

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

Remote Meeting Via Zoom Conference Call

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared the 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 2020-09, and Emergency 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

JUNE 2, 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; Mark Newport, Police Department; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1 and Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the May 5, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Howe moved to approve the minutes from the May 5, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** 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. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this application to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

B. 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.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. Mr. Crimmins commented that they met with TAC last month and provided revised materials based on those comments. Mr. Crimmins reviewed the most recent comments provided by the Committee.

TAC Comments:

- Driveway corner radius at Bartlett should be enlarged to provide easier access and egress. *(It does not appear modifications were made to address this)*
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that the corner was softened to a 50-foot radius and requested clarification on what else needed to be done. Mr. Eby responded that the comment was referencing the northern corner which is still a radius of 15. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they will look at softening that more.
- Third party peer review of updated traffic generation memo shall be completed prior to Planning Board review.
 - Mr. Crimmins agreed with the comment.
- Applicant is responsible for final design, construction, and permitting of the greenway trail along the North Mill Pond, as it counts toward the community space requirement.
 - Construction of the trail will have to be coordinated with occupancy of the building it is required for fire department access to the building and may also need to be designed to support a fire truck.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they understood the comment and wanted to clarify that the scope for that would be the greenway section of the path that goes around the building. Ms. Walker they can work with staff to clarify the scope.
 - Mr. Howe commented that it should be designed with the appropriate width, snow maintenance, and access in and out for the fire trucks. The grade would have to accommodate the trucks as well. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would work with Fire Department to ensure it meets their needs.

- Mr. Britz commented that this section would be a more robust design than the rest of the path. It probably can't be porous pavement if the Fire Department needed to use it. They will need to make sure it integrates well with the rest of the path. Mr. Britz questioned where the trucks would come out. Mr. Crimmins responded that they will be able to circulate around the building.
- Ms. Walker questioned if the trucks could back out if needed. Mr. Howe responded that they would not back out.
- Mr. Desfosses commented that the section probably could be porous pavement because of the small amount it will be driven on. There will be some maintenance use for the jellyfish filters, but the porous pavement will probably work. Mr. Desfosses requested that the jellyfish filter #4 be moved closer to the path for better access. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.
- Mr. Howe commented that there would need to be signage for the fire lane as well.
- Section 10.1018.30 of the Zoning Ordinance requires porous pavement be installed for any new pavement in the wetland buffer. It appears as if there may be new pavement proposed in the wetland buffer. Please either confirm there is no new pavement in the wetland buffer or expand upon your rationale for not providing porous pavement in the wetland buffer including details on the depth to the water table and technical justification for not including porous pavement.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that overall pavement will be reduced in that buffer area. They looked at the porous asphalt in the buffer for the parking lot, but there were design issues with that approach. The ground water table is high in that area. The water was at elevation 5 in the late summer. The soils have a lot of clays which are also a restrictive layer. The jellyfish filters will perform better.
 - Mr. Desfosses commented that it would be good if they could add a stone drip edge and under drain or a rain garden to help reduce the water temperature before it entered the pond would be good. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would look at it.
- Has any soil testing been done to determine if there is any contamination on this site. If so, how will the contaminated soil be managed during construction?
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they have done pretty expansive testing on the site. The soil contains historic fill materials typical of what would be found on urban commercial sites. The site itself was formerly a railroad operation. There was no significant contamination found. The buildings and paved areas would be capping the soil and anything beyond that would have 2 feet of fill to cap it. There were no contaminants in the water samples. A tank was removed from the site in 1992 the soil has limited petroleum contaminants and that will be remediated.
 - Mr. Britz questioned if the old tank required a ground water management permit. Mr. Crimmins responded that they did not know yet but would get one if it was needed.
- It appears on Sheet C-301.2 that a small portion of the proposed elevated walkway along the front of Buildings A & B is within the city's 25 foot wide sewer easement area.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that was correct. It's a constrained site, but they will look to see if there is an opportunity to shift it. Mr. Crimmins questioned if the

City would be amenable to an agreement if they can't get it all the way out. Mr. Desfosses responded that they would need to consult with the Director. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they would submit their request in writing.

- The ground floor uses of the proposed buildings should be noted on the Site Data table on Sheet C-102.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that would be cleaned up.
- All the building dimensions should be show in order to demonstrate compliance with the building block, height, and façade modulation requirements.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that would be updated.
- The existing zoning district lines should be shown on the Grade Plane Plan to demonstrate full compliance with the building height requirements for each district.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they will add the notations to ensure the CD4-L1 is shown properly.
- The proposed round-about should be posted as a one-way circle.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.
- Consideration should be given to replace the small landscape areas between the proposed sidewalk and roadway along the proposed round-about with a wider sidewalk area in order to improve functionality and the viability for maintenance of these landscape areas. Note the landscape plan shown on Sheet L-1 does not show any planting details for these areas. Consistent with the site plan, additional landscaping shall also be added to the landscape plan along the end of the proposed parking lot near Langdon Street.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they would work with landscapers to see if there is a better way to align the path and clean up the areas. The intent is to maintain some open area for snow storage, but could add some landscaping on that end.
- Pavement markings or signs should be added to the proposed round-about indicating one-way traffic.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be added.
- A detail should be provided for the mountable vertical curb proposed for fire access to the waterfront side of the buildings.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be added.
- Visitor parking areas should be shown.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they are required to have 35 visitor spaces. Mr. Crimmins questioned if they were being asked to show all 35 spaces as visitor or just designate areas for visitor parking. Ms. Walker questioned if their parking plan met the ordinance requirements. Mr. Crimmins responded that they needed a CUP for the lot configuration because some of the parking is on a separate lot, but overall the plan meets the required parking.
 - Mr. Cracknell clarified that the comment was to understand where the visitor parking would be designated. The roundabout makes the most sense. Mr. Cracknell questioned if there would be a ramp of reveal on the granite curb for fire access and how it would integrate with the sidewalk. Mr. Cracknell questioned if the roundabout would be a flush mounted curb condition. Mr. Crimmins responded that the fire truck should be able to manage a higher curb in that location. They will look into that and work to better locate the sidewalks.
- The no-parking / turn-around area at the end of the surface parking lot should be reduced to only include the driveway aisle and a single space furthest from the waterfront.

- Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be revised.

Mr. Desfosses commented that they might want to think about putting the fire hydrant on the other side of the fire access and put in a 10-foot stump pipe before the cap. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.

Mr. Howe commented that often times if there is a multi-alarm fire, they still have the flat hose out to supply vehicles. They may block the turn around with that.

Mr. Howe commented that the turning templates are too tight in general. The trucks may be striking parked vehicles. They need more room. The turn into the rear access looks challenging at best. It's a sharp radius turn and there should be more room.

Mr. Britz commented that in the landscape plan for the round about it shows one black tupelo and says display garden. Mr. Britz questioned if that would because the landscaping plan hasn't come yet. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct and they will be adding more detail.

Mr. Desfosses circled back to the walkway on the sewer easement question. The applicant would be adding fill on top of the sewer main and the patio will be higher than that. That will create an issue with putting the walkway in the sewer easement. They should rotate the building to be parallel to the sewer main instead. Mr. Desfosses questioned if the applicant would maintain the view corridors. There is a row of trees that will be removed for the water main. Mr. Desfosses questioned if the trees would be replaced or not. Ms. Walker responded that the requirement is more about not blocking the view with buildings. There may be some reason to maintain vegetation in that area.

Ms. Walker noted that they had received some written public comments and advised that the applicant can address them in the next meeting.

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. Howe moved to postpone this application to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 2:45 pm, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee