

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

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

2:00 PM

August 6, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

Stefanie Casella, Planner II

MINUTES

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

- B. Approval of minutes from the July 2, 2024 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

[3:02] E. Eby made a motion to accept both sets of minutes. P. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

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)

[3:12] Chairman Stith announced that this application was still postponed as they are awaiting a third-party review.

- 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

[4:45] Brett Benson, Andrew Hayes, Nick Aceto and Neil Hansen came to present this application. Mr. Benson ran through a slideshow with project updates that have occurred since the last TAC meeting. These included: the community building for residents would now be included in a residential building and not a stand alone building, buildings have been moved further from the wetland buffer since the April submission, and stormwater system changes. Mr. Benson and Mr. Aceto went over site constraints, wetland buffer impacts, the proposed open spaces, community spaces and landscaping. Mr. Hansen and Mr. Aceto then addressed staff comments:

1. Please demonstrate how you are complying with the City's landscaped island standards in Site Plan Regs Section 6.6.

They believe they are in compliance with larger than needed landscaped island widths and deliberate placements.

2. Please update plant quantities on landscape plan (Sheet L-300)

They full intend to do this and need to work with the client to work through the quantities.

3. If hardscaping is planned for areas of the wetland buffer (bituminous paving and granite steps on the north side), please provide impact numbers (Sheet L-200).

They believe have accounted for all of the hardscaping areas within the impervious calculations.

4. Please share more details on shared multi modal way and how it will promote slow traffic.

The intent of the multi-modal way is to provide traffic calming with street trees, on-street parking and landscaped islands. The intent is to provide visual friction as you move along the corridor in a vehicle.

5. Does the sheltered parking have solar?

They are continuing to study this, the orientation is optimal for solar and they believe it will be easy to accommodate solar panels.

6. Please explain why lots 2 and 3 can not be combined into one lot.
7. Please demonstrate vehicular and utility access for all lots to/from a public way.

To answer comments 6 and 7 - the intent is to preserve the three lots that exist today at the property and they have proposed to redraw the lot lines to not impose on the proposed structures. Their intent is to have a master easement agreement across the three properties to link them all together.

8. Weston & Sampson and the City's legal department have agreed on the three-party agreement contract language. It will be issued shortly. Staff will provide more comments after report has been issued.

The third-party review for stormwater is coming from the AOT review from NHDES. This will be submitted in the next submission.

[19:29] C. Putney asked the applicants to show the fire hydrant locations in their final submission and to include arrows in their wayfinding pointing towards the buildings they indicate.

[20:05] P. Britz noted that it looks like there had been an improvement with the previous path going through the rain garden and the current proposal looks easier for maintenance of the rain garden. He asked if the proposed seating would be an issue for mowing, the applicants responded no. P. Britz also noted that the newly proposed guardrail to discourage foot traffic was a good addition. Mr. Hayes noted the improvement in the wetland buffer and the overall reduction of impervious throughout the whole site.

[22:41] S. Wolph asked if the parcel lines would be reconfigured so that there would be nothing going through buildings. Mr. Hansen responded that no lot lines would be going through the buildings and all of the existing access and utility easements would be cleaned up and reconfigured for the newly proposed roadway layout. Mr. Benson noted that there would be imaginary lot lines drawn between the buildings to help distinguish fire separation distances. Mr. Hayes noted that for the easement agreements, their intent is to record the easement agreements as a condition precedent to the building permit. P. Britz responded that they will need an easement plan to show all the proposed easements, especially the cross easements between lots. Mr. Hansen responded that there were separate easement plan sheets in the back of the current application.

[25:05] D. Desfosses mentioned a few things for the applicants to consider before the next submission. He apologized for the delay of the third-party review from Weston and Sampson and noted that DPW has not reviewed those plans because they are awaiting Weston and Sampson. The engineering comments from DPW are forthcoming. Additionally, he is not satisfied with the access to the hotel by building #1. He believes that the hotel should have its own driveway off of the access road. He noted that would be okay with submitting to NHDES and DPW just reviewing

their comments when it comes to stormwater. Mr. Hayes noted that they had studied multiple configurations for the hotel access and could schedule a follow-up meeting to discuss those in more detail.

[27:00] P. Britz asked what had happened to the rain garden that had previously been proposed for the entry area. Mr. Hansen noted that as part of this TAC application, it had not changed but as part of the submission for the Conservation Commission in August, updated plans show the rain garden removed from that area. The stormwater and drainage system had been reconfigured to deal with this. The greenspace in the roundabout will be a planted space. D. Desfosses asked about the City stormwater system within that area and Mr. Hansen responded and they discussed an easement proposal for the City stormwater system. Once the third-party stormwater is received, D. Desfosses noted that they would have to have discussions about off-site improvements.

PUBLIC HEARING

[29:17] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing.

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough Street came to speak. She mentioned that she had sent a letter as well. She is hoping that the northern park will be passive, as was encouraged by the Conservation Commission. She did list some concerns about the traffic study and its study area, comments made during the July Conservation Commission meeting that she would like to see addressed, had questions about the rain gardens and where they drained to and wondered what had happened to previous plan iterations showing a retaining wall.

[33:52] Chairman Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[34:18] Chairman Stith considered a motion to postpone. D. Desfosses made the motion to postpone this application. Z. Cronin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Ricci Lumber (Applicant) Portsmouth Hardware & Lumber LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street** requesting Site Plan Review Approval for the demolition of existing sheds and construction of three new storage sheds with associated site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 157 Lot 2 and lies within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W) District. (LU-24-132)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[35:15] Pat Moretti (Ricci Lumber), Ed Hayes (property owner), Neil Hansen (Tighe & Bond) and Bret Kelly (Kodiak Building Partners) came to present this application. Mr. Moretti mentioned that this had been an ongoing project and they were currently addressing phase two which is the removal of some older wooden structures and replacement with modern structures. In a previous submission, they were considering a barn structure that would overhang part of an existing sewer

easement and have since removed that impediment from the project. The new proposed shed barn will be off the easement by 10-11 feet. Existing lighting would remain the same for this project and stormwater separation would be addressed during the construction of these buildings. The existing exit routes remain the same. Proposed fire requirements have been submitted and they are awaiting review. Any new fencing will conform to City requirements or seek a variance for approvals.

Mr. Moretti then addressed one of the comments sent by staff:

1. Please submit a green building statement or submit a waiver from this requirement.

This has been drafted and will be submitted.

[40:55] Mr. Hayes mentioned that the upcoming construction project adjacent to the lumber yard would be addressing the separation of sewer and stormwater shortly. He also noted that any need for an easement between this property and the railroad will be done and the property owners have a good relationship with the railroad and will work with them on whatever they need.

2. Lot merger must be part of proposed project.

This is acceptable to the property owner.

[42:55] E. Eby asked Mr. Hayes which railroad company he has had discussion with. Mr. Hayes responded that it is the same group who used to be Boston and Maine and Pan Am.

[43:37] S. Wolph asked if they would need an easement for maintenance from the railroad. Mr. Hayes said that once the buildings are built, there should be a few feet to work within for maintenance needs. They will be steel-sided buildings and should not require much maintenance. The space between the property line does get very tight in some areas. S. Wolph also mentioned that they agree about not needing to sprinkler the building and that they could put the buildings closer with more fire prevention techniques in the wall. C. Putney noted that any padlocking that is proposed would have to go through the Fire Department's Knox system. Any electronic gates would need an override Knox key provided to the Fire Department.

[47:25] Chairman Stith asked if the applicants would be constructing Building #3 at all. Mr. Moretti stated that the ground down at Building #3 is not as good as where they are currently working so it will take significant work to get the foundation in. This also means that it will be over budget so they will be looking to install that later down the road. C. Putney asked about emergency egress lighting and Mr. Moretti stated that the business closes at 4:30 every day so there should be enough natural lighting for all the proposed new buildings.

3. Please inform Robert Previti of lot merger proposal.

[49:41] *Mr. Moretti addressed this staff comment and said that he had contacted Mr. Previti and left him a voicemail.*

4. Provide distance between proposed buildings and the sewer main as well as distance to sewer easement.

[49:09] Mr. Hansen responded to this comment and noted that he had pulled those dimensions and would put them on the plans going forward. For Building #1, it is 11.4' from the building footing to the edge of the easement and 21.4' from the centerline of the sewer. Building #2 is 25.5' from the footing to the edge of the easement and 35.5' to the centerline of the sewer.

5. Include maintenance easement to benefit City outside of current easement that allows the City to place shoring or other necessary measures to protect your foundations in the event that replacement or maintenance is necessary on the sewer main.

[50:02] Mr. Moretti asked what the City would be looking for in a maintenance easement. Z. Cronin responded that if there is an issue with the sewer main, they will need to dig down pretty deep and DPW would need to establish shoring enough to protect the foundations of the proposed new buildings. DPW is looking for the right to put shoring further outside of the existing easement potentially in order to protect the buildings in case of a sewer impact. D. Desfosses noted that this could be done with a note on the plan that should cover how if sewer maintenance is needed, the property owners would allow the City to maintain it.

6. All comments are in regards to proposed buildings 1 and 2. No comments are being provided for proposed future building 3. Proposed future building 3 may be too close to the sewer main to be constructable and will need to return to TAC.

A statement has been supplied stating that they are not pursuing the construction of Building #3 at this time. It will also be removed from the site plans prior to going to the Planning Board.

[52:36] D. Desfosses noted that last time the applicants were before them, the truck turning templates did not look possible. Mr. Hansen noted that they had submitted new truck turning templates and went through the turning radii and the delivery traffic patterns. Discussion continued about the possible turning methods. Mr. Hansen will adjust the curb in one spot and the template will be readjusted to respond to DPW feedback.

PUBLIC HEARING

[58:01] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[58:22] S. Wolph made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Board with the following condition:

1. Applicant will submit new turning movements to DPW prior to Planning Board submission demonstrating that trucks can exit through the rear gate.

C. Putney seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. A discussion continued about the timeline for submitting materials to DPW prior to the next Planning Board submission.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

DRAFT