

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

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

2:00 PM

July 2, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Chad Putney, Fire Prevention Officer; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief, Vincent Hayes; Land Use Compliance Agent/Associate Planner

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

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

MINUTES

[2:42] Chairman Stith opened the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the June 4, 2024 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

[2:54] Chairman Stith announced that the June meeting minutes would be available for review in July.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The request of **635 Sagamore Development LLC (Owner)**, For property located at **635 Sagamore Avenue** requesting Site Plan approval for the removal of the existing structures and construction of 4 single-family dwellings on one lot with associated site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 222 Lot 19 and lies within the Single Residence A (SRA) District. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE (LU-22-209)**

[3:17] Chairman Stith announced that the applicants for 635 Sagamore Avenue had requested postponement, and this item would be skipped.

- B. The request of **Oak Street Real Estate Capital (Owner), 100 Durgin Lane Owner, LLC (Applicant)**, for property located at **100 Durgin Lane** requesting Subdivision approval of a lot line adjustment and Site Plan Review approval for the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of 360 rental housing units in a mix of 3-story and 4-story buildings with associated site improvements including parking, pedestrian access, community spaces, utilities, stormwater management, lighting, and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 239 Lot 18 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-24-62)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[4:25] Brett Benson (project architect), Colleen Sloan (landscaper), Andrew Hayes (owner representative), and Patrick Crimmins (engineer) came to present this application. Mr. Benson went through a brief PowerPoint presentation giving an overview of the project and the recent changes that occurred after receiving staff feedback and feedback from the Conservation Commission.

[13:48] Z. Cronin noted that he had reached out to Weston and Sampson again regarding the flow monitoring which DPW wants included as part of the third-party review. The City is working with Weston and Sampson to get that review ready soon. Chairman Stith noted that he understood all frustrations with regards to getting third party reviews in place and it has been tough to get quick responses from the third parties.

[15:23] Chairman Stith asked the applicants how conversations with Hampton Inn have been going. Mr. Hayes responded that they have been speaking to the business people at Hampton Inn and they are supportive of the changes at this point but ultimately it is within the hands of the legal team so they are awaiting comments on that.

[16:00] K. Homet asked a clarifying question about a comment made in the PowerPoint presentation regarding the rain gardens and that community space could be removed from the unusable areas of the rain gardens. Ms. Sloan responded that the unusable areas would be the stormwater retention space in the center. K. Homet asked if the community space would be cut out of the sloped edges as well and Ms. Sloan responded that steps and access would be incorporated there so it can still be community space.

[16:52] P. Howe noted that he could not fully evaluate the truck turning templates until they there is a confirmed and agreed upon layout with the Hampton Inn. The current plans look tight, and P. Howe expressed concerns for hitting parked cars with this layout. They do not want to see wheels nor the vehicle tracking right up against a parking space. Additionally, some of the turns should be shown from coming from both directions. Mr. Hayes asked if they could have a follow up meeting to discuss all the truck turning pinch points. P. Howe agreed.

[18:29] E. Eby asked about the roadway leading to Motel 6 and the church and whether the applicants needed to provide two-way access on that road. Mr. Hayes responded that they do as part of the current easement. E. Eby noted that if they were able to make it one-way it could allow for more pedestrian opportunities.

PUBLIC HEARING

[19:14] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[19:37] E. Eby noted that they were still waiting for the traffic peer review. Chairman Stith noted that it would be good to see what happens at the Conservation Commission in the following week.

[19:59] Z. Cronin made a motion to postpone the application. D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

C. The request of **Christ Church Parish, (Owner), Portsmouth Housing Authority (Applicant)**, for property located at **1035 Lafayette Road** seeking Conditional Use Permits from Section 10.5B41.10 for a Development Site, from Section 10.5B72 for density bonus incentive for increased dwelling units per building and a Conditional Use Permit from Section 10.1112.14 to provide less than the required parking and Site Plan Review Approval for construction of a 4-story, 44-unit multi-family residential building to the south of the existing church building, conversion of the first-floor of the existing church into office space and construction of a 7-unit transitional housing addition. The lower level of the existing church will be renovated for the daycare and the church will be relocated to the existing rectory building on the site. The project will include associated site improvements such as parking, pedestrian connections, access to public transportation, utilities, stormwater management, lighting, and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 246 Lot 1 and lies within the Gateway Center (G2) District. (LU-24-92)

[20:41] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[21:50] Neil Hansen (engineer), Patrick Crimmins (engineer), Mark Lentz (Portsmouth Housing Authority) and Robbie Woodburn (landscape architect) came to present this application. Mr. Hansen explained that they had come before the Committee the previous month and the most recent submission addresses the comments from that meeting. Ms. Woodburn and Mr. Hansen proceeded to address the most recent comments sent by members of TAC:

1. Please demonstrate compliance with site plan review regs Section 6.6 (3-6)
Ms. Woodburn described the existing landscaping conditions and the proposed conditions. They will adjust as necessary in order to meet the 9' wide landscaped island standard.
2. Please provide the proposed water source for irrigation.

They are not planning for permanent irrigation on site.

3. Please provide a progress update on the creation of an onsite transit stop.

As of now, they are showing the location of the bus stop on the site plan and COAST is planning to bring their service onto the site in front of the existing church building.

4. Do not install water and sewer under the stairway to Lafayette.

D. Desfosses noted that utilities should be installed under the wall.

5. SMH1 should not be installed in the sidewalk.

The applicants will see if they can remove it, DPW does not want it in the right of way.

6. Do not install thrust block behind the 1" water service connection.

This will be removed.

7. State need for 4" domestic service to church building. May be oversized.

They can do a 4" fire and 2" domestic but they will confirm this.

8. State proposed invert in elevation to existing SMH on Lafayette.

The applicants will look into removing this.

9. Change POCS 3 to an internal drop manhole and move structure farther north so it discharges at lower elevation and is less likely to cause erosion.

They are trying to avoid discharging into the wetland buffer. D. Desfosses from DPW will have an onsite meeting with Tighe and Bond to review this.

10. Confirm that the orifices on POCS 01 and POCS02 have grates over them.

This is the intent, it will be labeled.

11. Drainage connection to Lafayette Road will require excavation permit from NHDOT.

This is acknowledged. The applicants are currently finalizing their traffic study to submit to NHDOT.

12. Ensure the stairs and sidewalk connection to Lafayette Road sidewalks meet ADA requirements.

They will show the detail of this.

13. Public works is waiting for the traffic study before traffic related comment.

This will be finished within the next week or two. Tighe and Bond is waiting for word from NHDOT stating they are in line with the volume correction that is to be used for the study.

[32:33] Mr. Hansen stated that the applicants were hoping to be moved along to the Planning Board meeting for August so that they can get their funding lined up to start constructing this project by next year.

[33:08] Chairman Stith asked for clarification on whether Coast would place a transit stop on the site. Mr. Hansen responded that they would. Chairman Stith asked if that affected the CUP for parking. Mr. Hansen responded that the CUP for parking is related to the daycare use.

[33:56] P. Howe asked if there was a way to get the turnaround designed so that the truck could make it all the way around whereas it currently is unable with the proposed design. Any turnaround should comply with the IFC Annex and they generally try to avoid turnarounds and backing up trucks on every call if they go there. They do not necessarily need a 20' minimum on the one-way side. Mr. Hansen noted that it was likely able to be done and they will go back and inspect how to reconfigure this.

[35:57] P. Howe noted that his last comment for the applicants is that the building on the right-hand side, if it does not have an assembly use or residential use, then it will not need to be sprinklered. If that changes, they might have to sprinkler that building.

[37:10] V. Hayes asked if there should be plantings and fencing inside the cemetery buffer on the landscape plan? Ms. Woodburn responded that the proposed fence is beyond the cemetery 25' buffer and the three trees shown are existing.

PUBLIC HEARING

[38:06] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing.

[38:20] North Sturtevant from JSA wanted to make sure that the existing church building, as far as the sprinkler system goes, and its residential addition, would be fully sprinklered. P. Howe noted that the existing church building will be NFP 13 sprinklered, he noted that in previous comments he had been referring to the rectory, not the addition.

[39:19] Chairman Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[39:21] E. Eby asked the applicants about the EV parking spaces and if the utilities should be shown as directed to those parking spots on the utility plan. Mr. Hansen responded that they would do this.

[39:55] Chairman Stith noted that there were two outstanding items – a traffic study and a truck turning template. But the truck turning template could be reviewed by the Fire Department separately.

[40:37] Z. Cronin asked Mr. Hansen if he knew the existing and proposed water usage of the development. Mr. Hansen responded that he did not. Z. Cronin noted that the DPW outstanding items include:

1. The size of the domestic and fire services line
2. The location of the sewer connection
3. The final configuration of the outlet for stormwater
4. The traffic circulation study

[41:50] E. Eby noted that as far as the traffic study goes, he is not concerned with the study holding up the application because he thinks there shouldn't be any major issues. Mr. Hansen noted that the traffic study will be ready before the Planning Board submission. E. Eby would be comfortable reviewing it at a later time.

[43:57] Chairman Stith listed the conditions that ne noted were applicable to a motion for this application:

1. Applicant shall provide information on the existing and proposed water usage on site.
2. Applicant shall update the truck turning template.
3. Applicant shall provide a traffic study to be reviewed by DPW.
4. Applicant shall adjust the sizes of the fire and domestic service lines.
5. Applicant shall identify the sewer connection location.
6. Applicant shall confirm stormwater outlet configuration to be reviewed by DPW.

[44:52] E. Eby made a motion to recommend approval of this application to the Planning Board with the previously stated stipulations. D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUISINESS

- A.** The request of **Lonza Biologics (Owner)**, for property located at **101 International Drive** requesting Site Plan Approval for the addition of two (2) industrial equalization (EQ) tanks and one (1) pump house located between the EQ Tanks that will include portions of the existing detention basin to be regraded. Installation of a new outlet structure to support the resized detention basin and a stormwater filtration system are proposed with this project. Said property is located on Assessor Map 305 Lot 6 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District. (LU-24-112)

[45:32] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[46:11] Neil Hansen and Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond, along with Christopher Tiernan from Lonza came to present this application. Mr. Hansen explained the project which is to construct two equalizer tanks at Lonza for their industrial wastewater permit compliance. They have existing tanks on site that are currently undersized for the needs of the facility. As part of this project, they are looking to resize the existing retention basin. This will include replacing the outlet structure and the addition of post-detention treatment. This means that 30% of the water flow will be treated in a jellyfish filter, which is a two-year storm event equivalent. This will provide a significant upgrade to the stormwater discharge from this site. Mr. Hansen then addressed the two staff comments received prior to the meeting:

1. *Clean the drainage swale from Goose Bay to Corporate and on Corporate Drive.*

Lonza is committed to performing this maintenance as required by the City, PDA and the State.

2. *Show connection of utilities from existing building to new building.*

They will add those into the package for the next submission. There will be no offsite utility connections for this.

[50:05] P. Howe asked if the wastewater would eventually go into the wastewater for Pease. Mr. Hansen responded that yes, this wastewater goes through a waste neutralization process before going into the City system.

[50:56] Z. Cronin asked if this would go through the IPP process for industrial pre-treatment and the City's coordinator for this. Mr. Tiernan said he was not sure but would confirm.

[51:50] P. Howe asked what was being neutralized. Mr. Hansen responded that he was not entirely sure but that the process involved temperature, pH levels, etc. and they were not aware of any placarding or labeling requirements.

PUBLIC HEARING

[52:39] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[54:43] Chairman Stith asked about some of the PDA comments and the applicants' responses. Specifically, there was a comment about protecting Hodgsons Brook during construction. Mr. Hansen responded that it would primarily be the contractor's responsibility for monitoring discharge. Mr. Hansen had suggested that a method that could be used by contractors would include putting a plug in the outlet pipe and bypass and discharge into a silt bag which would be for when the new outlet structure and treatment system were being installed. He mentioned that all of the standard erosion control notes are on these plans.

[57:22] D. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval of this application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

1. Clean the drainage swale from Goose Bay to Corporate and on Corporate Drive.
2. Show connection of utilities from existing building to new building.
3. Applicant confirms that communication has started between the City Engineer and the Industrial Pre-Treatment Coordinator. Confirm that permits have been acquired as necessary.

E. Eby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** The request of **231 Corporate Drive LLC (Owner)**, for property located at 231 Corporate Drive requesting Site Plan Review Approval for the construction of a 2,340 SF addition for a linear accelerator vault to support the veterinary hospital. The project includes removal of a row of parking which will reduce overall impervious surface impacts within the wetland buffer by approximately 8,801 SF. The project consists of associated site improvements such as lighting, landscaping, and stormwater management. Said property is located on Assessor Map 314 Lot 2 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District. (LU-24-114)

[57:58] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[58:50] Neil Hansen and Patrick Crimmins of Tighe and Bond came to present this application. Mr. Hansen briefly explained the project which is for an addition to place a linear accelerator vault for a veterinary office and associated parking lot rearrangements which will include a substantial improvement to the wetland buffer on site. Mr. Hansen also addressed comments sent by staff:

1. *The door off of the new addition should be tied into the surrounding sidewalk.*

This can be added as a connection from the sidewalk.

2. *PSMH 01 should be cut in and not a doghouse manhole.*

They will more clearly detail this, it was their intent.

3. *Sewer service from new addition should be 6”.*

This will be corrected.

4. *State sizes of existing fire and domestic water services.*

The existing fire service is 6” and the domestic water service is 4”.

[1:01:24] Chairman Stith asked what the variances they needed were for. Mr. Hansen responded that they were for the use and for the fence being located between the front of the building and the street.

[1:02:12] S. Wolph asked if elevations were included in the packet. Mr. Hansen responded that they only included the floor plan sheet.

[1:02:41] K. Homet asked if the lighting for the parking lot was dark-sky friendly. Mr. Hansen responded that they would verify with the lighting designer but that it was their intent to be dark-sky friendly. K. Homet asked if they could include a note on the plans detailing this. Mr. Hansen responded that they would.

[1:03:18] E. Eby asked what a linear accelerator was. S. Wolph responded that it helped to treat cancer by speeding up the electrons.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:04:40] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:04:52] D. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

1. *The door off of the new addition should be tied into the surrounding sidewalk.*
2. *PSMH 01 should be cut in and not a doghouse manhole.*
3. *Sewer service from new addition should be 6”.*
4. *State sizes of existing fire and domestic water services.*
5. *All proposed lighting shall be Dark Sky compliant.*

Z. Cronin seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate E. Homet
Associate Environmental Planner