

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

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

2:00 PM

March 7, 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; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Michael Maloney, Patrol Division Captain

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT:

Kate Homet, Associate Environmental Planner

*Items in brackets [] denote timestamp of recording

[3:27] Meeting began at 2:01 pm

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Approval of minutes from the February 7, 2023 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

[3:40] D. Desfosses made a motion to approve the minutes from February as presented. P. Britz seconded the motion. 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. (LU-20-259)
REQUEST TO POSTPONE

[3:50] Chairman Stith announced that the applicant for 375 Banfield had requested to postpone.

- B.** The request of **Pease Development Authority (Owner)**, and **Aviation Avenue Group, LLC (Applicant)** 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)
- C.** The request of **Pease Development Authority (Owner)**, and **Aviation Avenue Group, LLC (Applicant)**, for property located at **80 Rochester Avenue** requesting Subdivision Approval under Chapter 500 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Subdivision Regulations, to subdivide 10.9 acres (474,333 square feet) to create a lease lot area for the applicant. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 308 Lot 1 and lies within the Pease Industrial District (PI). (LU-22-210)

[3:58] Chairman Stith introduced Old Business items B and C together. Chairman Stith noted that the description for this application in the agenda for C was incorrect – it was no longer a lot line revision but rather a subdivision request.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[5:37] Patrick Crimmons of Tighe and Bond along with Joe Coheegan from Tide Mark representing the ownership team. Mr. Crimmons noted that all of the previous comments had been addressed and went on to address the one remaining comment from the day before.

1. With the anticipated low number of pedestrians to be generated by the project, together with the data from the traffic counts at other locations showing minimal pedestrian activity, marked crosswalks are not warranted. Marked crosswalks are not required for pedestrians to legally cross the street, and they can provide a false sense of security, as pedestrians may assume that traffic will yield or stop due to the presence of a crosswalk. When pedestrian volumes are never more than 20 in an hour, traffic often does not yield as drivers do not notice the pedestrians. Rather than install items that will need to be maintained whether or not they are used, I would recommend conducting observations after the site is fully occupied to determine the actual level of pedestrian activity to determine if crosswalks and additional safety measures are needed. Pedestrians tend to cross whether or not there is a crosswalk. Providing a crosswalk does not tend to induce pedestrian activity where little exists.

Mr. Crimmons responded to this comment by agreeing to the recommendation and overall comment. They have pre-reviewed this with the Pease Development Authority (PDA) which is fine with accepting it and they will have it added as a stipulation.

[7:42] E. Eby noted that they could add in a pedestrian crossing for the multi-use trail at the end of Sherburne Road if they would like to since it is not under City jurisdiction but rather PDA jurisdiction.

PUBLIC HEARING

[8:30] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[8:46] Chairman Stith noted that this application is still before the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) and if it were to move forward at this stage there would need to be a stipulation for getting ZBA approval.

[9:05] P. Howe made a motion to approve this application with the following conditions:

1. Approval is received from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
2. Applicant monitor pedestrian safety for the first six months or up to a year after full occupancy and report back to City staff. Applicant will coordinate with DPW and City staff to set up and schedule monitoring.
3. All previous comments be addressed.

[9:20] D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of and **Thomas E, Marybeth B, James B, and Meegan C. Reis (Owners)**, for property located at **305 Peverly Hill Road** requesting redevelopment of the property including the addition of two new dwelling units for a total of three units with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 255 Lot 5 and lies within the Single Residence A (SRA), Single Residence B (SRB) and Natural Resources Protection (NRP) Districts. (LU-23-18 and LU-22-251)

[11:11] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[12:20] Erik Sari of Altus Engineering, Jim Reis and Meegan Reis, property owners, came to present this application. Mr. Sari went on to explain the property, including the 48 acre size of the property, the existing conservation easement area, an existing house and barn and the current use as a horse farm. This project had previously gone to the ZBA to allow for an attached

dwelling to the existing house along with a new freestanding three-bedroom house. Mr. Sari inquired what approval would be needed for the approval of a septic system by the City.

[15:43] S. Wolph gave his own experience and knowledge of septic approvals for smaller towns which usually includes a third party or someone from the State to approve of the test pits.

[16:55] D. Desfosses mentioned that he would like to be on site for the test pits and would like to be notified a few days in advance.

[17:05] Mr. Sari proceeded to go through the staff comments:

1. Septic System: DES approval for construction prior to building permit issuance, and approval for operation prior to certificate of occupancy.

Previously addressed.

2. Please confirm the existing septic can support the addition of the 2nd unit.

Previously addressed.

3. Please confirm the erosion control measures are temporary and will be removed after construction is complete.

Mr. Sari confirmed that the measures were all temporary and would be removed after construction and stabilization.

4. Please provide more information on the work in the conservation easement area and how it is consistent with the permitted uses defined in the conservation restriction deed.

The only work proposed in the easement area is work on the water line as well as the overhead electric line which appears to be allowed within the easement.

5. Although a landscaping plan is not necessary, please indicate which trees are to be removed and which trees are to remain.

The trees were not picked up in the survey but a row of trees will go away with one large tree remaining. No trees are being removed in the easement area. A conversation continued on the impacts to the easement area and P. Britz recommended that they inform the State of their plans due to the nature of the State Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP) easement.

[19:42] P. Howe asked about the business side of the farm and if it impacts the existing sewer services. Mr. Hett mentioned that the farm uses port-a-potties for with weekly pick ups for the business so there is no extra impact to the sewer.

[20:31] P. Howe asked if they had looked into a sprinkler system for the new attached building setup. He recommended that they look into a detached system and also requested that they address fire access on the plans.

[23:41] P. Britz asked for more details on the silt fence and potential grading changes. Mr. Sari responded that there will be no elevation changes and everything will remain at grade.

[24:15] S. Wolph asked for clarification on how the new addition will attach and noted that fire separation will be needed in between the two units which their architect will address. Mr. Hett and Mr. Sari agreed.

[25:05] M. Maloney asked the applicant how they planned to differentiate the different units with an address. Mr. Hett responded that they could label with A, B and C.

P. Howe and S. Wolph responded that in order to be consistent with the E911 handbook they will have to make the driveway a new street with a new name which could later have to go to the Planning Board and be accepted as a new road.

[27:56] Mr. Sari asked D. Desfosses if he was satisfied with the septic situation. D. Desfosses responded that he believed that they would need to put in a larger system or enhance the current system and add an additional one next to the new detached building proposed. S. Wolph added that he believed it would make more sense to have two separate facilities as well.

PUBLIC HEARING

[29:16] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[30:35] P. Howe made a motion to continue this application to the April meeting where the applicant will provide a revised plan showing the utilities and fire access. P. Britz seconded the motion to continue. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

V. ADJOURNMENT

[31:06] Z. Cronin made a motion to adjourn the meeting. P. Howe seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:29 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate E. Homet

Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee