

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

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

2:00 PM

February 6, 2024

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief, Vincent Hayes; Planner I – Development Compliance

MEMBERS ABSENT:

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

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

[1:45] Chairman Stith opened the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

[2:06] E. Eby made a motion to accept the January minutes as presented. P. Howe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Atlas Commons LLC (Owner)**, for property located on **581 Lafayette Road** requesting Site Plan review approval for two 4-story additions to the existing building that will total 72 residential units with associated site improvements including lighting, utilities, landscaping, and stormwater treatment/management. Said property is located on Assessor Map 229 Lot 8B and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-23-189)

[2:16] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

John Chagnon of Haley Ward, came to present the application along with Mark McNabb (developer), Tracy Kozak (architect), Terrence Parker (landscape architect), and Marie Bodi (McNabb Properties). Mr. Chagnon noted that they had received staff comments from the previous day and he proceeded to hand out a sheet with their responses to the comments.

[3:25] Mr. Chagnon proceeded to address each staff comment.

1. *Staff will require a document of support from Super Intendent to use the high school land for public realm improvements.*

Mr. Chagnon noted that this will be done prior to the Planning Board. Staff responded that they would like to see this all sorted out while in TAC and before the Planning Board.

2. *Staff would like the project to be completed by the applicant rather than a monetary contribution.*

They are in discussion with the School Department about this as there is an upcoming RFP they are publishing.

3. *Please connect the trail to existing infrastructure.*

They have revised the trail to now connect to Andrew Jarvis Drive. See Sheets C9 and C10.

4. *Please correct plan callouts to be fully visible (See C7 lower right corner).*

This label was cutoff and is visible on other pages but it is not really important to the calculation of open space.

5. *Space identified as "wide sidewalk: does not qualify as a wide sidewalk.*

Understood.

6. *Community space needs to meet the definition of community space.*

This has been updated on Sheet C8. There are three separate areas, wide pedestrian sidewalks, outdoor dining, and a pocket park. They will be asking for 6.4% community space where 10% is

required. This number will increase after inputting the feedback for the wide pedestrian sidewalk. Terrence Parker has updated landscape plans for the community space.

[14:27] P. Britz asked for more specific information on the community space types, especially the wide pedestrian sidewalks and the blue-colored space. He noted that they would have to talk offline about considering the offsite work as community space and any work in the right-of-way. A discussion ensued about the different possible park connections and the community space's purpose.

7. Is the courtyard space open to the public?

Yes, by deed as outdoor dining space.

8. Landscape plan and community space plan have different sidewalk designs.

The landscape plan will have a minor update to the current sidewalk.

9. Please confirm that the ADA parking spaces in the covered parking meet the minimum width for ADA. Support columns look like they may inhibit access.

The spaces on the right do have columns but there is five feet on either side for maneuvering outside of the columns. Updated parking plans have been passed out. The motorcycle spaces have been relocated and bicycle spaces have been added and offset the existing parking requirements. There are 65 bicycle spaces on site where 27 are required. The extra 38 bicycle spaces are being swapped for 3.5 required parking spaces for the new addition along with 2.2 parking spaces that were required by the existing restaurant use.

10. Please assign tandem parking spaces to units and confirm they conform to Section 10.1114.33

The tandem spaces will be assigned to the units during the final building permit process. A detail has been added to Note 10 on Sheet C3 and Note 5 on Sheet C4 to show this requirement.

11. Please include all levels of parking (interior and exterior) in parking plan

Please see Sheet C13 where everything has been included.

12. Please include designated ADA spaces in parking calculation table.

This is reflected in the updated plans, but it still needs to be updated on the chart.

13. See Site Plan Regulation 7.6.5 (1): In the maintenance plan for stormwater devices, remove “if required”. An annual inspection and maintenance report is required. Please submit to the Department of Public Works.

A page has been attached in the report which strikes out that ‘if required’ note.

14. Please move the proposed transformer from its current location in the landscaped island – this will interfere with the infiltration of stormwater into the landscaped island.

This has been removed and the open space calculation has not changed.

15. According to 10.5A44.41 in the Zoning Ordinance: you must provide 1 landscaped island for every 10 parking spaces (A). A landscaped island must be at least 325 s.f. in area (C) and be at least 9-ft wide (Site Plan Regulation 6.6-3). Please demonstrate your compliance with these requirements.

The applicant would like to keep the parking as it is currently shown, without additional landscaped islands. Three are required but only two are being provided. They could lose a parking space if it is desired but are requesting a waiver from this regulation.

16. “No Right Hand Turn” signs should be added to the detail sheet, and locations of signs shown on plan.

See the new detail on Sheet D6. E. Eby would like to see this sign changed to an arrow with a circle through it and it updated on Sheet C3 with its location.

17. Provide summary of accessible parking spaces required and provided.

The plans will be updated.

18. Show how new buildings sewer will connect to the proposed sewer service.

These connections have been shown on the updated utility plans.

19. What is the proposed water demand and proposed flows to the sewer from the new development?

See Note 4 on Sheet C5 for the sewer flow calculations.

20. Provide profile of sewer service.

The sewer service is internal with a short section outside the building. Photos have been included to show the profile.

21. How will the sewer service be protected from cars and pedestrians?

There will be bollards and shields, a note has been added to Sheet C4.

22. Non buried sewer service subject to environmental conditions. May require expansion joints.

Mr. Chagnon's understanding is that the sewer in the basement would be at a pretty constant temperature. But the pipe type, joint type, and grout selection for the through connections for the final building plans will address that issue.

23. SDR 35 pipe may not be suitable for non buried applications.

The newly attached photo show that SDR.

24. Need details on pipe hangers, cleanouts, and connections.

This will be detailed on the Building Permit plans.

25. What is the proposed flow rate of the pump station?

The detail has been added to Sheet D6, it will be 500 gal/day with the pump running at 20 gal/minute.

26. What are the float elevations in the proposed pump station?

All the elevations are now included in Sheet D6.

27. Details on proposed pump station show 1 ½" discharge pipe and utility plan shows 2". Confirm size and pipe materials.

The detail has been revised to show 2" pipes only.

28. Sheet C4 shows sewer service size as 6" and utility plan shows 8". Correct.

This will be 8".

[43:10] E. Eby asked about the loading area and the five adjacent parking spaces on the Level 1 parking plan and wondered how cars could get out if there was loading happening.

Ms. Kozak responded that those parking spaces could be made into tandem spaces.

[43:55] Z. Cronin asked about parking spot 41 and whether it cut into the corner. Ms. Kozak responded that it does and they will adjust it.

[44:30] S. Casella noted that the requirement for the tandem spaces is a 9' width but the ones displayed on the parking plan are only 8.5'. Ms. Kozak responded that they could make those adjustments.

[45:39] S. Casella asked E. Eby if handicap spots were allowed to be tandem. E. Eby did not know if there were requirements for that. Ms. Kozak responded that the tandem handicap space was a bonus, one more than they were required to provide. A discussion ensued about the requirements for assigned handicap spaces. Staff will look into this.

[47:27] E. Eby asked about the bollards used to protect the sewer line, which would have to be placed in the parking space, cutting into the length on the space. Would more length be needed for the parking space? Z. Cronin noted that this was one of the reasons for wanting to see the sewer profile. Mr. Chagnon responded that they would be about 5' off the floor. A discussion continued about potential dimensional requirements of bollards and how this would include bollards inside the parking spaces, not outside the spaces. Ms. Kozak noted that they had 2' of extra space for each parking space that they could use and an extra 1' of free space in front of each parking space which they could use to place the bollards in.

[51:48] Z. Cronin noted that the photos provided show a pipe type that is not SDR-35.

[52:35] P. Howe asked if the sprinkler system would all be 1' for all three buildings. Mr. Chagnon responded that this was still early in the process for them and they were talking about a second system, but it may be better for them to be connected together. They would have internal systems at the sprinkler room at the existing location and again at the new proposed sprinkler room in the proposed Building B. P. Howe asked if there would still be a riser. Mr. Chagnon responded yes. P. Howe noted that the fire department connection there would no longer be very accessible to the department, but they could deal with this during the sprinkler planning. The issue is the location of the hydrant. He was wondering if any yard hydrants were proposed, which would be necessary. Mr. McNabb agreed that they could add a hydrant to the plans. D. Desfosses noted that they would need a hydrant maintenance agreement to go along with the installation of a new hydrant. The discussion continued about the best locations for a new hydrant. Mr. McNabb stated that a note will be added to the plans that a final location for the hydrant will be decided with the Fire Department's input.

[56:47] P. Britz raised the issue of the parking on the NH DOT right of way. He wanted to know how it currently exists. Mr. Chagnon responded that if this was to go to the Planning Board, he would compare this issue with Route 1A in Rye and how that stretch has a 100' right of way that the public parks on. P. Britz asked if there was any information on the parking from the last

application for development of this site. Mr. McNabb responded that it had been there for decades and the encroachment was on the state's plan, with no showing of it being taken out. He noted that they could condition it so that in any event, that is not the case with the state, there will be a violation that can be corrected. P. Britz said it would be nice to have the documentation to support this. Mr. McNabb noted that the documentation would be the state's plan which Mr. Chagnon included in the latest packet in the supplemental materials.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

[59:50] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The hearing closed.

IV. DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:00:05] E. Eby asked if the five parallel spaces in the basement plans were 20' long. Ms. Kozak responded they are 19' x 8' 6" in dimension.

[1:01:04] S. Casella noted that the stall requirements are for 20' in length. Ms. Kozak said they could adjust those.

[1:01:29] E. Eby asked about the Level 1 floor plan and whether there was anything to prevent the eight vehicles pulling in from under the overhang from blocking the bicycles and scooters. Ms. Kozak and others agreed that a curb stop could do this.

[1:01:56] Mr. McNabb mentioned that they could fix everything discussed and proceed onto the Planning Board. P. Britz responded that there are a lot of comments and edits, and they just had received revisions the day of and staff is not comfortable sending things onto the Planning Board before TAC members can wrap their heads around it. He did not feel this application was ready for the Planning Board with the bits and pieces they had and with missing calculations for community spaces, parking space details, waiver details, etc.

[1:03:28] Mr. McNabb said that he did not agree with this but he did not have a vote. E. Eby agreed with P. Britz that he would like to have more time to review updates to the parking. Z. Cronin also agreed and noted that he needed more time to review the sewer details.

[1:04:07] P. Britz made a motion to postpone the application to the next TAC meeting so that the applicants could address the issues raised. E. Eby seconded the motion.

[1:04:32] P. Britz mentioned that he would like to see an easement plan before sending to the Planning Board. D. Desfosses noted that he would like to see a plan of where the landscaping is planned to be maintained, especially the off-property ones. He wanted the applicant to take care of the cross-section of sidewalk (the sidewalk going into the parking lot and the sidewalk on Ledgewood Drive) that goes where the road used to be because it is their landscaping from their property to that sidewalk. D. Desfosses also noted that the public realm improvements must be ADA compliant and this must be shown on the plan. Additionally, a fire hydrant maintenance agreement must be in place. P. Britz mentioned that he would talk to the Legal Department about the NHDOT issue with encroachment.

[1:08:02] Mr. Chagnon responded that they would like to set up two meetings to go over everything, with legal and on the other issues.

[1:08:16] Ms. Bodi spoke to the letter from the Superintendent, saying that staff had communicated with the group saying that it would not be an issue if there was no agreement just yet. Ms. Bodi noted Mr. McNabb's frustration and that of the team that there had been so many staff comments for the application that had not been previously brought up. The minutia of focus from the last month to the current month was different.

P. Britz responded that this was a very complicated plan and they would not be sending anything to the Planning Board that was half-baked and had non-compliant parts. They would like to get a product to the Planning Board that staff feels comfortable with and the current application merits the amount of focus that staff is giving to it.

[1:09:52] Ms. Bodi asked about why the staff did not prefer a donation to public realm improvements. P. Britz responded that they could not represent the wishes of the superintendent and would prefer to wait to see what they say. Staff would prefer to see what is proposed being built and that it is viable. A discussion continued about public realm improvements and potential agreements. Ms. Bodi asked if there had been any communication between TAC members and the school department about this, staff responded that they had not.

[1:11:50] The motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

[1:11:58] Z. Cronin made a motion to adjourn. P. Howe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate E. Homet
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee