

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

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

2:00 PM

January 3, 2023

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Peter Britz, Planning and Sustainability Director; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer, Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT:

Stefanie Casella, Planner 1; Kate Homet, Associate Environmental Planner

*[] Items in brackets denote timestamp of recording

[4:14] The meeting began at 2:00 pm.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Approval of minutes from the December 15, 2022 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

[4:35] P. Britz made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Desfosses. 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** (LU-20-259)

[4:47] Chairman Stith stated that the applicant had requested to postpone.

B. The request of **Frederick J. Bailey III & Joyce Nelson (Owners)**, and **Tuck Realty Corporation (Applicant)**, for properties located at **212, 214, and 216 Woodbury Avenue** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval for a Lot Line Relocation to create the following lots: Proposed Lot 1 to be 60,025 square feet of lot area where 26,012 square feet are existing, Proposed Lot 2 to be 12,477 square feet of lot area where 29,571 square feet are existing, and Proposed Lot 3 to be 7,917 square feet of lot area where 24,836 square feet are existing. No changes in street frontage are proposed. Said properties are located on Assessor Map 175 Lots 1, 2, and 3 and lie within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (LU-22-129)

C. The request of **Frederick J. Bailey III & Joyce Nelson (Owners)**, and **Tuck Realty Corporation (Owner and Applicant)**, for properties located at **212 Woodbury Avenue** requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of an eight-unit condominium development consisting of four (4) single living-unit structures, two (2) two-unit structures, 18 parking spaces where 13 are required, and associated stormwater, utility and site improvements with access to the development from Boyd Street. Said properties are located on Assessor Map 175 Lot 1 and lie within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (LU-22-129)

[5:10] Chairman Stith read in both items B and C together as one application to be heard.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joseph Coronati of Jones & Beach Engineers and Michael Garrepy, the developer, came to present this application. Mr. Coronati went over the updates from their last application, these included: drainage updates, existing trees listed on the plans, detention pond details and changes, infiltration changes, grade changes, etc. They have responded to many of the third party review comments from Altus Engineering and are awaiting responses from them.

[11:20] Mr. Coronati proceeded to go through each comment submitted by staff.

1. Landscaping plans should be stamped by a licensed landscape architect.

They are working with someone who is a landscape designer but not a licensed architect, but a stamp is not required. Mr. Cracknell would like the proposed wall of arborvitae to be interspersed with other species so that there is a better mix of plantings such as evergreens.

2. Green building statement to be provided in every submission.

It was submitted back in email but will be included in submissions going forward.

3. The 9" 'Sycamore' (London Plane) tree in front of 216 Woodbury will need to go before Trees and Greenery for permission to remove. The tree should be replaced with a suitable species.

They will go to the Trees & Greenery Committee for this.

[14:33] Mr. Coronati mentioned that the rest of the comments were straightforward and would be addressed. They would add notes about the landscaping and irrigation comments along with the sidewalk extension comments.

[17:32] Mr. Coronati mentioned that the only comment they were not in agreement with was the very last comment about a redesign.

PUBLIC HEARING

[17:58] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing for this application. No one spoke. The hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[18:31] Chairman Stith mentioned that they were still waiting for Altus Engineering to complete their review of the drainage.

[18:50] Mr. Britz mentioned that the sheet flow and the reduction of riprap helped considerably since the previous application. He also asked for clarification on the note about eco-pavers and standard asphalt.

Mr. Coronati responded that it notes the difference from where the eco-pavers end where the asphalt begins. The eco-pavers could not be done on every driveway because of the high groundwater table.

[20:33] Mr. Cracknell suggested using other pavers instead of asphalt so that they all look the same.

[21:38] Mr. Desfosses asked how they plan on water-metering each building.

Mr. Coronati responded that they would have water shut offs going to each unit. Mr. Desfosses would like the pipe details to show a sleeve and the shut offs generally should be located in grass areas if possible. The domestic valve caps have to be painted blue and the fire service caps should be painted red.

[26:37] Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone the application to the next meeting to address all the Altus Engineering comments and the comments given today. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- D.** The request of **One Market Square LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **1 Congress Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the partial demolition and expansion of the existing structure to construct a 3-story building with 58,780 square feet of gross floor area, 12,080 square foot building footprint, 13 parking spaces, and associated onsite and offsite improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 117 Lot 14 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4), Character District 5 (CD5), Downtown Overlay (DOD), and Historic District. (LU-22-12)

[27:10] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[27:48] John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering, Mark McNabb (developer), Tracey Kozak (architect) and Terrence Parker (landscape architect) came to present this application.

They previously presented at the November meeting and had addressed a list of comments for plans that have not changed other than a separation from the offsite improvements application.

[28:45] Mr. Chagnon proceeded to address the most recent comments from staff.

1. Move 8" valve before connection to water on Ladd Street so it is not directly over sewer main.

Mr. Chagnon passed out a revised detail sheet showing this change.

2. Show details on connection to 4" main on Ladd.

Mr. Chagnon responded that these details were also added to the revised plans.

[31:05] Mr. Cracknell mentioned that there were a few staff concerns that were minor such as the zoning analysis, the open space, building height details and pervious pavement areas. These can be gone over in a short meeting with staff when the applicant is ready.

[32:15} Mr. Howe raised concerns about the fire department access to High Street and Haven Court and would like to see a truck turning template. There will be a condition on the off-site improvement plans that the curb cuts go away to meet the fire department's needs and access requirements.

[36:50] Mr. Desfosses mentioned that he was hopeful that they could put in building-mounted lighting in lieu of street poles because he could not approve of pole lighting. The sconce lightning fixture may not be visually appropriate on the older buildings but something like those would be good.

Mr. McNabb responded that they are committed to doing catenary lighting and they could work on the sconce lighting fixture as well.

PUBLIC HEARING

[39:19] Chairman Stith opened up the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[40:00] Mr. Eby made a motion to recommend approval of this application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

Prior to Planning Board consideration:

1. Applicant and project team will meet with the Planning staff to discuss the zoning compliance table.
2. Pole lights will be removed and the replacement fixtures will be reviewed and approved by Public Works Department.
3. Any utility work that is necessary to construct a fully operational building will need to be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department.

Subsequent to Planning Board approval by prior to the issuance of a Building Permit:

4. Prior to issuance of building permit the proposed off site improvement for High Street and Ladd Street and Haven Court will be reviewed and approved authorized by the City entity to ensure building, pedestrian, vehicular, and emergency vehicle safety.

Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

[42:18] The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- a. The request of **Pease Development Authority (Owner)**, for property located at **80 Rochester Avenue** Site Plan approval for the construction of a ±209,750 SF advanced manufacturing building including ±18,145 SF of office space, two (2) parking areas, two (2) loading dock areas, minor realignment of a portion of Rochester Avenue, and associated site improvements consisting of underground utilities, landscaping, lighting, and a stormwater management system. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 308 Lot 1 and lies within the Pease Industrial District (PI). (LU-22-210)
- b. The request of **Pease Development Authority (Owner)**, for property located at **80 Rochester Avenue** requesting lot line adjustment to add 22,251 square feet to the existing lot as part of a realignment of Rochester Avenue for a proposed lot size of 496,584 square feet (11.4 acres). Said property is shown on Assessor Map 308 Lot 1 and lies within the Pease Industrial District (PI). (LU-22-210)

[42:35] Chairman Stith introduced new business items A and B and read them together.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[43:50] Patrick Crimmons and Neil Hansen of Tighe & Bond, along with Michael Mates of PDA and John Stephens of the development team came to present these applications.

Mr. Hansen proceeded to give a brief overview of the proposed plan which would include a 209,000+ sf advanced manufacturing facility on a currently vacant site. The proposed site plan would include two separate loading and parking areas, one in the north and one in the south. These areas also have options for future parking expansions if needed. This project has received a variance from the ZBA for a front yard setback. They will no longer be seeking an application for a lot line revision but will instead be seeking another variance for a rear yard setback which is related to a comment received about City drainage infrastructure concerns. They will also be seeking an alteration of terrain permit from NHDES for all proposed stormwater improvements.

[47:50] Mr. Hansen read through and responded to the comments received by staff.

1. Please confirm this project includes a lot line adjustment and not the creation of a new parcel.

They will no longer be pursuing a lot line revision, but they will still need to go through the subdivision process for the lease area.

2. Rochester Ave pavement is too far deteriorated for the mill and pave process. The road needs reclamation fortified and new pavement. Stratham and Newfields Streets need to be reconstructed as well.

They acknowledge this and will update the plans to reflect these changes.

3. The new lease line may extend over the street drainage system and sidewalk. A license may be required.

They have no issue providing the City or PDA with whatever the proper conveyance is for any drainage lines.

4. PCB 18 should tie into the street drainage, not the site drainage

[49:20] The PDA is requesting that this be connected to the onsite drainage system so that it receives treatment.

5. DMH 1925 is likely not large enough to accept such a large new core. Please confirm this design will work by investigating the structure with Stormwater division from DPW.

They have no issue investigating this. They will have to expand the opening a bit but plan to do it during the investigation.

6. Proposed sidewalk should be at least 5.5' wide, preferably 6' wide.

Assuming the PDA has no objection to this, they can make the revision to a 5.5' width sidewalk.

7. Third party review of stormwater design. Is location of pretreatment outlet structure after detention basin appropriate? Is treatment prior to detention basin more appropriate?

They will be needing an alteration of terrain permit so this stormwater will be reviewed by the State which could serve this third party's purpose.

8. State sizes of domestic water and fire services.

They will begin work with the project architect to get those sizes added to the plans.

9. Provide flow tests to show the existing water main can supply adequate water to proposed building.

Those can be completed.

10. Provide vehicle speed data for New Hampshire Avenue to confirm adequacy of sight lines at driveways and to determine need for additional safety measures at proposed crosswalks.

The sidewalks were added at the request of the PDA and they do not anticipate any issues for site distances at the driveways for vehicles or pedestrians. Additionally, the traffic study is being peer reviewed at the request of the PDA.

11. Provide pedestrian counts and vehicle turning movement counts at intersections of New Hampshire Avenue with Newfields and Stratham, to document need for crosswalks across New Hampshire Ave.

Similar to the last comment, this is under a third party review.

12. A third party peer review of the traffic study should be done.

[55:15] Mr. Eby asked for clarification on how the building placement was decided.

Mr. Hansen responded that the building is designed based on the bay spacing of the columns and the parking configuration could only work like this with the spacing they have laid out.

[56:28] Mr. Howe asked where the front of the building was located. He mentioned that they do not need a fire truck turning template for the front of the parking lot because they would have access along the streets. He also asked if there were any hazardous materials proposed to be stored in the building.

Mr. Hansen responded that it will be along New Hampshire Avenue. They do not know what will be stored in the building because they do not yet know who the end user will be.

PUBLIC HEARING

[58:35] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:00:00] Mr. Desfosses asked for the re-evaluation of the catch basins and their locations in the middle of the driveways.

[1:03:14] Mr. Eby asked what type of facility this would be because the description states that it would reduce the number of employees needed yet they are keeping the option open to expand parking.

Mr. Stephens stated that they do not yet know who the user will be but with advanced manufacturing they expect for mechanized manufacturing with less employee needs but they want to leave their parking options open in case they need to include office uses as well.

[1:05:02] Mr. Stith requested that the next application include the subdivision application as well before the next submission.

[1:05:23] Mr. Cracknell made a motion to continue this application to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cronin. The motion passed unanimously.

- c. The request of **Nicole J. Giusto** and **David A. Sinclair (Owners)**, for property located at **765 Middle Street** requesting Site Plan Approval for a fourth dwelling unit in a new detached structure with a 3-bay garage, including stormwater management improvements, expanded driveway utility services and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 148 Lot 37 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts. (LU-22-196)

[1:06:02] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[1:06:43] Eric Weinrub and Marissa Sewell of Altus Engineering, Jen Ramsey the project architect, and David Sinclair the property owner came to present this application. Mr. Weinrub described the application with the proposal of constructing a fourth dwelling unit on the property. There currently is a single-family home, a two-apartment carriage house and they are proposing a garage with an apartment above. They have previously received relief for density and setback requirements from the ZBA and Ms. Ramsey has been working with the HDC for the design process. In the past, the lot was previously two parcels. They would like to keep this

as a single parcel and keep the current streetscape on Middle Street and the access off of Lincoln Avenue.

[1:10:20] Mr. Weinrub proceeded to go over and respond to staff comments.

1. Does the 1970 square foot calculation include the deck or is that total only for the building footprint?

The proposed garage and residences are proposing over 2,200 sf of surface area, adding in the deck brings this count up to 2,248.67 sf and the overall building coverage remains at 23%.

2. Green building statement states, “the proposed 3-bay garage reduces the site impervious and improves the storm water runoff.” Please explain how the impervious surfaces are reaching an overall reduction on the site.

This was a typo and in fact the impervious will slightly increase and this will be the effective impervious.

3. Install catch basin at low point of driveway (elevation 23.75) and connect to catch basin in road. Install overflow pipe in retention pond and connect it to catch basin on property.

They have no issue with that but they prefer to put in a leeching structure instead so they are not disrupting the mature plantings along Lincoln Avenue. They do not believe it is necessary to connect their closed drainage and infiltration drainage systems due to their calculations, the pond should not overtop even in a ten-year storm.

4. State size of proposed water service to new building.

They will have a 1” domestic water line to the main house and will continue that to service the new apartment above the garage. They would like to have the decision of the service line size be a condition prior to getting a building permit so they can have a third-party engineer look at it and determine it later.

Mr. Desfosses clarified that they were bringing both main lines into the principal structure so that in the future if they want fire protection the main line will already be there for the home.

5. Driveway apron must be asphalt from roadway to edge of right of way.

[1:16:25] Mr. Cracknell asked what they plan to do with the textured surface of the driveway entrance.

Mr. Desfosses mentioned that cobblestone pavers on the sidewalk right of way would not be ADA compliant. Textured surfaces on the apron are not allowed in the City because it would require City maintenance and it can only be asphalt.

[1:18:11] Mr. Wolph asked if there was a set of stairs from the second floor down to the garage or if it was all internal.

Ms. Ramsey responded that there was both an internal and external set of stairs. One bay will be for the accessory dwelling unit, two will be for the property owner, and a fourth bay will be a flexible space mainly used for yard tools.

[1:19:56] Mr. Howe asked what the model of the fire suppression system would be.

Ms. Ramsey responded that they have not gotten that far yet but it will be chosen after approvals by a general contractor or engineer.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:20:30] Chairman Stith opened up the public hearing.

[1:20:44] Nicole Bodoh spoke on behalf of 729/733 Middle Street. She expressed concerns for exacerbating water runoff impacts on her abutting property and the applicant's need for a variance for an accessory dwelling unit.

[1:22:38] Mr. Cracknell responded that since there was no existing garage structure on this property it does not count as an accessory dwelling unit. The proposed garage is just being considered a third principal structure.

[1:32:00] Mr. Wolph mentioned that it would be nice to come up with a mechanism that guarantees that the drainage will not be worse for an abutter than before a project has begun.

Mr. Cracknell responded that by asking the applicant to document existing conditions and asking them to determine whether it exacerbates existing conditions is something that they already ask for and is a valid method.

[1:33:35] Mr. Weinrub responded that they had included a detailed drainage study that shows the drainage runs toward the abutter to the east, which would indicate that Ms. Bodoh's flooding issues do not stem from this particular property.

[1:35:38] Mr. Britz commented that the site plan review regulations in Section 7.6.1 say that there has to be at least an annual inspection of maintenance for bioretention systems and Mr. Britz wants them to specify who will be doing the inspections and when.

Mr. Weinrub responded that they will specify who will be the inspector, likely a stormwater design professional or a PE.

[1:37:18] Mr. Cracknell spoke on the issues relating to the HDC that he felt were relevant. The issues raised at the HDC were reiterated for everyone to consider. These included the screening in between properties, he would like them to refine or augment their design with a proposed screen such as a fence or fence with plantings along the property line. Additionally, they should

consider reducing the carriage house deck size by recessing it. They should panelize the railing along the property line so that it is more opaque for the renters and the abutters. Also, they might consider a pergola to provide more privacy with landscaping and changing their proposed double hung windows to Bahama shutters for privacy.

[1:42:21] Ms. Bodoh expressed concerns for the proximity of the deck to her property line, which she mentioned would have direct views into her dining room.

[1:43:45] Chairman Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:46:58] Mr. Britz made a motion to approve the application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

Prior to Planning Board consideration:

1. Applicant will update application materials to identify who will perform the maintenance of the stormwater system and make information available to the City on an annual basis.
2. Applicant will update application materials to move the leeching catch basin to the low point in the driveway.
3. Applicant will show fire service and domestic water line on the utility plan.

Subsequent to Planning Board approval by prior to the issuance of a Building Permit:

4. A licensed utility engineer will determine the appropriate sizing for the fire service and domestic water lines.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

V. ADJOURNMENT

[1:50:45] Mr. Cronin made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Cracknell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate E. Homet
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee