

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

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

2:00 PM

November 2, 2021

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peter Britz, Interim Planning Director, Environmental Planner; Peter Stith, Chairperson, Principle Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Stefanie Casella, Planner 1; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT: Darrin Sargent, Police Captain;

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Approval of minutes from the October 5, 2021 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Cracknell moved to approve the minutes from the October 5, 2021, Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Howe. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A.** The request of **North Mill Pond Holdings LLC (Applicant), and One Raynes Ave LLC, 31 Raynes Ave LLC, and 203 Maplewood Ave LLC (Owners)** for property located at **31 Raynes Avenue, 203 Maplewood Avenue, and 1 Raynes Avenue** requesting Conditional Use Permit as permitted by Section 10.1112.62 of the Zoning Ordinance and according to the requirements of Section 10.1112.14 to allow 111 off-street parking spaces to be provided on-site and 25 spaces to be provided on a separate lot where a total of 159 are required and Site Plan Review approval for the demolition of three existing buildings and construction of the following: 1) a 5-story mixed use building with 65,650 gross floor area and 17,565 sq. ft. building footprint including 8,100 sq. ft. of commercial use on the ground story and 60 residential units on the upper stories;

2) a 5-story 128-room hotel with 63,400 gross floor area and 13,815 sq. ft. of building footprint; 3) 27,000 sq. ft. of community space as well as associated paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping and other site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 123 Lot 14, Map 123 Lot 13, Map 123 Lot 12, Map 123 Lot 10 and lie within the Character District 4 (CD4) District, Downtown Overlay District (DOD), Historic District, and the North End Incentive Overlay District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond commented that since their last meeting they revised the building slightly and reduced the number of residential units and the number of hotel rooms. The package includes responses to the comments from the last meeting.

TAC Comments:

- TEC should evaluate whether the reserve parking is necessary as part of the approval of this project. Preferably, the applicant should remove the reserve parking – shown now as the surface parking along the driveway facing Maplewood Ave. – and be required to submit a subsequent application should this parking become necessary to support the approved development program.
 - Reserve parking in 100' buffer may need to come back for approval in the future.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they were requesting reserve parking. They are needed to meet the parking requirements. The intent is to meet the parking requirement. They will put the lifts in as part of the program and the reserve parking would go on the back side. It should not need to go back to TEC. The reserve parking will not be built now. If more is needed in the future, then this can be built.
 - Future reserve spaces designed to meet parking req. Crimmins – in last TEC preferred calc based on city requirements and that's how they were done.
- Include change in S.F. in buffer zone impervious and pervious surface.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they have broken that out on the exhibit. They can break it out for the reserve parking area separately.
- Easements and access to water service shutoffs need to be provided.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that the easement plan was provided.
- Distance from building to external grease trap may not be to code. Distance may be too far. Please add needed details.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that it does exceed 50 feet. It will be designed to meet code.
- Project will require sewer extension permit application from NH DES.
 - Mr. Crimmins agreed and noted that it was a sewer connection not extension.
- Applicant and City to discuss responsibility for maintenance of landscaping or plantings in community space area and walking path.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they agreed. There is a community space agreement put in place. The city would maintain the path and they would maintain the landscaping.

- All plantings should follow City standard details.
 - Mr. Crimmins agreed.
- Follow City guidance for fertilizing within buffer zone.
 - Mr. Crimmins agreed.
- City will need third party inspection during construction.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that this was acknowledged.
- Public space plan should be provided and include space matrix and exhibits.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they did have a community space exhibit and all of the public easements are identified on the easement plan. They can add the square footage to the easement plan.
- “Optional” language should be removed from proposed public spaces.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they can remove it. They had been showing as optional because they wanted to leave them as an option for the Conservation Commission and Planning Board.
- The community space areas should be clearly identified on the plan with each type, area, and location clearly identified.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that the community spaces were identified in the community space exhibit.
- The wide pedestrian sidewalk should be expanded to include the seating area in front of the hotel as well as the sidewalk to the waterfront between the proposed buildings.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that the waterfront access to the sidewalk was already shown. The seating is not possible because there is a planter there.
- The pedestrian alleyway from Vaughan Street to the greenway along the North Mill Pond adjacent 3S Artspace should be raised or elevated from the parking area behind the hotel. It should also be designated as community space with easements for public use and access.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they are not designated as community space because they don’t need it to meet the requirements. They are designated as public access with an easement. Right now, it is raised between the hotel. The portion that is not raised has a paved edge with parking. It can be a mountable curb for fire truck access.
- The exposed parking level should be screened from view – especially from Maplewood Ave.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they have revised the design along the back edge of the reserve parking. There will be berms that will screen parking and a fence along the Maplewood Ave. side. There will also be significant landscaping on top of the berm.
- The kayak launch and timber pier should be included as community space.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that it was shown as that. It was stopped at the mean high-water line.
- The proposed greenway trail along the abutting property should be shown on the site and landscape plan.

- Mr. Crimmins confirmed that could be shown.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there would be back shields on the lights to keep light from going on the water. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Cracknell requested details on the revised number of units on the hotel and residential apartments. Mr. Crimmins responded there were now 32 larger residential units. The hotel went from 128 rooms to 124 rooms. Part of the feedback from HDC was to step building. There is a penthouse on the fifth floor now.

Mr. Cracknell commented that TEC traffic consultants reviewed the prior project counts. It would be good to hear from TEC about how much reserve parking could be further reduced based on this. The goal is to have less reserve parking. Mr. Crimmins responded that TEC did agree with the parking calculations demands from the city. The units changed between this meeting and last. Mr. Cracknell noted that it would be good to show where parking was reduced. Mr. Hanson responded that the residential building did shrink. The prior version had 2 sets of 4 car wide lift spaces. Seven spaces were eliminated in the top right area. Some additional spaces were removed where the path connects between the two buildings.

Mr. Cracknell commented that the most offensive surface parking was the not yet built parking along Maplewood Ave. The berm is a good idea. It would be nice to figure out how to not put in parking perpendicular to Maplewood Ave. Mr. Hanson responded that they tried to maximize impact by reducing parking. Mr. Cracknell commented that they treat reserve parking as built. It's just a matter of when.

Liz Oltman from TEC commented that the applicant is providing 145 spaces total including 25 off site spaces and 138 is required. They could remove 7 parking spaces. Mr. Cracknell commented that they should remove those 7 spaces to get it down to 138.

Mr. Cracknell noted that he wrote the comment about community space. They should take credit, at least from a PR standpoint, for all the other community space in the project. The plan is offering more than 25%. They should show that they are far exceeding the minimum requirements.

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. Cracknell commented that the applicant should reduce to 138 spaces and take one more pass over the reserve parking on Maplewood Ave.

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

- o The Community space plan is to include all the public space types
- o Dock, kayak launch, and pier are included as public spaces
- o Parking spaces are reduced to 138 with specific space reduction on Maplewood Ave.
- o Lights will include full cut off feature with a shield to prevent light pollution across the water
- o Mountable curb is included on pedestrian walkway between proposed hotel and 3S Art Space
- o Grease traps will be designed to meet code requirements
- o Sewer connection permit will be obtained from DES
- o Applicant and City will enter into a Community Space Agreement
- o Fertilizing within the buffer zone will follow city guidance
- o Third party inspection serves are required during construction
- o Square footage will be added to the public space plan, matrix and exhibits
- o Wide pedestrian sidewalks and alleyways, including seating, are to be included as Community Space
- o Exposed parking shall be screened from view
- o Proposed greenway trail along the abutting property is shown on the site and landscape plan

The motion passed unanimously.

B. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The application of **Banfield Realty, LLC, (Owner)**, for property located at **375 Banfield Road** requesting Site Plan review approval to demolish two existing commercial buildings and an existing shed and construct a 75,000 s.f. industrial warehouse building with 75 parking spaces as well as associated paving, stormwater management, lighting, utilities and landscaping. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 266 Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Peter Stith noted that this would be carried over to the December 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting.

C. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The application of **Monarch Village, LLC (Applicant)**, on behalf of **Neveesha Hospitality, LLC (Owner)** for property located at **3548 Lafayette Road** requesting Site Plan Review and a Conditional Use Permit as permitted under 10.5B41.10 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for the demolition of 6 structures; the redevelopment of 6 existing structures to create 6 units in building 8, 15 units in building 2, 5 units in building 4, 2 units in building 5, 9 units in building 7; the construction of 4 new structures to create 12 units in building 3 with a 4,303 square foot footprint, 24 units in building 6 with a 7,048 square foot footprint, a 250 square foot storage structure and an

825 square foot storage structure; creating a total of seventy-five (75) residential units with 123 parking spaces where 113 spaces are required. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 297 Lot 6 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-21-90)

REQUEST TO POSTPONE

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Peter Stith noted that this would be carried over to the December 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting.

D. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The request of **The Sagamore Group, LLC, (Owner)** for properties located at **1169 Sagamore Avenue and 1171 Sagamore Avenue** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition of 3 existing principal structures (3 single family units) and 3 existing accessory structures to be replaced with 6 single family structures and 2 2 family structures to total 10 living units and 22 parking spaces where 15 is required. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 224 Lot 14 and Assessor Map 224 Lot 15 and lie within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) District. (LU-21-167)

REQUEST TO POSTPONE

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Peter Stith noted that this would be carried over to the December 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting.

E. The request of **Dagny Taggart, LLC, (Owner)**, for property located at **93 Pleasant Street** requesting a Conditional Use Permit as permitted by section 10.1112.62 of the Zoning Ordinance and according to the requirements of Section 10.1112.14 to allow 18 off-street parking spaces where 35 are required. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 Lot 74 and lies within the Historic, Downtown Overlay, and CD4 Districts. (LU-21-183)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering, Mark McNabb, Architect Tracy Kozak, and Traffic Consultant Rebecca Brown spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon commented that they redesigned the building to show that relocating the driveway was possible.

TAC Comments:

- Stipulate how the garage will handle vehicles entering and exiting at the same location. Light indicator for vehicles exiting, other systems?
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they understood the comment and would include it in the plan.
- Trench drain in garage will not be connected to City sewer or drain, please add note to plans. City previously commented on this item but cannot locate note on the plans.

- Mr. Chagnon responded that they added the note on sheet C4.
- Correct existing sewer main size on Court Street.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that was corrected.
- Water main is very shallow in this area. Fire service needs to be installed with 5' of cover and insulation immediately after connection to the water main tapping valves.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they added note 11 on sheet C5.
- License agreement for buried electrical service is needed.
- Due to depth of water, main extreme caution must be taken when excavating around. Coordinate with DPW to ensure a City representative is on site. City previously commented on this item but cannot locate note on the plans.
- DPW recommends connecting downspout drain line directly into DMH 1.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that would be revised.
- Tree plantings seem to be in conflict with R-Tank system. Roots may interfere. Please address this.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the landscape plan showed where the trees have been relocated.
- The revised curb-cut and access plan shall be presented as a response to the traffic review comments. TAC should further review this plan and provide written comments prior to the next TAC meeting.
 - Ms. Brown responded that they have gone through the comments submitted by the TEC peer review. The one outstanding comment is the sightline issue. The controller intersection is at Pleasant St. and Court St. The driveway is 80 feet from the Pleasant St. and Court St. Drivers will be traveling 15 mph or lower from that intersection to the driveway. There is a 15-mph supplemental sight line assessment included. It was done 14.5 feet back from the curb line. That allows a driver to see pedestrians standing on the sidewalk. A driver could check for pedestrians then inch the vehicle forward to be flush with the sidewalk then they will be able to see through to the intersection 80 feet one way and over 100 feet the other way. With the new driveway they are able to achieve sight lines.
- The applicant should coordinate with public works in order to finalize the location of the proposed transformer. All efforts should be made to identify a location off the property that will provide coverage for additional buildings within the surrounding block.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was ongoing.
- Additional details shall be provided to clarify the driveway slope and whether the garage ramp will be heated in order to manage snow / ice conditions.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the applicant agreed it was a good idea to heat it.
- The applicant should clarify whether any design changes affect the variance application currently before the Board of Adjustment.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.

Mark McNabb commented that the other plan removed 180 sf stone wall. This plan doesn't touch it. They heard loud and clear from the Temple that they wanted the driveway away from there. The main address for the entire project will be 93 Pleasant St. People will enter on the

front porch for the main entrance. They will be using the loading zones on State St. or Pleasant St. Deliveries will be made to Pleasant St. The handicap entrance will be on Court St. Mr. McNabb noted that he has never spoken to the Portsmouth Herald. These have always been micro apartments. There will be a full kitchen, they will be leased with one-year leases. This has never been a boarding house or hotel. Micro apartments don't have laundry. They are providing an area for laundry. The obstacles for micro apartments are cars, affordable eating, furnishing, and utilities. These are micro apartments as outlined in the ordinance. Mr. McNabb's comment about turning this into an office building if it does not become micro apartments was taken out of context as a threat. The goal is to make these micro apartments to provide housing for workers who cannot afford to live downtown. If these can't be micro apartments, then it will become an office building because it's the next best use for the building.

Mr. Chagnon commented that the parking plan has the same number of parking spaces and bike spaces. The utility connections are all in the same place. The water lines were moved to line up with the new ramp.

Mr. Cracknell commented that this certainly has potential to be a good project. Moving the delivery and entrance to Pleasant St. was good. It's a better location for parking in the middle of the site. It would be good to see the detail on how this revision relates to the historic wall. It's good the applicants are willing to work with the city and abutters about other transformer locations. It will be good to see how TEC responds to the pedestrian sight lines and stacking on the street. On street dining may be more permanent than short term. It has created different traffic issues downtown. There is brick sidewalk in front of the historic wall and that should be shown on the plans. It is brick up to the driveway. They could use thicker brick or make it a different color to make it clear that is a vehicular access. Mr. Chagnon noted that there are tip downs there.

Mr. Howe requested more detail on the emergency exit. Ms. Kozak responded that they changed the main entrance to be on Pleasant St. The updated plans show that the stairwell has a door on the left side. It is a straight line from the door to Pleasant St.

PUBLIC HEARING

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. commented that the applicants need to demonstrate to TAC that the parking is sufficient for the site when applying for a CUP. Ms. Bratter did not agree with the category used in the ITE. Portsmouth changed the parking ordinance to match the size of units and account for guests. Five years ago, this project would have needed 68 spaces. The current zoning requires 39 spaces plus 8 visitor spaces. The applicants can take advantage of a 12-space reduction because they are in the Downtown Overlay District. That leaves 35 spaces. They are asking for a 29-space reduction. Portsmouth has already accounted for the size of units and the downtown location when creating the ordinance. All of the justification presented in the parking analysis includes the downtown location and size of units. That is double dipping. The parking is not sufficient for size of the project.

Attorney John Hennicky Jr. spoke on behalf of Peter and Janet Didon. Attorney Derek Durbin submitted a letter to TAC because he could not be here today. The letter requests that this Committee continue the application and Mr. Hennicky agreed with it. The plans have not been fully vetted by the public. The applicant just changed their plans yesterday. The Committee has an obligation to continue the application so they can have a chance to properly review the plans. Mr. Hennicky still had concerns about parking. It's an unknown problem. The studies relied upon are urban related. People in NYC and Boston don't have cars, but Portsmouth is different. People with these units will have cars. The projections the applicant presented are unrealistic. Mr. Hennicky was concerned about the ability to have short term rentals in the same zoning area. This will be chaos if short term rentals are allowed. Parking will bleed out into the streets and adjacent lots. The 18 parking spaces should be assigned to residential units. That should be a stipulation of approval. Mr. Hennicky was concerned about fire access and safety to all sides of the building.

Peter Didon of 78 Court St. commented that storage and pets will be issues for this building. People need a space to store their stuff.

Peter Stith acknowledged that TAC received the letter from Derek Durbin.

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. Cracknell commented that this application should be continued. Material was submitted late, and it is imperative that a traffic engineer looks at this again. They can look at the ITE manual and ensure the numbers look good. It may be helpful to get a sense of how micro units operate already in downtown Portsmouth. The McIntosh building is a good example and there is not a lot of parking in that area. It would be helpful for everyone to get a sense of how they function. The applicants should clarify if they are assigning the parking spots or leaving them open.

Mr. Desfosses agreed that it was obvious 18 spaces was not enough. People who live here will park on the streets or in the garage. The applicants are targeting people already working here and already parking here. The whole concept is that people will park somewhere, and some will be on municipal property. These apartments can't have a reasonable rate and parking. It is up to the Planning Board to decide if they want to approve this concept. Mr. Desfosses used to live downtown and did not have parking.

Mr. Cracknell noted that they have municipal parking garages in the city for a reason. It is a public utility and people pay for it. The city tried to avoid providing surface parking. Structure parking is only possibly by building luxury apts. The Planning Board will need to evaluate if this plan makes the mark. The private parking needs to be adequate to meet the function, but they cannot put 50 spaces on this site. It would look horrible and be expensive.

Mr. Howe commented that the fire safety for this building is better than some other places in the city. It will be fully sprinkled. It will be fire safe. These apartments are for people who can't afford to live here now. They aren't coming to speak on this project because they aren't residents. We don't know who they will be. This is not going to solve the housing crisis, but it will help.

Mr. Cracknell moved to postpone this application to the December 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

- F. The request of **Dagny Taggart, LLC, (Owner)**, for property located at **93 Pleasant Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the redevelopment of the existing 4 story structure and the construction of a new structure totaling 52 living units and 18 parking spaces. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 Lot 74 and lies within the Historic, Downtown Overlay, and CD4 Districts. (LU-21-183)

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Cracknell moved to postpone this application to the December 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Martingale, LLC, (Owner)**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, requesting site plan approval to allow the expansion of the existing deck to include expanded seating 238 deer the business as well as public access to the Piscataqua River. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. (LU-21-181)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Owner Mark McNabb spoke to the application.

TAC Comments:

- Detail shows that there may be a door between proposed public access and public walk way. Will this be closed or locked at any point in time?
 - Mr. McNabb confirmed that it would be closed when the restaurant closes at night.
- Public access should be given access to all areas where there is expansion into the Public Trust land.
- Understanding that the public deck is approximately 200 SF in area with approximately 12.5 feet of pedestrian frontage along the Piscataqua River it would be beneficial to consider expanding the riverfront portion. If the overall size is a concern, then I would

suggest that an equal area of the public deck, further from the riverfront, could be reallocated to the private portion of the deck.

- Mr. McNabb responded that they brought up a good point. The public gets a benefit by being able to go to a restaurant. That is a significant benefit over private residential. They cannot expand certain ways because they have to abide by the liquor license and dining laws. There has to be a clear demarcation. The main egress is on the deck and it can't be shifted. The plan is to meet in the middle. The goal is to create a public wharf with an easement. No one does that. Mr. McNabb was willing to give more of the area on the public front and make it 20 feet wide. There will still be the hostess station, but the majority of the area will be public. They will put in murals and a fence for a full stop.
- Mr. Britz appreciated the revision. There is a public component to the restaurant too but that comes with the price of a meal. The whole pier can't be public but there has to be a tradeoff. This is a significant amount of space. The public will enjoy this.
- Mr. Cracknell commented that this revision was a gift to the city of Portsmouth. Mr. Cracknell appreciated the willingness to listen, and the action taken is very generous. The public will be able to see more of the waterfront.
- Mr. Howe requested details on how they would close off the public deck. Mr. McNabb responded that the gate would be moved down to the restaurant location. The public deck would be closed at reasonable hours. Mr. Howe noted that there should be some signage showing that it's open for the public. Mr. McNabb confirmed there would be signage. The goal is for it to be inviting and clear that the public can be there.

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 approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

- Public access along the waterfront is increased to 20 feet
- Public access signage will be displayed
- Owner reserves the right to close gate afterhours for public safety

The motion passed unanimously.

- B. The request of 238 Deer Street, LLC, (Owner), for property located at 238 Deer Street, requesting Site Plan Review approval for demolition of the existing structure and**

the construction of a new 3-4 story mixed-use building with 21 residential units with a footprint of 5,286 s.f. and 19,190 s.f. gross floor area with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 3 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4), Downtown Overlay, and Historic Districts. (LU-20-238)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Johan Chagnon spoke to the application.

TAC Comments:

- Responsibilities regarding trash removal and solid waste should be clarified.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they added a note saying that trash would be carted out and picked up by a private company.
- Existing domestic water service is 2". Please correct on plans.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be corrected.
- Confirm proposed 4" fire service is sufficient for fire suppression in new building.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was calculated when Deer St. was being reconstructed last summer. This was the correct size.
- Per City ordinance if the commercial space is intended to be used as a restaurant then an area for an external grease trap must be shown on the plans. If unable to provide external grease trap then the commercial space cannot be used as a restaurant.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that was understood. At this time there is no proposed restaurant.
- Public access easements will be required for the pedestrian alleyways beside and behind the building. Note that these will connect to the existing easements the city holds for the 46 Maplewood Ave. project.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed and confirmed that a note would be added.
- A wider pedestrian sidewalk is likely a better option than the small landscape planting beds adjacent the entrance doors facing Deer Street.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they were willing to talk about it, but would prefer to keep those in. They might put in raised planter beds to soften the front of the building.
- The thin landscape bed along the south side of the building does not appear to be of sufficient width to support viable landscaping. Similarly, can additional windows be inserted into this façade or can a mural be considered to soften this façade?
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they put in that thin strip of planting after working with the adjacent condos and their association. They wanted to give them as much space as possible for their cars to back out. The 5 spaces on the north are tight on the property line. Landscaping would soften the building and prevent the need for bollards.

Mr. Cracknell commented that he made the landscaping comments. It is fine either way. It is not a typical urban condition in the downtown. That's where the comment was coming from. It should work either way because vehicles should not have a tire go into the 3-foot setback of the building. It is a bland on that side a wider planting or mural would be good on that side.

Mr. Desfosses commented that he would need to see a will serve letter from Eversource saying that they will serve the power for this building as is. If the load is big enough, then it needs its own transformer on this lot. This is a bigger building than the Statey. Right now, there is no place on this plan for a transformer. There is only underground power.

Mr. Cracknell the power transformer could go where the bike racks are. Mr. Desfosses commented that this needed to be resolved before this is approved.

Mr. Cracknell commented that they could include a stipulation that the plan needs a letter to serve from Eversource with this design to move forward. If any changes need to happen, then it will need to come back to TAC.

Mr. Desfosses requested detail on the drainage. Mr. Chagnon responded that it flows out along the building and pitches to go to the drain in the parking lot. Mr. Desfosses commented that they should show a drainage plan. There is no easement to the pipe going to the catch basin. Mr. Desfosses needed to see more details on the electrical and drainage.

PUBLIC HEARING

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. commented that she was confused about the number of units and how that relates to the parking.

John Chagnon clarified that there would not be any more than 21 residential units.

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. Cracknell moved to postpone this application to the December 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The request of Torrington Properties Inc. (applicant), on behalf of 2422 Lafayette Road Associates, LLC (Owner), for property located at 2454 Lafayette Road** requesting to amend a previously granted Conditional Use Permit to provide less than required parking in accordance with Section 10.1112.14 of the Zoning Ordinance and Conditional Use Permits for increased housing density and for increased building height as allowed by Section 10.5B72.10 and Section 105B72.20 of the Zoning Ordinance, and development within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use District in accordance with Section 10.5B40 of the Zoning Ordinance; and for Site Plan Review to demolish the

existing structure and construct a five (5) story structure with 95 condominium units with 20% designated as workforce housing units and provide 21,896 square feet of community space. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 273 Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District. (LU-21-192)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Cracknell had to leave early.

Attorney John Bosen and Neil Hanson from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. Mr. Bosen commented that they were hoping to move onto the Planning Board. The comments were straight forward, and they can satisfy everything with the exception of the multi-use path. They are willing to provide a path that satisfied the ordinance but not go as far as Banfield Rd. The proposed path would be 700 linear feet. All other TAC comments can be satisfied. The project has a lot of public benefit including workforce housing, community space, a dog park, pickle ball courts, and a COAST bus stop. All of the improvements meet what is required in the ordinance.

TAC Comments:

- The City requests a multi-use path on Constitution from back entrance of development to Banfield Road.
- The dog park should include a detail showing the interior gates, surface material and drainage system.
- Given the location, the pickle-ball courts should include night court lighting.
- The roundabout details should match the lines and dimensions shown on the site plan.
- The side entrance to the proposed bicycle center should be modified to be a stronger design element thereby activating this elevation as a primary façade of the building.
- The proposed community spaces should be shown on a plan. Please provide a matrix showing type, area, and location.
- The proposed workforce housing units should be identified (using a table and note) on the plan by the location, size, and number of bedrooms.
-

Mr. Howe questioned if the second-floor egress would be open to the corridor. Mr. Hanson responded that there should be a door to the hallway. None of the units show a door to the hallway yet.

Mr. Britz requested more details on the proposed multiuse path. Mr. Hanson responded that they were proposing to extend the path from the Water Country access drive to the Walmart driveway. That would provide pedestrian access to the rear of the Walmart Plaza.

Mr. Desfosses recommended that this be tabled for another month because there are some items that still need to be worked out with Public Works.

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 this application to the December 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Stith adjourned the meeting at 4:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee