Ms. Walker questioned if the Committee was fine with just the Fire Department reviewing the turning movements for the fire truck with the new access. The Committee confirmed that was fine.

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

Stipulations to be addressed prior to Planning Board review:

- 1) A trip generation memo using the traffic generation for medical office use shall be submitted to the City's Transportation and Parking Engineer, Eric Eby, to determine if a revision of the previous traffic study is required
- 2) Fire truck turning templates shall be submitted to the City's Deputy Fire Chief, Patrick Howe, for review and approval. Any additional modifications required for the design parking lot and access ways shall be reviewed and approved by the Deputy Fire Chief and the Transportation and Parking Engineer.
- 3) The entrance to the bike lane from the cul-de-sac shall be adjusted to avoid conflict with the proposed driveway.

Stipulations to be included in Planning Board approval:

- 1) Prior to construction of the reserve parking area, the plans shall be submitted to the Conservation Commission for review
- 2) Prior to construction, the stormwater maintenance plan, revised to incorporate the proposed rain gardens, shall include a schedule for annual inspection and maintenance of the proposed rain gardens to be continued in perpetuity. An amended site plan including a note referencing the stormwater maintenance plan and annual inspection and maintenance schedule shall be recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds.

The motion passed unanimously.

E. The application of **Arbor View & The Pines, LLC**, Owner, for property located at **145 Lang Road** requesting Amended Site Plan Review approval to construct two (2) three-story multi-family buildings and associated site improvements, grading, utilities, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 287 as Lot 1 and lies within the Garden Apartment/Mobile Home Park (GA/MH) District.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to **postpone** this item until the July 2, 2019 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Britz moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:10 p.m., seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee