

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

**Remote Meeting Via Zoom Conference Call**

Register in advance for this meeting:

<https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJcodu6vpjMoHtyd9SVpsAT2EbWftQm9D7J6>

*You are required to register to join the meeting over Zoom, a unique meeting ID and password will be provided once you register. Please note, this meeting will also be broadcast on the City's [YouTube Channel](#) and Cable TV Channel 22. Public comments can be emailed in advance to [planning@cityofportsmouth.com](mailto:planning@cityofportsmouth.com). For technical assistance, please contact the Planning Department by email ([planning@cityofportsmouth.com](mailto:planning@cityofportsmouth.com)) or phone (603) 610-7296.*

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared COVID-19 outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 2020-04, Section 8 as extended by Executive Order 2020-5, and Executive Order #12, Section 3. Members will be participating remotely and will identify their location and any person present with them at that location. All votes will be by roll call.

**2:00 PM**

**MAY 5, 2020**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Juliet TH Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Fire Department; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner and Mark Newport, Police Department

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

**ADDITIONAL STAFF PRESENT:** Jillian Harris, Planner 1

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. Approval of minutes from the April 7, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the April 7, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

**II. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. The application of **Richard Fusegni, Owner**, for property located at **1574 Woodbury Avenue** requesting a Conditional Use Permit for a drive-through facility in accordance with Section 10.440 (19.40) of the Zoning Ordinance and

Site Plan Review Approval for the construction of a new retail bank with parking, utilities, landscaping, lighting, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 238 Lot 17 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District.

Alan Rosco spoke to the application and reviewed the TAC comments that were provided.

TAC Comments:

- *Nandin domestica*, Heavenly Bamboo shown at the front and rear building entrances is listed as a USDA invasive species. Please specify a substitute species for this plant unless there is information that this is a different (non-invasive) variety.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be updated.
- Sanitary sewer needs to be 6" pipe. Connect bank to existing 6" sanitary sewer line, note on plan says 4". Existing line not shown properly, please trace and show in its entirety. Do not hook to grease trap line. Show both lines, show grease trap line being capped at wye. Remove covers from grease trap.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be updated. There is a reference to the grease trap that goes with the Ruby Tuesdays. The plan for that is to abandon it in place. Mr. Desfosses commented that the full extent of the sewer service is still not shown on the plans. It needs to be traced and outlined on the plan. The whole line should be scoped to ensure it's acceptable for reuse.
- Show limits of milling and paving in the road. Should be 2' larger than patch.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that the drawing would be updated.
- CDS treatment unit needs to be cleaned yearly. Report to be submitted to Portsmouth public works after every cleaning.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be part of the Operations and Maintenance Plan.
- The site is lit abnormally brightly for a principally daytime use. Consider revising lighting levels excepting atm area of course.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be updated.
- The stormwater from the drive through is leaving the lot, does the property owner have an easement that allows that?
  - Mr. Rosco responded that all the flow patterns will be maintained, so there should not be an issue.
- A 1 ½" water line is quite large for a bank, consider reducing at the property line to provide better water quality.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that was the normal size for banks, but it can be changed to a 1-inch water line.
- Convert existing fire service to new Hydrant. Contact Portsmouth Water for Standards. Provide easement for hydrant.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be updated.
- No Parking sign at head of access aisle should be moved to back of sidewalk to allow for use of tip down ramp.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be relocated.
- HP spaces and access aisle can be 8 feet wide instead of 9.
  - Mr. Rosco confirmed that they could leave it. Mr. Eby confirmed that was fine.

- Pavement marking words should read in the direction of travel. The first word of the message should be nearest to the road user.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be updated.
- The STOP sign at the intersection of the drive thru lane and the main parking lot may be more appropriate on the parking lot approach instead, to help define the separation of the different site uses, and because the drive thru approach to the intersection will likely have higher volume than the parking lot approach.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be updated.
- The bike rack should be the inverted U style, rather than the wave style.
  - Mr. Rosco responded they would swap the bike rack.
- Adjust language on HP sign to be consistent with local ordinance.
  - Mr. Rosco agreed.
- Is there any potential conflict between vehicles entering the site and vehicles exiting the parking spaces immediately adjacent Woodbury Ave?
  - Mr. Rosco responded that the configuration of the entrance with the main parking area is identical to what is there now. Mr. Eby responded that it would be nice to have a deeper throat, but it is acceptable the way it is.
- Is it required or more appropriate to have a van-accessible space in front of the bank?
  - Mr. Rosco responded that there will be one ADA spot that will be van accessible. Mr. Eby noted that they just need to add a sign to say that it is van accessible.

Mr. Rosco questioned if the sewer work needed to be completed before it went to Planning Board or if it could be a condition of approval. Mr. Desfosses responded that it needs to be done before the final plan set is approved. Ms. Walker added that it would be better to do before the Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses requested clarification that the hydrant would be at least two feet back on the backside of the sidewalk on Woodbury Ave. Mr. Rosco confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Britz questioned if they selected a new plant to replace the bamboo. Mr. Rosco confirmed that they would work with the landscaper to select something native to NH.

Mr. Desfosses noted that comment three was not needed because they will not need to go out into the road for the hydrant. The domestic service can be handled on the property. There will be no work in the road.

## **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**

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

Conditions of approval to be completed prior to submission to Planning Board:

1. "Nandin domestica", Heavenly Bamboo shown at the front and rear building entrances is listed as a USDA invasive species. Please specify a substitute species for this plant;
2. Sanitary sewer needs to be a 6" pipe. Connect bank to existing 6" sanitary sewer line. Correct note on plan that says 4". Existing sewer line is not shown properly, please trace and show in its entirety. Do not hook to grease trap line. Show both lines, show grease trap line being capped at wye. Remove covers from grease trap;
3. Consider revising lighting levels excepting ATM area;
4. Confirm that the property owner has an easement or agreement for the stormwater from the drive through that is leaving the lot;
5. A 1 1/2" water line is quite large for a bank, consider reducing at the property line to provide better water quality;
6. Convert existing fire service to new Hydrant. Contact Portsmouth Water for Standards. Provide easement for hydrant and update plans to note easement;
7. No Parking sign at the head of access aisle should be moved to the back of the sidewalk to allow for use of tip down ramp;
8. Pavement marking words for drive-thru should read in the direction of travel. The first word of the message should be nearest to the road user;
9. The STOP sign at the intersection of the drive thru lane and the main parking lot may be more appropriate on the parking lot approach instead, to help define the separation of the different site uses, and because the drive thru approach to the intersection will likely have higher volume than the parking lot approach;
10. The bike rack should be the inverted U style, rather than the wave style;
11. Adjust language on HP sign to be consistent with local ordinance;
12. Update plans to accommodate a van-accessible space in front of the bank.

Conditions to be included in Planning Board approval:

13. CDS treatment unit needs to be cleaned yearly. Report to be submitted to Portsmouth Department of Public Works after every cleaning;
14. Provide a draft easement for the new hydrant for review and approval by the Legal and Planning Departments.

The motion passed unanimously.

### III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The application of **Matthew Wajda, Owner**, for property located at **183 Coolidge Drive** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide a lot with an area of 20,444 s.f. and 209' of street frontage into two (2) lots as follows: proposed Lot 1 with an area of 10,113 s.f. and 85' of continuous street frontage; proposed Lot 2 with an area of 10,330 s.f. and 124' of continuous street frontage. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 268 Lot 29 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. The lot is a long narrow lot with frontage on Coolidge Dr. and Grant Ave. The proposal is to subdivide it in the middle to

make two lots. There is an existing home that would remain on Coolidge Dr. and it would become Lot 1. Lot 2 will have a new single-family home with a driveway on Grant Ave. The project has received approval from the ZBA for the layout. The topography slopes from Coolidge Dr. to Grant Ave. There is a garage and temporary shed on Lot 1. The shed will be removed to avoid setback issues. The plan shows a proposed house within the setbacks on Lot 2. This allowed for a drainage analysis to show that it would work. The utilities would come from Grant Ave. The grading and drainage plan show the construction of a proposed rain garden in the northeast corner of lot 2. The proposal is to deepen the existing condition because the runoff goes to that corner today. The proposal would be to mimic the condition and increase the infiltration area.

TAC Comments:

- It should be confirmed that the projected landing and stairs are less than 3 feet in height to be eligible for the exemption under Section 10.516.40.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the grading is shown on the plan. The elevation to the landing is 1.8 feet.
- 1.5" line for water is oversized and unneeded.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that would be revised.
- Change sewer service detail in regard to Fernco connection to reflect pvc to Ac connection.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that would be revised.
- Water service curb box is not cast iron.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that would be revised.
- Pavement in utility trench should be 2 3/4" binder, 1 1/4" top.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that would be revised.
- Consider lifting the FF of building a bit due to likely high groundwater.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that suggestion would be considered in the final house design.
- Construction of the rain garden shall be witnessed by DPW and the design engineer and be in conformance with the stormwater manual.
  - Mr. Chagnon agreed with the comment.
- Proposed drainage easement should be flowage easement or alternatively (and preferably) the grade in front of 183 should be changed so that street drainage does not enter onto the lot at all.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that was a good comment. The grade of Coolidge Dr. does slope to a catch basin southwest of the frontage. The preference would be to follow that suggestion. The plan will show some revised grading. The driveway will tip up to accomplish that and they will not need a drainage or flowage easement. There would be some grading on the neighbor's lot, but it should in the right of way. If not, then they will get the appropriate permissions.
- The existing home's lot drains onto the proposed lot. May need a drainage easement.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that an easement should not be required.

Mr. Desfosses agreed with Mr. Chagnon about the existing house lot and the proposed drainage on the lot. There should be a swale to capture roof runoff into the rain garden. Mr. Chagnon responded that there was a note on the drawing that there would be gutters. Mr. Desfosses noted that a swale would work too based on house design.

Ms. Walker clarified that the grading on the abutting lot would primarily be in the right of way. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Walker commented that they should make note of raising the first floor above the finished floor elevation. This is not an approval of the specific design of the house. However, it should be noted. Mr. Desfosses noted that the basement finished floor should be above the ground water level because that level may rise due to the rain garden. It's always good practice to not go too deep into water table.

## **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**

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

### Conditions of approval to be completed prior to submission to Planning Board:

1. 1.5" line for water is oversized and unneeded. Plans should be updated as necessary;
2. Change sewer service detail in regard to Fernco connection to reflect pvc to Ac connection;
3. Revise water service curb box as it is not cast iron;
4. Pavement in utility trench should be 2 3/4" binder, 1 1/4" top;
5. Plans should confirm the Finished Floor of the new residential building is to be above groundwater level;
6. Applicant will re-grade the area in front of the property and abutting properties so that street drainage does not flow onto the lots.

### Conditions to be included in Planning Board approval:

7. Construction of the rain garden shall be witnessed by DPW and/or by a certified design engineer and be in conformance with the NH stormwater manual.

The motion passed unanimously.

- B. The application of **Vaughan Street Hotel, LLC and Stone Creek Realty, LLC, Owners**, for properties located at **299 Vaughan Street and 53 Green Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a 5-story hotel with community space, paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping and associated site improvements and a Conditional Use Permit according to Section 10.1112.62 of the Zoning Ordinance for shared parking on separate lots. Said properties are

shown on Assessor Map 124 Lot 10 and Assessor Map 119 Lot 12 and lie within the Character District 5 (CD5) District.

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. The proposal is for a 5-story hotel. The first floor will be the lobby with hotel rooms above. They will be using the banked credits from the AC Hotel to achieve 30% community space and build an additional story. The plan originally was to use a proposed connection for the community space credit. The connection will still be constructed, but the banked community space will be used for the incentive. A lot line revision will be filed with the Planning Board and a CUP will be required for the shared parking. The project is in the Downtown Overlay District and meets the parking calculations for that zoning. A shared parking analysis is included in the plan. This plan will need an NHDES shoreland permit and NHDES sewer connection permit in addition to the local permits. The existing conditions include the AC Hotel and an office building, which will remain. There is another building that will be removed. The new hotel will be on the 299 Vaughn St. parcel. There will be a 14-foot sidewalk with street trees. The parking has been reconfigured to provide better access in the site. There will be a connection built between the Moxy and the AC Hotel. The hotels will be working closely together for valet management. There was a comment about circulation which recommended that they circulate cars the other way. That will be revised on the plan to reverse the flow of traffic for the hotel drop off. The directional signage will be changed to further direct cars. There was a question about the dashed line on the Green St. sidewalk. That represents the upper floors. The building projects 1 foot over the sidewalk. There will also be a canopy hanging over sidewalk, but the sidewalk will be 14 feet wide. There is no basement in this building. Reconfiguration of parking was a concern at the work session. That has been addressed and the plan includes turning templates to show clear access into the site. There were comments on the valet parking and those will be addressed. The parking in the corner is blocked by adjacent spaces. That is correct because it's all valet managed. There was a comment relative to the zoning ordinance dimensional requirements. The thought was that it was fine because it will be valet managed. They have the ability to drive in at a tighter radius, but it can be revised if the staff wants that.

Ms. Walker commented that it is understood that they are planning to use valets to manage the area, but the ordinance does not have a provision for that. The plan still needs to meet dimensional requirements for spaces to count as parking. Mr. Crimmins responded that they exceed the parking requirements, so they have the ability to remove some spaces.

Mr. Crimmins commented that they cleaned up the trash area to provide better access to the dumpsters. They added pavement in the buffer. They received comments about providing conforming dimensions to existing spaces in the back, so the pavement will lengthen the aisle to meet the requirements. The plan is also removing more pavement than what is in the buffer now. Because the plan is taking pavement out of the buffer, the applicant was not sure if a Wetland CUP was needed. The small shaded areas represent the addition of pavement. East of the parking area is where the pavement is being removed. It is a net improvement in buffer. Mr. Britz commented that it was positive that it's a net improvement, but the ordinance says any ground disturbance in the buffer requires a CUP. It may make sense to add a rain garden to the snow storage area if there will be ground disturbance in the buffer anyway. That would help to prevent snow from melting directly into the buffer. Mr. Crimmins responded that the goal was to

keep it as far from the buffer as possible. Mr. Britz added that it may be worth putting in a physical barrier to help prevent pushing snow further than that. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would look at it.

Mr. Crimmins commented that the roof runoff will be collected and discharged into the rain garden for the AC Hotel. It has the capacity to take on the additional flow. There was a comment relative to the piping under ramp. There will be a retaining wall along the connection. The first floor will spill out from the hotel over the connection that will ultimately connect to the future North Mill Pond trail. The rain garden, retaining wall, and a landscape buffer will be located along the connection. Mr. Britz requested more detail about the wall and rain garden. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would all have more detail in the next round. TAC provided good feedback on the utility plan at the work session. Eversource confirmed electricity can be pulled from the existing AC hotel transformer. A light pole will be added on either side of the driveway, and the details will be included in the plan. The existing sewer service is 6 inches, which based on the flow will be adequate size. There was a question about the grease trap. The plan does not propose a full restaurant. It will be a light fair kitchen. A grease trap can be added if it is required. Ms. Walker confirmed it should be incorporated into the design now.

Mr. Howe commented that the remaining office building would not be on the same lot as the new hotel. The office building's sprinkler is fed from the portion of the building that is going to be demolished. The plan will need to show how to deal with the utilities for the office building. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they will need to investigate that and provide additional water, fire, and sewer if needed.

Mr. Crimmins noted that there was a comment at the work session about replacing the water line on Green St. A plan similar to the one created for the AC Hotel and created a separate sheet showing the water line improvements. The proposal is to design the water main and provide a plan and providing a fair share contribution for the water line. They will work with staff on that. Ms. Walker responded that they will have to talk about that further.

Mr. Crimmins commented that a landscape concept was included. Ms. Walker responded that it seems conceptual at this point. There was a TAC comment related to a street tree being added.

Mr. Crimmins noted that roof runoff will be captured in the existing rain garden. Overall there is a reduction in impervious surface on the site. Mr. Britz commented that the plan showed a rain garden closest to Green St., then a long narrow rain garden and then another one further down. Mr. Crimmins responded that it was all one rain garden. There are two larger bays on each end of the ramp that are connected by a narrow portion.

Mr. Crimmins commented that a turning template was included in the package. Mr. Howe provided a comment on the access that was provided. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they looked at that comment. Mr. Howe noted that the concern was that there would be heavy residential use with poor access particularly for rescue. That should be addressed as best it could be. The template is very tight, and the lines are not labeled. Mr. Crimmins responded that it was the standard template and can be further cleaned up to give better detail. Mr. Howe noted that the



overall access was still a big concern. They don't have access with the aerial apparatus and the existing office building needs to be addressed which may impact access.

Ms. Walker noted that it would be good to show how the garbage truck will come in and out of the dumpster location.

Ms. Walker commented that they would need a Wetland CUP for that pavement in the buffer.

Mr. Britz agreed and noted that any ground disturbance in the buffer needs to get a permit.

TAC Comments:

- The finished floor elevation is listed at 13', please confirm that there is no building space planned below this elevation.
- Fire department access for firefighting and rescue operations is still a concern. Please see 2015 IFC Appendix D, particularly section D105. The fire truck turning exhibit looks extremely close.
- One light pole should be placed on either side of driveway.
- Provide granite curbing for far side of driveway to define it properly.
- Existing sewer service is 6". This size should be large enough. Please confirm and update utility plan.
- Rigid steel conduit not required for the larger light poles.
- Water line replacement actually terminates near valve shown in proximity of telephone manhole in driveway. Plan shows it going further than necessary.
- The drainage for the existing AC hotel building is not practical. Use piping to drain the area under the ramp and fence off that area to make the pathway safer.
- Is a grease trap required?
- One way flow in parking lot should be reversed so that van ramp is on access aisle side, and easier to pull up and drop off at hotel entrance.
- Ends of stacked parking should have painted islands to designate no parking area.
- Dead end parking lot should have turn around area for passenger cars at a minimum. Fire truck will have to back out?
- Parking space in corner is blocked by adjacent spaces.
- Removable bollards on landscape plan not shown in details.
- Where will valet parking operate and park vehicles?
- All proposed parking spaces and aisles widths must conform with the City's Zoning Ordinance dimensional requirements or variances will be required.
- The bulb-out next to the entrance of 55 Green Street should be brick to match the wide pedestrian sidewalk.
- Consistent with the landscape plan a street tree needs to be added to the sidewalk along Green Street.
- Is there a connector sidewalk or pathway from the Moxie hotel to and from the A/C Hotel? If so, is it gated or open for public access to either building?
- Are the upper floors projecting over the wide sidewalk on Green Street?
- It appears that a portion of new pavement will be within the 50' wetland buffer, which would require a Wetland Conditional Use Permit. Please confirm.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Alex Choquette of 233 Vaughn St. opposed the new hotel. Mr. Choquette was concerned about the impact study vs. the reality. Mr. Choquette questioned if the traffic studies fully analyzed the immense impact of the whole parking and traffic area. There are over 500 hotel rooms in this part of Portsmouth now. The AC Hotel has the roof top bar and when it was open the traffic increased a lot. Mr. Choquette was concerned about the capacity for traffic, fire safety, and the impact to the community. The railroad tracks are an issue because they are unprotected and active. Adding the Moxy Hotel would be an additional hazard.

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**

Mr. Eby commented that the trip generation analysis was provided, and it showed that it would be about 30 trips in a peak hour. That is not at the level that would warrant a full traffic study. The AC hotel and 111 Maplewood Ave. have also provided analysis. Traffic has been studied out there and the reports all build on each other. The railroad is working on the crossings to make improvements. The traffic will be monitored going forward, but Mr. Eby did not expect concerns out there at this time.

Mr. Newport questioned if the proposed rotary in Market St. and Russell St. would have impact on Green St. Mr. Eby responded that it would not. Cars will still come out in approximately the same location. It should not be more visible than it is now, so it should not become a cut through. Ms. Walker added that this specific project does not trigger a level that would merit extensive traffic changes in this area. Over time the City will be making overall traffic improvements and development projects will contribute to that.

Mr. Howe commented that they need to go back and look at the existing office building and how the lot line change can impact egress requirements etc. They may need easements for egresses.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the area between the AC and this new proposal is troubling. The labeled rain garden is not a rain garden. The upper pond area is under the parking deck and there is a hole that water goes into. The area along the ramp that connects the two should be fenced in. The area back there needs to be looked at. Mr. Desfosses did not agree with what was proposed. The water main needs to do its fair share and is in horrific condition. It needs to be replaced and the City doesn't have the money to do it.

Mr. Howe to **postpone** this application until the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The application of **Clipper Traders, LLC, Portsmouth Hardware and Lumber, LLC, Owners and Iron Horse Properties, LLC, Owner and**

**Applicant**, for properties located at **105 Bartlett Street and Bartlett Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition and relocation of existing structures and the construction of 174 dwelling units in two (2) multi-family apartment buildings and one (1) mixed-use building with first floor office, amenity space and upper story apartments and associated community space, paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping and other site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 157 Lot 1 and Lot 2 and Assessor Map 164 Lot 1 and 4-2 and lie within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W) and Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) Districts.

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. This application has gone through a number of land use meetings and work sessions. They have all helped to shape this submission. The package includes supporting information with a trip generation update, building renderings, subdivision exhibit, wetland buffer impact exhibit, drain analysis, truck turning templates and a will service letter from Unitil. The project consists of 2 multi-family buildings with basement level parking. The maximum height is 4 stories with story step downs. There will be a total of 174 units and site plan improvements. Community space along the North Mill Pond will allow for project incentives. There is a lot line revision from what was previously approved. The subdivision exhibit shows how the lines will change from the existing to the proposed. The project is going to require a number of local and state permits. It is on the agenda for the Conservation Commission this month. There has been a trip generation update memo based on the new program. The old program had 120 units and included the brewery and doggy daycare. This has 174 units and the brewery and doggy daycare will not be there. Removing the existing commercial uses and adding residential units resulted in a negligible change. The applicants are fine with a third-party peer review. There will be three new buildings and they are referred to as A, B and C. Building C holds the existing footprint of the brewery building. The plan is in CD4-W and CD4-L1. The plan addresses those zoning requirements throughout. A CUP is required for the 10 parking spaces around the cul-de-sac to count. To meet setback frontage build out requirements the cul-de-sac has been shifted. It has been pulled into the existing parking lot for the brewery. The parking coming in off Bartlett St. had been previously shown as angled, but it was changed to perpendicular parking and pulled further into the site. There is surface parking below and between Buildings A and B. There is a typo in site data block. It's a 4-story building that is 50-feet in height. There will be 90-degree parking along the design center coming down through the proposed private road. There will be parallel parking on the road as well. The intent was to create an urban type street to help with traffic calming. The Ricci parking lot will be angled parking. Building A is divided by zoning, so it is stepped down to 2 stories. There is a proposed courtyard connecting A and B. Building B is 4 stories along the water and steps down to 3 stories. Building C will be 4 stories and step down to 1 story. The cul-de-sac 100-feet in diameter. There is proposed parking around the edge of it. The staff commented on that parking. They can provide a revised plan to give more space for cars to park. One thing that is not shown is the floodplain line and that will be added. The base flood elevation is 9. The plan is outside of the floodplain. The green bike box would give access to the North Mill Pond Trail and they will coordinate with staff as they design it. There was a comment that it should be eliminated, so it can be removed for now. There are additional spaces along the road. That parking is not needed to meet requirements. It could be used for public parking for the trail or just reserve parking for visitors.

Ms. Walker questioned if there were any changes in front of the kitchen store that already exists. Mr. Crimmins responded that the curbing will be adjusted and there would be some grading improvements. The parking arrangement dimensions change slightly. They will still be perpendicular. Ms. Walker commented that was subject to a prior variance, so be careful about how much is changed there. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would look into it more.

Mr. Crimmins commented that Building B has basement level parking surface parking and they pulled the building back as much as possible. It's a challenged site. There is a proposed greenway park that would come off the trail and a landscape concept is included. The project will provide significant improvements in the buffer. The site will be 50% open space. There was a comment about no parking signs and those will be provided. There was a question relative to assigning parking spaces, and they can be numbered. It will be a managed parking area. Ms. Walker requested elaboration on why they should be numbered. Mr. Eby responded that he was concerned about the long dead-end aisle with no turn around. If people have an assigned space, then they know it should be open.

Mr. Crimmins noted that there was a comment about to the dead-end parking and snow storage shown. That will be revised to show the snow storage moved to allow for a turn around. There was a questioned about the amenity space. It will be a wellness space for tenants. Ms. Walker noted that it would be helpful to present the project and then walk through the TAC comments.

Mr. Crimmins commented that the grading and drainage for the roadway piece is consistent with what had been an improvement on the subdivision plan. Runoff will be treated before it reaches the pond. There will be treatment units and the rear park area will use a rain garden to collect runoff. There are two proposed outfalls. This is an improvement from the existing conditions. The utilities will come off the road consistent with what has been approved from prior subdivisions. The development site shows service connections to the mains coming in. An easement plan was developed based on the different utilities and drainage on site. The lot line revision would be reflected in a formal survey plan. The landscape concept needs additional detail, but it was submitted to get feedback on the general layout.

#### TAC Comments:

- Plans list proposed building height 54 story and 50' for buildings B and C, this appears to be a typo as the building is proposed to be 5 stories using the overlay district zoning. Please correct.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that was a typo and it would be corrected.
- A detailed building height plan should be submitted showing the average grade plane and heights along the perimeter of the building.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that has been prepared.
- An application for a lot line adjustment is also being submitted, please clarify on plan set if the lot dimensions shown are existing or proposed.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that the dimensions are proposed.

- The building block lengths are accurately measured along the public greenway. For clarity, please clearly label the building lengths along that frontage to verify compliance with zoning requirements.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that would be updated.
- Has the applicant considered porous pavement for the parking lot area?
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they did not consider it because of the high-water table and proximity to the pond.
- The landscape plan is understandably conceptual in the future trail easement area. More details are necessary for the areas outside of the proposed trail easement area.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they would include more.
- There is reference to the raingarden planting details - have they been provided?
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they have provided a rain garden cross section detail.
- Do not see the floodplain line referenced on the plan.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will add that to the plan.
- Please describe whether the floodplain requirements found in the Zoning Ordinance Article 10.620 have been satisfied.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that the buildings are outside the floodplain.
- There are still concerns regarding fire department access for firefighting and rescue operations. Please see 2015 IFC Appendix D, particularly section D105. The fire truck turning exhibit looks extremely close and I only see where it goes down to the cul-de-sac just before building C. This should extend all the way throughout the project and show a turnaround if it is a dead end.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that was a good comment and they will look at providing some sort of turn around.
- Consider an additional fire hydrant on the other side of Building A.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will do so.
- What are the addresses of the buildings going to be?
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will work with Staff and the Fire Department. Ms. Walker questioned if Mr. Howe had any specific requests. The street will have a new name. Mr. Howe responded that they will need to meet the signage requirements and the addresses should make sense.
  - Mr. Howe commented that the turnaround should meet the requirements set forth in the fire code. There are specific requirements for width and length. Mr. Howe had concerns about the access for rescue purposes. There is no ability to access the upper floors for the middle building. The parking under buildings is almost connected and should be treated that way for fire code.
  - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that it was a connected basement.
- The roof drains entering the buildings may want to be PVC so they can be sealed up properly when penetrating the building.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that would be revised.
- Move the hydrant proposed by the kitchen store off the island to behind the sidewalk 30' closer to Bartlett St.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will do so.

- The proposed outfall is too close to the power and communication drops from the existing poles.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they agree will work with Eversource.
- The water pipe coming from Dover St needs to be replaced.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that will look at that and work with DPW.
- What is the size, material type and manhole data for the sewer line leaving great rhythm that is to be reused?
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that will be confirmed and provided in the next round.
- Do not place the structure within 15' of the center of the brick box.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they were referring to the manhole on Building A. It will be pushed away from the brick box and ensure it all complies. Mr. Desfosses commented that it was a very large sewer and they need to be able to replace it if needed. Structures refer to any buildings.
- The 8" water main on Bartlett St should be retired as part of this project from the common site driveway to Woodbury Ave.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they agree and will work with DPW.
- Independent third party review and inspection of all utilities and stormwater will be required.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they agree. Ms. Walker clarified that this was for oversight. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct.
- One-way flow with angled parking should remain in same direction as today.
  - Mr. Eby noted that the parking area in front of Ricci is one way and angled. It makes more sense to keep it how it is today and have cars come into angle park then exit out the building entrance. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they would look into it.
- Parking around cul-de-sac will be challenging for drivers to parallel park into. Could stick out into drive aisle and impede traffic and emergency vehicles. Vehicles are rectangular, not curved, like trying to fit a square peg in a round hole.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they would look at opportunities to improve the parking around it. Ms. Walker noted that they don't need to have parking there. Mr. Crimmins responded that they need 10 additional spaces to support the parking count for the development. The thinking was that people will come and pull into park there for a leasing appointment etc. They may just pull off and park there anyway, so the plan was to try to formalize it. They can look at ways to improve it.
- Long dead-end parking aisle will result in vehicles backing up if no open spaces at end. Snow storage will eliminate any chance to turn around in winter.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will look at it.
- Parking spaces should be numbered and assigned. What is the plan for visitor parking?
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will look at it. Ms. Walker noted that they should provide a plan for visitor parking.
- Secondary access with resident-only gate should be provided out to Maplewood.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that this project is not contemplating access out to Maplewood Ave. Mr. Eby commented that the traffic analysis needs to include that lack of access. The previous proposal included that second access. Mr. Crimmins responded that the trip generation would be peer reviewed. When the

West End Yards proposed improvements, they used the first proposal as background. The improvements were incorporated.

- Driveway corner radius at Bartlett should be enlarged to provide easier access and egress.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will look at it more.
- Green bike crossing box does not lead to a bike facility on the south side. Should be eliminated.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that will be removed.
- 22 foot drive aisle with parallel parking will become even narrower in winter with snow banks.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that there were notes on plan for snow management. It will be hauled off site as needed.
- HP access aisles should have NO PARKING signs if possible.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that will be added.
- There is concern with sight lines at corners of building with future multi-use path. Will bicyclists have enough sight distance?
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that path is not fully designed, but they can work with Staff to show more appropriate sightlines. Mr. Eby noted that this was to make sure bikes could see each other coming on or off the path. It shouldn't be a blind corner. Ms. Walker commented that there should be more of a consideration of the edges where building comes right up to path. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would look at it.
- Given that a third party peer review was previously conducted for the traffic analysis when the original subdivision was submitted for this property, TAC would like to have a limited peer review completed of the updated traffic generation memorandum to confirm that the original conclusions are still applicable.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that was covered in the presentation.
- Please explain what the "amenity space" consists of and whether the off-street parking should be updated to include this space.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that was covered in the presentation.
- In addition to Site Review approval this project will require a City Wetlands Conditional Use Permit with review by the Conservation Commission and Planning Board. The wetland conditional use permit application looks at the impact of the project on the tidal wetlands of the North Mill pond. This project will also need a permit from the NHDES Wetlands bureau for work within the 100' tidal buffer zone of the state and an Alteration of Terrain permit to address stormwater impacts on the site. Additionally, for any impacts outside of the 100 tidal buffer zone but within the 250' shoreland water quality protection zone this project will need a Shoreland Permit from NHDES.
  - Mr. Crimmins agreed and noted that the project would be thoroughly reviewed at a local and state level.

Mr. Desfosses noted that they had previously discussed the possibility of having the bike trail be the fire access around the building with upgraded paths that could be a turn around as well. Building that part of the bike trail would be part of this project in that case. There is no access to the backside of the building for maintenance so that would provide that access as well. The project would work better if parking was under Building C.

Mr. Britz appreciated the comment about porous pavement and didn't realize the high-water table was that close. Mr. Britz questioned if a rain garden could be added in the middle of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would look at it. It may not reduce the outfalls but would reduce the flow and look aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Britz commented that the site is not in the floodplain there is an extended flood hazard overlay which should apply here. Basically 9 feet is the base flood elevation and 11 feet would be the extended overlay. It may require flood proofing for the garage.

Mr. Howe commented that having only one way in and out right now is a big concern. Mr. Howe was concerned about the shared parking under the buildings. The fire alarm will need to be tied together and the sprinklers may need to coordinate almost like it's one building.

Mr. Eby questioned if the trucks coming into Ricci would have to back out or if they could go around the building. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they could go around. Mr. Howe commented that the turning templates only showed the cul-de-sac and they need to show it throughout. Also, it looks like the truck would hit parked cars.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Liza Hewitt of McDonough St. commented that there were still a lot of questions and concerns raised in the meeting. These same concerns have been brought up in past plans and they still haven't been addressed in this plan. Ms. Hewitt was concerned about soil contamination and wetland permits. The outlet to Maplewood Ave. should be considered further. There are concerns about access to the pond side of the buildings. The architecture of the buildings looks like a cluster of college dorms. Ms. Hewitt requested to know the finished floor elevation of the basement parking to the top of the highest story especially after needing more height in the floodplain.

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. questioned if these plans or a revised version would be presented at the Conservation Commission. Ms. Walker noted that the application was already submitted for that meeting. Mr. Crimmins added that it would be difficult to address everything and before the Conservation Commission Meeting. Mr. Britz noted that they were not expecting the application to move on from the Conservation Commission next week.

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**

Mr. Howe to **postpone** this application until the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

## **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

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



.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee