

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

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

2:00 PM

AUGUST 1, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Peter Stith, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector; Patrick Howe, Fire Department.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planner Director;

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **165 Deer Street**, (“Lot 3”), requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an existing building and the construction of a 5-story mixed use building (including a residential units, hotel, restaurant, retail sales and a 1st floor parking garage) with a footprint of 22,073 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 99,307 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17 and lies within the CD5 District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). (This application was postponed at the July 5, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the September 5, 2017 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **181 Hill Street**, (“Lot 6”), requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an existing building and the construction of a 5-story mixed use building (including residential units, a retail bank, office use, retail sales and a two level parking garage) with a footprint of 17,973 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 81,498 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17-2 and lies within the CD5 District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the July 5, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the September 5, 2017 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
C. The application of **409 Franklin Pierce Highway, LLC, Owner**, for four vacant lots located **off Woodworth Avenue and Swett Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to consolidate and reconfigure lot lines to create two lots as follows:

1. Assessors Map 243, Lot 25 consisting of 8,492 s.f. being merged and eliminated;
2. Assessors Map 243, Lot 26 increasing from 10,181 s.f. to 14, 411 s.f. with 0’ of continuous street frontage.
3. Assessors Map 243, Lot 27 increasing from 10,615 s.f. to 27,681 s.f. with 0’ of continuous street frontage.
4. Assessors Map 243, Lot 28 consisting of 12,804 s.f. being merged and eliminated.

A variance was granted on April 25, 2017 by the Board of Adjustment to allow 0’ of continuous street frontage. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 243 as Lots 25, 26, 27, and 28 and lie within the Single Residence B (SRB) District where the minimum lot area is 15,000 s.f. and the minimum continuous street frontage is 100’. (This application was postponed at the July 5, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering, provided an overview of the project. The application has been through city council to get approval to work on the paper streets and zoning. The applicants have been working with TAC for a while. In the last meeting there were two separate driveways. The applicants have since worked with the abutter, Mr. Hoeman, and an agreement has been reached to have a shared driveway with the three units. The turn around area has been extended so a fire truck can access the property. The abutter will be losing some of the gravel area. The agreement is to give the Mr. Hoeman license to use some area of the gravel on the applicant’s property as long as the Mr. Hoeman owns his property. There was concern about the sewer line going next to two maple trees, so the applicants have moved the sewer away from the maple trees. The rain garden area has been changed to just be a lawn area. The width of the roadway start starts at 18 feet then slowly tapers down to 13 feet wide where the hydrant is, then it widens back to 18 feet. It would be difficult to widen the road to 18 feet the whole way because of abutters. Some of the hill will be removed, it is steep and there is a blind spot. Taking out two feet at the top would improve sightlines.

Mr. Eby pointed out a typo with the easements. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they would fix it.

Mr. Eby noted concern about the hill because it is a blind spot, and requested a mock up of the profile of the new hill to see what it would look like. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that could be done.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if the applicants have authorization to remove a portion of the driveway on the abutter’s side and move to where it’s shown. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed yes and added that the abutters did support it.

Mr. Cracknell questioned why the applicants were removing half of the gravel area and are leaving the other half. Mr. Weinrieb responded that this is at the request of the abutter, so they could continue to park there. The applicants are giving the abutter a license to continue to use the gravel driveway. There may or may not be a fence added to provide privacy. Mr. Cracknell questioned if what the applicant will be putting in would be paved? Mr. Weinrieb confirmed this. Mr. Cracknell noted that a fence would be a good idea. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they would like to keep the fence in the plan as optional.

Mr. Desfosses commented that final plan needs to reflect what has been discussed in the meeting. The next iteration of the final plan will need to show how the project will be constructed, profile views, and mockups. Mr. Desfosses noted that the driveway needs to be 18 feet the whole way.

Mr. Britz echoed that taking off some height of the hill would be safer.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the area where the road extension is located is on a city lot not a right of way. The applicants may need city permission to pave on top of it.

Mr. Pezzullo noted that the ownership and maintenance of the private forced main should be an agreement between the parties using it. The applicants need to ensure there is an agreement there because it's the responsibility of the homeowners, not the city. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed this would be done.

Mr. Pezzullo suggested the applicants extend a little beyond the pavement, 20 feet or so, to account for snow storage for the city. Mr. Weinrieb responded this could be done. Mr. Britz questioned if that would still be outside the buffer. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it would be.

Mr. Pezzullo noted the limits for city plowing vs. private driveway ownership and maintenance need to be clear. Mr. Weinrieb responded that this has not been addressed, and thought the Department of Public Works would sort that out. Mr. Weinrieb noted that the applicants assume the city would be responsible for only within the sweat right of way not the turn around. Mr. Pezzullo responded is just needs to be clear on that and an agreement needs to be made.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that the sweat needs to meet the standards, and the applicants need to provide profiles. Mr. Weinrieb asked for clarification on how wide the committee was asking for. Mr. Pezzullo responded that they are looking for a minimum of 18 feet.

Mr. Weinrieb summarized the concerns about the roadway. Right now the drive starts at 18 feet tapers to 13 then widens back out to 18 feet. The applicant's preference is to not have the driveway be 18 feet the whole way. It would taper to 16 then widen to 18 feet. As far as meeting the city standards of vertical curves, the applicants cannot do that. If more than 2 feet is taken out of there, then it will be beyond the right of way. The abutter is supportive of the project as long as the applicants maintain the two maple trees. The applicants request the drive begin at 18 feet then taper to 16 feet then widen back to 18 feet and two feet of the top of the hill is removed. Will the City accept this? Mr. Desfosses

responded that the driveway needs to be 18 feet the whole way. Mr. Howe added that the 18 feet is important to the Fire Department too.

Mr. Pezzullo requested to see the impacts of the right of way with the vertical cuts etc. to what can be achieved.

Mr. Pezzullo also noted that the City reserves the right for a third party inspection.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz reviewed the feedback the Committee would like to see incorporated for the next meeting:

- Correct the easement typos
- Show profiles of the plan and driveway including cross sections
- Clearly show how the fence will be
- Show ownership of the forced main and how it will be maintained
- Extend the existing proposed road 20 feet for snow storage
- Clarify the limits of the city vs. private street maintenance
- Show all right of way impacts
- The city will reserve the right for a third party inspection
- Clarification will be needed from legal for the right of way paving on City property
- The private forced main in the right of way will need a license from City Counsel.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the September 5, 2017 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **165 Deer Street**, (“Lots 2 & 3), requesting Site Plan Approval for creation of a temporary parking lot having 73 standard parking spaces and 3 handicap accessible parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lots 17 and 17-1 and lies within the within the CD5 District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). (This application was postponed at the July 5, 2017 TAC Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon, Maxwell Rogers, and Timothy Phoenix were there to represent applicants. Mr. Chagnon spoke to the project. The project was tabled last month, so the applicants could make some changes to the plans. Updates were made to the sign package, some parking spaces have been moved around, hours of use have been added, sloped granite curb at the entrances were also added and removal of the pavement beyond that was incorporated. The proposal is to create a temporary parking lot. The Board Of Adjustment has granted a variance. The intent of the applicant is that this will be a temporary lot for about 2 years, and then a building will be constructed on these lots. Portsmouth has parking demand now, so this will be a bonus. There will be no changes to actual surface of the lot. A fence will be put up to buffer from the Foundry Place construction. The plan was revised to show a row of parking that has been rotated to maintain aisles, and an area that will be dedicated for City use as a lay down area for Foundry Place. Applicants can add ADA sign details and relocate some of the do not enter on the pavement if needed. Parking hours would be 7 am to 6 pm, and it will be all leased parking.

Chagnon requested clarification from the committee if there is a way this can be approved administratively, or it has to go to the Planning Board. Mr. Britz responded that it will most likely need to go through the Planning Board, but will need to clarify with Ms. Walker. The project should proceed that it's going to the Planning Board.

Mr. Eby questioned how the applicants would prevent parking post 6 pm. Mr. Rogers responded that it would be enforced via posted signs and towing.

Mr. Cracknell questioned why the lot is not going to be open later. Mr. Chagnon responded that the lot would not have the proper lighting. Mr. Cracknell questioned why a later lot opening is not worth pursuing? Mr. Rogers responded that it is not worth the financial investment to set that up.

Mr. Cracknell request clarification if the lot would be permit parking that is paid for or would it be passes. Mr. Rogers responded they would be passes, so it will appeal to residents and construction workers in the area.

Mr. Cracknell commented so it's not a public lot; it's leased people during the day. Adding the public night parking would be a whole different project. Mr. Cracknell asked the board if lighting was all that was missing. Mr. Desfosses confirmed the lighting was the only issue. Mr. Cracknell noted that does it seem insurmountable to add lighting. Mr. Desfosses confirmed it should be easy.

Mr. Cracknell asked the Board if the lot was to be open to the public at night with proper lighting was there anything else missing. Mr. Desfosses responded that the only issues are the lighting and there is a big flat spot that doesn't have proper pitch and grad. Mr. Britz commented that typically landscaping is required for parking lots. Mr. Cracknell clarified that the intent is just to extend hours on the temporary lot. Would landscaping be needed for that? Shrubs and flowers could be added at the entrance. If some lighting could be added to open this as a public parking lot that would be beneficial. Mr. Chagnon responded that the applicant would need to analyze this investment vs. return. Mr. Britz stated that for now the project will be as originally proposed with potential to change it through administrative approval.

Mr. Desfosses asked would be appropriate to pave to provide a half percent grade on the flat spot. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that the slab can be removed, and crowned.

Mr. Britz questioned if the applicants would be paving the whole parking lot because there are wide gravel strips. Mr. Rogers clarified that the crushed asphalt was put on top of pavement to create a shim up. If the applicants were going to pave that would be removed.

Mr. Howe noted the combustible mulch is not allowed for landscaping. Mr. Rogers questioned what it should be changed to. Mr. Cracknell stated non-combustible mulch. Mr. Britz added that river stone is a good option too.

Mr. Howe questioned what the pitch point at the entrance was. Mr. Chagnon confirmed it would be 20 feet. Mr. Howe clarified if that was for the corner where the do not enter sign is. Mr. Chagnon confirmed the connection point is 20 feet wide.

PUBLIC HEARING

Joe Trudano, 897 Woodbury Ave, commented anytime more parking is added in Portsmouth, then he is all for it. Mr. Trudano is speaking on behalf of the project.

Dan Dexter, Ferguson Enterprises. Ferguson currently has parking passes with 126 Bridge Street. Their 8 passes would increase to 12-14 as the office grows. More parking would be beneficial.

The Chair asked if anyone else was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval with the following stipulations, seconded by Mr. Cracknell:

- 1) The application should clearly state that the approval for this parking lot is for only 27 months and any extension would need to be granted by the Planning Board.
- 2) The applicant will shim the area formally occupied by the building with pavement to take out the flat spot and create positive drainage on the site.
- 3) The applicant should consider extending the hours and use of the parking lot to allow for public use in the evening which would require future approval by the Planning Board or Planning Department.
- 4) The plans should reflect that the landscaped areas will incorporate non-combustible mulch.
- 5) A "Do Not Enter" sign should be added to the right side of the drive isle where it is currently proposed on the left.
- 6) In the area outside of the trailer pavement striping shall be added at the limit of the 20 foot travelway.
- 7) Given the short duration of the use, the landscape plan shall be revised to show only shrubs and herbaceous plants, no trees.

The motion passed unanimously

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Andrew F. Cotrupi and Jennifer B. Cotrupi, Owners**, for property located at **137 Wibird Street**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots as follows:

1. Proposed lot A having an area of 7,770 ± s.f. (0.18 acres) and 76' of continuous street frontage on Wibird Street. 100' of continuous street frontage on Lincoln Avenue; and
2. Proposed lot B having an area of 7,525 ± s.f. (0.17 acres) and 58.85' of continuous street frontage on Lincoln Avenue.

Said property is shown on Assessor Map 134 as Lot 48 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District where the minimum lot area is 7,500 s.f. and the minimum continuous street frontage is 100'. (The Board of Adjustment granted a variance on August 16, 2016 to allow proposed Lot B to have 58.85 s.f. of continuous street frontage and to contain an accessory structure as a principal use.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Alex Ross with Ross Engineering presented with the owners Andrew and Jennifer Cotrupi. This is a simple subdivision project. The owners have been there for 15 years and are looking to downsize. The project has gone through the ZBA and has received all variances. Mr. Ross reviewed the changes made to the plan from the last meeting. The front steps are granite now, the upper hayloft door has been enlarged to be proportionate, the roof shingles are lighter, and the chimney has been changed to stucco. The site plan lay out changes include a revised configuration of the driveway on Lincoln Ave, so it lines up as a straight shot to the garage. There will still be a paver for a turn around. There was concern about runoff along the property line so an infiltration trench was added to catch any additional runoff. The comments about existing catch basin have been incorporated, and it has been added at that cross section to the plan. The new catch basin has a back flow preventer. The added curb cut information and pavement patching details are included in the plan as well. In the last work session there was discussion about the width of the driveway. The driveway showed as 16 feet. There was discussion from the Board to widen it to 18 feet. That would impact the trees on the property, and the owners would like to request to keep the driveway at 16 feet wide. A corner lot typically has a frontage of 110 feet. This lot will only have 100 feet. The applicants requested a waiver, and it was approved by ZBA.

Mr. Pezzullo requested a small depression area be added at the infiltration trench even if it's just 6 inches to prevent anything from going into neighbor property. Mr. Ross confirmed this could be added.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that the diameter of the pipe from the proposed catch basin to the city's catch needs to be a minimum of 6 inches. Mr. Ross responded that the plans would be updated to incorporate that. Mr. Pezzullo added that the applicants would need a permit from the city to connect the pipe. Mr. Cotrupi questioned how a permit could be obtained. Mr. Pezzullo responded through the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the back preventer probably wouldn't be approved because it would need a mechanical joint. Mr. Desfosses recommended getting a red valve instead. Mr. Ross confirmed this could be updated.

Mr. Desfosses commented the road will need to be milled and paved a year after the utilities are put in. The pavement should be 5 feet beyond all utilities. Mr. Ross confirmed this could be done.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the plans do not clearly indicate what is a sidewalk and what is not. Mr. Ross responded that this would be clarified.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the details for curb say 6 feet but it should be 12 feet because it's continuous. Mr. Ross confirmed this would be updated.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the applicants would need to apply for a driveway permit. Mr. Cotrupi confirmed this would be done.

Mr. Eby questioned if approving this project would approve the driveway? Mr. Desfosses responded that it would not because the property is private.

Mr. Cotrupi questioned if there was anything concerning about the driveway. Mr. Eby responded that the radius should be move a little or tightened. Mr. Desfosses added if it's moved from 5 feet to 3 feet the problem should go away.

Mr. Cracknell commented that 16 feet should work because it looks like the property has two additional feet before the tree, so the width should work for small cars.

Mr. Cracknell suggested the applicants slide the patio closer to the street to have a landing area at the bottom of the step. This would allow for a turn around point in the driveway and better landscaping.

Mr. Cracknell commented the applicants should consider a boxwood hedge to screen the pavers. The roof pitch could be a little steeper if the applicants wanted it to be. Mr. Cracknell suggested the applicants look at how the chimney will be capped because right now it just looks like it stops.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board with the following stipulations, seconded by Mr. Cracknell:

- 1) The applicant shall install a backflow preventer, preferably a "Red Valve" or equivalent mechanically operated backflow preventer to the proposed drainage system.
- 2) The applicant shall show the curb to curb area to show repairs to the pavement upon the completion of all work on utilities in the roadway.
- 3) Show area where concrete sidewalk will be repaired/replaced.
- 4) The applicant shall secure a driveway permit for the proposed new driveway.
- 5) The applicant shall amend the plans to show a 3' radius on the proposed new driveway.
- 6) The drain line connecting to the City storm drain should be a 6" diameter pipe.

- 7) The infiltration trench should be depressed at least 6” below the surrounding grade.
- 8) The applicant shall consider moving the porous pavement areas up to 3’ closer to the street to allow the two planting beds adjacent to the house to be more functional.

The Motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue** (previously 30 Maplewood Avenue), requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 5-story mixed-use building with a footprint of 17,410 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 53,245 ± s.f., including 22 dwelling units and 13,745 ± s.f. of retail use, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 2A and lies within Character District 4 (CD4), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the January 7, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Howe moved to postpone review of the application to the September 5, 2017 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Goodman Family Real Estate Trust, Owner**, and **Aroma Joe’s Coffee, Applicant**, for property located at **1850 Woodbury Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Review for a 785 ± s.f. restaurant/take-out building and 195 ± s.f. attached patio, with drive thru service and a walk-up window, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 239 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Business (BD) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Eby moved to postpone review of the application to the September 5, 2017 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Flintatta, LLC, Owner**, and **Unitarian-Universalist Church of Portsmouth, Applicant**, for property located at **73 Court Street**, requesting Site Plan Review to construct a 286 ± s.f. addition to provide a ramp and egress to and from the existing building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said

property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 19 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone review of the application to the September 5, 2017 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:33 pm, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee