

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

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

2:00 PM

December 7, 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; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Darrin Sargent, Police Captain; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT: Stefanie Casella, Planner 1;

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the November 2, 2021, Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the November 2, 2021, Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **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 January 4, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting.

- B.** 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)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Saari from Altus Engineering and Attorney Kevin Baum spoke to the application. Mr. Saari reviewed what has changed. The covered parking structures have been removed and it was modified to include an 8-foot walkway. The sidewalk was moved out of the right of way on Route 1 and an easement was created. They responded to the comments from the traffic review and the drainage review. Comment number 5 on the drainage review was about maintenance. This is an infiltration base system with pretreatment and catch basins. The area will be landscaped so there will not be a high sediment load. The applicant has committed to not using sand in their snow maintenance. That will significantly help toward lessening the sediment. The system that is there now has been working for decades and this will be an improvement. There should not be any long-term problems.

Mr. Britz commented that reducing the sand may mean an increase in the use of salt. The people in charge of snow maintenance should go through the snow pro certification program. Mr. Saari agreed that could be a condition. The other comment was about the frost slope and dry well. It's 4.14% from building to infiltration area. It should not be an issue at all. Mr. Desfosses agreed. The last comment related to the foundation drains. Those will be empty unless there is a major storm event.

TAC Comments:

- The sewer laterals for buildings 6 and 7 seem to be in conflict with the water mains that are shown on the sewer profile.
 - Mr. Saari responded that this would be fixed.
- The new sewer line should enter manhole 5158 at least a few inches above the main sewer run. This will help with construction and in keeping the new main from backing up when the main sewer is running fuller.
 - Mr. Saari confirmed that would be updated.
- Install water mains about a foot above the sewer on a more or less constant grade.
 - Mr. Saari responded that they were trying to maintain 5 feet of cover. It would be a smoother run but there would only be 4 feet of cover with insulation. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was fine.

- Provide hydraulic Ripley Dam on the proposed sewer main at Station 3+00 to prevent spring condition backed up water in the drainage infiltration system from chasing the sewer installation stone toward the City's sewer main in Lafayette. This dam installation is to be witnessed by DPW during construction.
 - Mr. Saari responded that note would be added.
- What are the Yard Drain structures? No detail provided. Are they Neoplast?
 - Mr. Saari responded that would be updated.
- The easement required for the front drainage system should be a condition of approval.
 - Mr. Saari responded that Mr. Baum would address all easement comments at the end.
- The 12" FES from the CPP leaving outlet structure 1 should be at least elev. 49.00 to prevent future clogging.
 - Mr. Saari responded that it was already 3 inches above existing grade. They can raise it more.
- Does the applicant have the right to upgrade and receive power from the adjacent lot? It seems as though the power should come from Rt1 directly to avoid future issues should the adjacent lot be developed. Provide documentation of any easements.
 - Mr. Saari responded that Mr. Baum would address all easement comments at the end.
- The 4" proposed water will also have a tapping saddle and valve, the shut off valve shown on the property line is redundant.
 - Mr. Saari responded that would be changed.
- The water shut off heads for the buildings will be painted blue if domestic and red if for fire with permanent paint.
 - Mr. Saari responded that a note would be added.
- Inside building 8, provide shut off valves on both the incoming and outgoing mains to facilitate meter changing. Also provide 4" backflow device and bypass metering as desired by Portsmouth Water. Portsmouth water to review plans for this area prior to construction.
 - Mr. Saari responded that right now there is a separate domestic and fire service. The meter is in the front of the building. They will add a note that the DPW will review the plumbing plan.
- Applicant will hire a 3rd party company to identify areas of ground water infiltration that can be eliminated from the local municipal sewer collection system. After agreement from the City on the targeted areas, the developer will need to permit and construct via whatever means are approved (repair/replace/reline) areas of the sewer successfully in order to create capacity for this development in the sewer system. The amount of infiltration to be removed must be a value equal or greater to two times the amount of waste predicted from the development.
 - Mr. Saari responded that there was already a report done. It looked like they could do a manhole or two. Mr. Cronin noted that this could be a separate conversation. Mr. Saari confirmed that he would follow up.
- Install second hydrant at beginning of water main near Lafayette Road.
 - Mr. Saari confirmed that plan would be updated.
- Document easement/right to flow across neighboring property.

- Mr. Saari responded that Mr. Baum would address all easement comments at the end.
- Community space must be identified as one of the defined spaces.
 - Mr. Saari commented that they called it out as a park. They would like to put in a dog park. Installing a playground won't happen because it's too big of a liability. Trails may not be possible because of the property lines and the wetland buffer. There are trails off site close by. Mr. Cracknell commented that they should show it on the plan and add signage if they are public trails. The dog park and a trail makes sense for that many people living there. A playground should not add that much liability. Mr. Saari responded that playground equipment would be too much of a liability. Mr. Cracknell commented that there should be more active community space in addition to the dog park. Right now, the proposed community space seems pretty weak.
- Community space should be redesigned for more functional uses.
 - Suggested additions as follows:
 - Playground in the 13,716 square feet of park area.
 - Dog park in the northern corner of the parcel.
 - Loop trail around the perimeter of the site.
- Remove 8 parking spaces adjacent to the 13,716 square feet of park area.
 - Mr. Saari responded that they can commit to removing the parking. It will help with drainage. They will move the curbing for parking. The new drainage design is a closed system. The existing system has a lot of homemade structures but surprisingly does work fine. It discharges to the abutting land. Everything dumps out through an 8-inch pipe.

Mr. Baum commented that the easements could be a condition of approval. These current conditions have existed for a long time. Their position is that they have rights by prescription to continue the flow over that lot. That's before all the work gone on in this lot to improve it. The owner of the abutting lot is an absentee landlord. It is an LLC out of NJ, and they have not been responsive. The applicant's position is that they have the right to continue to flow. An easement would be ideal, but there are real concerns that a stipulation for an easement will kill the project. There has been over 20 years of flow so there are prescription rights.

Mr. Saari commented that they were expanding the electrical in the same location and would put a new pole on the property. Eversource maintains an easement from what they can tell. It is possible to come in from the street, but it would be complex. Mr. Desfosses commented that they would need to see the Eversource easement that allows them to service this lot from there. Mr. Saari responded that this would be prescription rights as well because it was existing. Mr. Desfosses noted that it was being changed because they were upgrading it. They should submit something in writing to have the City's legal department review it. Mr. Britz noted that it did not make sense to approve a new pipe on their property unless the City's legal department agreed with their prescription rights position. Mr. Baum confirmed that he would coordinate with the legal department. Ultimately, it's a private issue between two properties. Mr. Britz agreed, however, if the Planning Board provides an approval, then the city is involved. This should be resolved

before it goes to the Planning Board because if something has to change it would need to come to TAC.

The owner (name inaudible) requested that they have the option to resolve the legal issue and then proceed to the Planning Board with the understanding if something had to change, they would come back to TAC. Mr. Britz responded that if the legal department sees the plan as sufficient, then that is fine. Mr. Saari commented that they would be sending less to the drainage than what goes through it today. The existing pipe will work up to a 10-year storm. Another option is to leave the pipe in place. If it's captured in the condition it should work. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that would work.

Mr. Britz questioned how they would build the retaining wall without disturbing the buffer. Mr. Saari responded that there was a foot between the base of the wall and the buffer. The wall is only 3 feet high. Mr. Britz questioned if the snow storage would be on the edge of the property. Mr. Saari responded that it would be pushed off all edges.

Mr. Britz commented that the "remove by hand" note for the open space beyond wall should be included in the site plan as well to ensure no equipment is used. Mr. Saari confirmed that would be added.

Mr. Cracknell provided more community space suggestions. There needs to be more active use areas. They could do a playground, half basketball court, or pickle ball court. There needs to be an amenity in there that will support the project. They have the space to do it. It would have been good to have a trail behind the storage area. Mr. Cracknell questioned if they would need a CUP for a trail behind the 3-foot wall to connect the sidewalk. Mr. Saari responded that they can put in a crosswalk to provide access.

Mr. Howe commented that he did not see fire service for building 2 on the plan. Mr. Saari responded that they will make sure it is on the plan. Mr. Howe questioned if building 8 had just 2 residential units. Mr. Saari confirmed that was correct. Mr. Howe noted that buildings 8 and 5 did not need fire service because they only had 2 residential units in them. The rest of the buildings need it.

Mr. Saari questioned if there was a specific location for the second hydrant. Mr. Cronin responded that it should be somewhere along Lafayette Rd. Mr. Howe requested that they coordinate the location with the fire department and DPW.

Mr. Howe questioned if there would be enough water without a pump. Mr. Saari responded that they were still awaiting a response from the mechanical engineer. Mr. Howe commented that it would have been nice to have that answer because they may need a second structure. If it is in one of the buildings, they need direct access to the outside and it needs to be separate from the remainder of the building. Mr. Saari confirmed that they should be able to put it in a basement.

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

The owner (name inaudible) commented that they would come back to TAC if they had to build a separate pump building or if the plan needed to change for drainage.

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

1. That the applicant use only Sno-pro certified contractors to conduct snow removal on the property.
2. Hydrant location reviewed by DPW
3. Provide easement or rationale for prescriptive easement to the Legal department for drainage and electrical service coming from the abutting property.
4. Show a note on the site plan that the area proposed for cleanup in the wetland exclude heavy equipment and earth disturbance.
5. Plan showing revised community space areas including design details for an enclosed dog park, playground and/or other active recreation (e.g. half-court basketball or a pickleball courts)
6. Remove 8 parking spaces along the proposed community space adjacent building #7
7. Update utility plan showing fire service to each building on the site.
8. Provide colored shutoff's for both domestic and fire water supply valves.
9. The sewer laterals for building 6 and 7 are revised so as to not conflict with the water mains.
10. The new sewer is to enter manhole 5158 at least a few inches above the main sewer run.
11. Sewer mains are installed about 1 foot above sewer on a constant grade.
12. Provide a hydraulic Ripley Dam on the proposed sewer main at Station 3+00.
13. A yard drain detail is added to the plan set.
14. The 12' FES from the CPP leaving outlet structure 1 should be at least elev. 49.00.
15. The 4" proposed water will have a tapping saddle and valve.
16. The water shut off heads for the buildings will be permanently painted blue if domestic and red if for fire service.
17. Add a note to plan that building 8 is to provide shot off valves on both the incoming and outgoing mains to facilitate meter changing. 4" backflow

device and bypass metering required. Portsmouth DPW to review plans prior to construction.

18. Applicant will hire a 3rd party company to identify areas of groundwater infiltration and create capacity within the sewer system for this project. The City must agree on the targeted areas and the applicant will construct the system to create capacity. The amount of infiltration to be removed must be a value equal or greater to two times the amount of waste predicted from the development.
19. A second fire hydrant will be installed at the beginning of the water main near Lafayette Road.

The motion passed unanimously.

- C. 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. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE (LU-21-167)**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Peter Stith noted that this would be carried over to the January 4, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting.

- D. WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT** 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. **WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT (LU-21-183)**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Peter Stith noted that this has been withdrawn.

- E.** 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)

- a. Please note this item is now being considered for 34,266 feet of commercial space with no residential use.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering, Rebecca Brown, and Mark McNabb spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon commented that they presented this last month and have since made some changes to the plan as a result.

TAC Comments:

- Remove all references to mixed use or residential as project is now 100% commercial.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that this proposal was for a building that was 100% commercial now. The sheets will be updated accordingly.
- Provide easement for Way-finding sign and relocate off the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that a note was added to sheet C3.
- Provide storm drainage connection for existing downspout on east corner of building.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would reroute into the basement area and attach to interior roof drain connections.
- The note on C6 'Downspout w UG Drain Pipe to street' needs to be removed. Connect downspout to drainage system.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they removed that note and will be relocating the drainpipe connection.
- Detail H on D2 should note that the pavers used in the driveway are 1) 80mm thick and 2) Require a driveway permit and responsibility of maintenance in perpetuity. The regular sidewalk brick should be noted to be 60mm.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that has been updated.
- Hatch 'tip downs' denoted on plan so that it is clear that they are brick.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the plan was updated.
- Reason for additional power pole to be provided.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that Eversource was looking to loop the power. The power feeds from the pole on Court St. to the transformer then back to Court St. and down to a proposed pole. That way if one wire cuts out, there is still a way to feed it. The pole was located for future connectivity. In the initial discussions with Eversource they wanted a second transformer placed near the property line and then overhead service to the buildings on State St. Essentially this pole location allows for future expansion. Mr. Desfosses commented that they would need to apply for a license for the new pole. They may not get it.
- Court St to be milled and overlaid 1.5" after construction is complete per DPW regulations from Washington to Court St.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they added note 10 on sheet C3.
- Detail 'T' on D4 references flexible connector couplings. Coupling are to be rigid gasketed SDR 35 couplings.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they changed that detail on sheet 4.

- The building drain should tie into the 15” pipe downstream of CB4629 with an inserta-tee and not into the basin directly in accordance with BMP.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they revised this on sheet C6.
- Please draw a profile of the drainage system so we can see how it will work.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they did a profile on sheet 4. They are working with ACF Environmental to get revised drawings. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it could be a condition of approval.
- Repairs to the sidewalk across Court St that occur will be repaired to the satisfaction of the DPW.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they added note 15 on sheet C3.
- Detail I does not apply and should be removed from the plan set. Do not install CI truncated domes on either side of the driveway.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this was completed.
- Width of garage opening should be wide enough to allow for cars to enter and exit at the same time to prevent cueing in roadway. Provide documentation of adequate width.
 - Ms. Brown responded that they provided a memo that summarized a response to this comment. As well as the comment from TEC on the sight distances. They could implement an alert system used by pedestrians and motorists. The exit ramp is operated by a garage door, so when that is activated to open an alert system would be activated. There would be two black poles 3.5 feet up off the road that would illuminate with the words “car coming” and 4 yellow bars flashing on top. The one to the west would be located near the wayfinding signage. The one to the east would be in line with the existing light poles. It would be visible to cars and pedestrians from either direction. There can be a similar system at the bottom of the ramp for incoming cars.
 - Mr. Desfosses commented that the signs could not be in the right of way. Ms. Brown responded that the pole to the west can be located out of the right of way. The eastern pole would be more difficult because of the historic wall. It would be preferable to have one on each side of the wall. They could put it on top of the wall.
 - Mr. Desfosses noted that DPW was concerned about cars queuing on Court St. However, now that it will be for business use most of the traffic will go in at one time and out at another time. Ms. Brown confirmed that was correct. 80% of the traffic will be entering in the morning and exiting in the afternoon. It is highly unlikely there will be much conflict at all. On the rare occasion there is a conflict, then the alert system will be triggered. Mr. Desfosses questioned if they had done a queuing analysis. Ms. Brown responded that they had not prepared a queuing analysis but did do a trip generation estimate. Mr. Desfosses commented that it would be helpful to see a memo on that subject. Mr. McNabb confirmed they would prepare a memo.
- Continue discussions with Eversource on transformer location.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they would.
- Tree plantings must follow City Arborist Standards.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they added the standards to the plan.
- Consider adding more scooter parking inside the garage area.

- Mr. Chagnon commented that a certain number of bike spaces were required due to regulations. The preference would be to keep it how it is and flip some bike spaces to scooter spaces if needed.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if the parking would be restricted to the tenants of building. Mr. McNabb confirmed that was correct. Mr. Cracknell questioned if they should consider a stipulation that any future change of use of the garage would be revisited by a traffic study reviewed by the city. Mr. McNabb agreed that was reasonable.

Mr. Cronin commented that the sewer should be updated from 6 inches to 8 inches on the plan. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.

PUBLIC HEARING

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. noted that there was no loading zone proposed with this project. Court St. is so small and there is no street level parking. This application should not move forward until there is a safe and reasonable loading zone located. TAC members should consider if all the standards in the regulations are in compliance with all city ordinances and codes. Sometimes things like parking are moved on to the Planning Board for them to address. However, they don't have the same expertise on traffic or how it impacts police and fire safety. This should not move to the Planning Board until parking availability has been clearly demonstrated.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Cracknell responded to the letter they received in public comment regarding the downtown overlay district. If a property is in the downtown overlay district and is only commercial use, then there are no off-street parking requirements. There is a presumption and recognition that there is available municipal parking regardless of distribution in the district. There are some areas in the district that has less than others. TAC does not have the jurisdiction to peel back the layers and require studies over the district. There may be a point in time where the city wants to look at the district especially with the new Foundry Garage to consider. There is no jurisdiction at this level or the Planning Board to require off street parking for this development at all.

Mr. Desfosses noted that there was a loading zone across the street on Pleasant St.

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

1. Applicant is to provide a complete drainage system plan prior to the building permit issuance.
2. Applicant will provide a memo from GPI speaking to the new traffic flow in and out of the parking garage.

3. Applicant is to continue discussion with Eversource to relocate the proposed transformer .
4. Sidewalk ramps are to be hatched on plan to show they are brick.
5. The HDC should administratively approve the proposed pedestrian alert signs.
6. The basement level parking shall only be used for tenants in the building and not be open for public use.
7. Any future change of use for the property shall require subsequent traffic study and approval by City.
8. Correct the Court Street sewer pipe size to show 8” on Court Street from 6” shown on plan.
9. Change landscape stone shown on the plan to river stone.
10. Pedestrian and vehicle alert system is to be located on private property.

The motion passed unanimously.

- F. 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

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application.

TAC Comments:

- Use granite steps instead of concrete
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- Show existing utilities on existing features plan and note any utility disruptions or removals on demolition plan. Note any changes in existing utilities with bold lines so that it is clear what the intent is.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.
- Reuse existing sewer connection to the degree possible. Separate water and sewer connections by at least 3’.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- Do not show **proposed** grading on land of others unless the applicant is proposing to re-grade with temporary construction easements.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they have been in discussion with 30 Maplewood Condo Association and added to the plan a proposed easement. It is mutually beneficial to both property owners. They are still working on the written language of the easement. It would allow for 30 Maplewood Ave. to have access to the land between the buildings and reserve a 2 foot landscape area easement for 238 Deer St. to put in plantings. There will be a no build access easement to the right of it. That will allow the building to be to code for window openings and provide space for future maintenance of the area. The grading on sheet C5 of the

plan has been updated to clarify it. They will match the brick sidewalk that was constructed with 46 Maplewood Ave. The easements will be obtained prior to construction.

- We are still waiting on answers from the Architect and Eversource regarding power.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they were working through this and had meetings scheduled this week.
- Provide documentation of easements to work on adjacent lots.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they added the easement plan, and it can be a condition of approval to finalize them.
- Identify proposed staging areas.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the hope would be that they could go through approval process and identify staging areas.
- Move curb 3 feet off the left side of the building to protect the vegetation.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they can do that, but they are in process with the easement negotiations.
- Consider adding scooter parking to bike parking area, possibly as spilt parking area.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they were concerned about complying with the amount of bike racks required by the ordinance and scooters between the buildings.

Mr. Cracknell commented that he did not like the 4 bikes in front of the commercial space on the corner. They should be moved to somewhere in the back of the building. It would be messy on the corner with 7-8 bikes. Scooters could park there. Mr. Chagnon commented that was part of Steve Kelm's property. Mr. Cracknell commented that they should replace the bikes on the corner with scooter parking. It should not be posted as bike or scooter parking but that's likely where they will go. The 2-foot landscaping will not provide any protection. It's good you got an agreement for that side of the building with an easement. It is important to protect the building especially with all that glass. The landscaping will not stop the vehicle. A decorative metal screen could be a better option. Mr. Chagnon commented that a 3-foot fence would be at the height of a bumper. That would be more damaging than pushing into a bush. Mr. Cracknell noted that there was a lot of glass on the first floor. They should take another pass on the screening 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. Desfosses moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

1. Show existing utilities on existing features plan and note any utility disruptions or removals on the demolition plan.
2. Easements shall be provided for all proposed work (grading, access, etc.) that is to occur on land other than the applicant's.

3. Proposed staging areas shall be identified during the CMMP development stage.
4. Applicant shall coordinate with abutting property owners to relocate the first 4 bike racks adjacent the commercial storefront windows.
5. Easements shall be provided to the City for the pedestrian alleyway access to the abutting public walkways.
6. A decorative metal screen should be added along the proposed curb line in the abutting parking lot in order to provide better protection to the building.

The motion passed unanimously.

G. 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

Neil Hanson from Tighe and Bond and Rob DiSalvo spoke to the application. Mr. Hanson commented that they submitted the revised plans and a response sheet to the comments they received from the previous month's TAC meeting.

TAC Comments:

- Entire Drainage system to be cleaned after construction is complete. Please provide a photo and description log for our review once complete.
 - Mr. Hanson agreed.
- There are manholes evident in the parking lot that have been paved over that should be brought up to grade to facilitate cleaning.
 - Mr. Hanson agreed.
- Please show us calculations regarding parking that there are enough spaces remaining to support the other Plaza uses during construction.
 - Mr. Hanson responded that they did a parking analysis, and the peak day is on Saturday. The demand is for 406 spaces. The area of construction will take over 210 spaces and leave 454 spaces available for parking.
- Verify that one 6" connection is sufficient to sewer the structure.
 - Mr. Hanson responded that they did a pipe analysis for peak demand, and it is sufficient. They will need a sewer connection permit as well. There will be plenty of space

- Remove existing permanent striping and replace with temporary striping in Constitution before removal of pavement begins for multi-use path extension.
 - Mr. Hanson responded that they would add a note.
- All structures in Constitution in the area of construction (both sides of street) are to be reset and fitted with catch basin liners prior to overlay.
 - Mr. Hanson responded that they would add a detail to the plan.
- There is no sump shown on the catch basin detail. Please provide.
 - Mr. Hanson responded that the detail would be revised.
- Please note the Constitution Ave work will be to DPW standards and that pavement mix designs will need to be approved through the DPW prior to paving.
 - Mr. Hanson responded that a note would be added.

Mr. Howe commented that they discussed the dead-end corridors on the second floor a little bit. Mr. DiSalvo added that the left-hand side of corridor is 49.6 from the cross corridor to the end wall. It meets the dead-end corridor requirements. Mr. Howe commented that the dead-end corridor requirements for assembly areas is 20 feet. Mr. DiSalvo responded that they have not defined the clubhouse layout, but it will likely have 3 doors out to the corridor. The program is not fully designed yet. Mr. Howe agreed that they can meet the clubhouse egress requirements, but the floor in general cannot have dead-end corridors of over 20 feet. That would affect at least 2 maybe 3 of the corridors. Mr. DiSalvo confirmed that they would look at it.

Mr. Cracknell commented that they may want to rethink the trees in the 15 wide strip if they are pines because the understory would die off. A spruce tree would provide better screening. The textured mountable apron should be as wide possible.

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

1. The applicant will clean out the drainage system on site upon completion of construction.
2. Locate manholes in parking lot that have been paved over and remove asphalt.
3. Insure sufficient lighting for dog park and pickle ball courts.
4. Add note to second floor plan about life safety that the interior floor plan will be amended to meet life safety code.
5. Remove existing permanent striping and replace with temporary striping in Constitution before removal of pavement begins for multi-use path extension.
6. All structures in Constitution in the area of construction (both sides of street) are to be reset and fitted with catch basin liners prior to overlay.
7. The sump is added to the catch basin detail.
8. The Constitution Ave work will be to DPW standards and that pavement mix designs will need to be approved through the DPW prior to paving.

The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Austin Repair & Renovation LLC, (Owner)**, for the property located at **27 Shaw Road** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide one existing lot with 57,354 square feet of lot area and 230 feet of street frontage on Shaw Road and 127 feet of street frontage on Walker Bungalow Road into 2 lots as follows: Proposed Lot 1 with 34,205 square feet of lot area and 230 feet of street frontage on Shaw Road; Proposed Lot 2 with 23,149 square feet of lot area and 127 feet of street frontage on Walker Bungalow Road. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 223 Lot 18 and is located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (LU-21-203)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Coranati and Joseph Onosko spoke to the application. The existing lot is on Shaw Rd., and it has frontage on Walker Bungalow Rd. They are looking to do a straightforward subdivision. One question they received was about the sewer. There is a sewer project coming into this area. They would like start construction prior to the start of the sewer project. Then they would have the opportunity to tie into the sewer system or potentially add a holding tank for the short term if needed.

Mr. Cronin commented that they have done that before, but it would be subject to DES approval. Mr. Coranati confirmed that they could add that as a stipulation. They could get the holding tank approval and only put it in if needed.

TAC Comments:

- There is currently no public sewer on Walker Bungalow or Shaw Roads but a low pressure sewer system will be bid in December of 2021. Applicant to coordinate any proposed connections to the new sewer with DPW. If sewer is not to be provided, please include needed on-site disposal system details.
- Please describe how lot 2 is to receive power and communication wires for further comment/approval.
 - Mr. Coranati responded that there were overhead lines all around. Given the area and potential for ledge it would be better to connect to those. Mr. Desfosses responded that the existing poles were out of the frontage, so they may be looking at adding a pole. Mr. Coranati commented that if they could not feed off the existing pole that's just off the frontage, then they would go through the pole application process. Mr. Desfosses commented that they should show the proposed pole location and start the process.
- As a condition of approval, the front setback should be from the right of way line, not the street centerline.
 - Mr. Coranati confirmed that was revised.

- The area around the 20 contour on the edge of Shaw Road will receive more runoff once Lot 2 is constructed. Please show a rain garden in this spot with proper underdrainage to prevent damage to the roadway.
 - Mr. Coranati confirmed that would be added.
- Please provide information substantiating the viability of Walker Bungalow Road for legal access.
 - Mr. Coranati requested clarification on the comment. Mr. Britz responded that it was a private street, so just make sure the access would work.

Mr. Cracknell commented that he would prefer to see the front yard setback to stay in the middle of the street. That would minimize vegetation removal on the site. The house should be aligned with Walker Bungalow Rd. with the houses on each side of it. That would retain the trees on the back half of the lot. Mr. Britz confirmed that's how they showed it on the plan. Mr. Onosko agreed they wanted to save the trees. Mr. Cracknell commented that it should be a stipulation.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if they were going to save the stone wall. Mr. Onosko confirmed they would.

PUBLIC HEARING

Paul Messier of 171 Walker Bungalow Rd. commented that he was in support of the project and suggested reorienting the driveway to avoid putting it on the hill.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Onosko commented that they have not located the house yet and requested that they not include a stipulation about placement because that could limit options. Mr. Cracknell agreed, but noted future applications should show a proposed house location.

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

1. Maintain front yard setback subject to zoning review.
2. Show detail of rain garden on lower lot (parent lot) including flowage rights and drainage easement.
3. Show how proposed lot 2 will get power and show pole if needed.
4. Show septic design/holding tank approved by DES.

The motion passed unanimously.

- B. The request of Sagamore Corner LLC, (Owner), for the property located at 960 Sagamore Avenue requesting Site Plan Approval to demolish the existing mixed use**

structure and construct a 6-unit residential structure totaling 21,066 square feet of gross floor area, 21 parking spaces as well as associated utilities, lighting, landscaping, and site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 201 Lot 2 and is located in the Mixed Residential Business (MRB) District. (LU-21-204)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Belden from Altus Engineering and Eric Cates spoke to the application. Mr. Belden commented that this was here in November to discuss the application for site plan improvements at 960 Sagamore Ave. The site is a little under an acre in size. There is a small wetland piece to the southwest corner of the property. All of the proposed improvements are outside the buffer except for a small patio. There is a 6-unit residential building with a 16 space garage and 5 exterior visitor parking spaces.

TAC Comments:

- Label the address in the title block of the CUP plan.
 - Mr. Belden confirmed that would be updated.
- The UG electrical service should be drawn to go from the pole to the building directly as it would be constructed.
 - Mr. Belden confirmed that would be updated.
- Water is dependent on the City constructing a new water main in Sagamore Grove, what is the backup plan for providing water if the main is not installed yet?
 - Mr. Belden responded that they could use the 6-inch line that services the hydrant. Mr. Desfosses responded that they could not. If the city doesn't build anything, then they will have to go across Sagamore Ave. for that. Mr. Belden confirmed they would coordinate with DPW.
- Installation of the proposed 10,000 gallon holding tank is subject to NHDES approval.
 - Mr. Belden agreed.
- Please use natural stone finish on stonewall.
 - Mr. Belden responded that they would work with the Planning Department on this.

Mr. Cracknell commented that they may want to make the community storage room a little bit more shallow to allow for better space in the parking area. Mr. Belden agreed.

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

1. Label address in the title block of the CUP plan.
2. The UG electrical service should be drawn to go from the pole to the building directly.

3. Applicant should coordinate with DPW on viable water source prior to building permit issuance.
4. DES approval of holding tank
5. Fire service plan
6. The natural stone finish of the proposed retaining wall shall be finalized and reviewed by the Planning Department prior to approval by the Planning Board.
7. The proposed community storage room in the basement level shall be reduced in size in order to support egress from parking space #10.

The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The request of **35 Pines LLC, (Owner)**, for the property located at **295 Maplewood, Unit 1** requesting a Conditional Use Permit Approval in Accordance with Section 10.1112.14 of the Zoning Ordinance, for the provision of no on-site parking spaces where three (3) spaces are required. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 141 Lot 35 and is located in the Character District 4-L2 (CD4-L2) and Historic District. (LU-21-207)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Lavoie and Lauren Green spoke to the application. Mr. Lavoie provided a copy of the condo approval. Mr. Britz noted that before it was a barber shop it was offices. They were required to have 4 parking spaces for that and had a variance. Mr. Britz questioned if they had any parking problems. Mr. Lavoie responded that they did not. There is one appointment an hour and they are all booked online ahead of time. There are only 2 cars at a time with maybe an overlap of 10 mins. Ms. Green added that a lot of clients walk or bike as well. There is a lot of public parking in the area. Mr. Cracknell questioned how many stools they had in the barber shop. Mr. Green responded just one. Mr. Cracknell responded that it made sense to move this forward.

TAC Comments:

- Please provide condo association authorization.

PUBLIC HEARING

Bryce Caldwell of 315 Maplewood Ave. spoke in support of the project and noted that there had not been any parking issues.

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:

1. If additional cutting chairs are added to the business the applicant shall resubmit for review and approval of any traffic- or parking-related impacts.

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cracknell moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:50 p.m., seconded by Mr. Desfossed. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee