

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

Remote Meeting Via Zoom Conference Call

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared COVID-19 outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 2020-04, Section 8, as extended by Executive Order 2020-17, and Emergency Order #12, Section 3. Members will be participating remotely and will identify their location and any person present with them at that location. All votes will be by roll call.

2:00 PM

SEPTEMBER 1, 2020

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet TH Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Fire Department; Mark Newport, Police Captain; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1; Peter Stith

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the August 4, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the August 4, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The application of **Clipper Traders, LLC, Portsmouth Hardware and Lumber, LLC, Owners and Iron Horse Properties, LLC, Owner and Applicant**, for properties located at **105 Bartlett Street and Bartlett Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition and relocation of existing structures and the construction of 174 dwelling units in two (2) multi-family apartment buildings and one (1) mixed-use building with first floor office, amenity space and upper story apartments and associated community space, paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping and other site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 157 Lot 1 and Lot 2 and Assessor Map 164 Lot 1 and 4-2 and lie within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W) and Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) Districts.

REQUEST TO POSTPONE

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Cracknell moved to postpone this item to the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Bacman Enterprises, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **140 Edmond Avenue** requesting Site Plan Review approval for improvements associated with the expansion of an existing chiropractor office and residence, to remove an existing asphalt driveway and replace it with a 1,169 s.f. pervious paver driveway, add 583 s.f. of grading work for landscaping and drainage, and add a 384 s.f. shed with a ramp in the rear of the property. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 220 Lot 81 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

Alex Ross spoke to the application. At the last TAC meeting there were concerns about the amount of parking that was being provided. This proposal includes an additional three spaces after revisions to the site plan were made. The plan now meets the requirements for parking for this use. This plan also frees up the right of way for pedestrian travel and helps with the sight lines.

TAC Comments:

1. Landscaping should be extended to the edge of parking space #6 to enhance wetland area and prevent overflow parking adjacent to the wetland area.
 1. Mr. Ross responded that this was discussed with Mr. Britz. The plan is to install some boulders and cut back the existing pervious pavers in the arc to give more space for plantings on the side of parking space 6. Mr. Britz agreed that the plantings were an improvement to the gravel.
2. The June 24 Parking Demand Analysis memo states that 13 spaces are required. The notes on the site plan state that 12 spaces are required. This discrepancy should be clarified.
 1. Mr. Ross responded that originally 13 spaces were required. However, taking into account the business hours and percentages allowed, the site only needs 12 spaces. Mr. Ross questioned if a parking demand analysis was required if all spaces were provided on site. Ms. Walker responded that an analysis is required for certain uses outlined in the ordinance and required for a CUP all of the parking can't be provided on site. Ms. Walker did not think it was required for a medical office.
3. Protection should be provided, such as bollards, for the utility pole at the corner of parking space 12.
 1. Mr. Ross responded that the corner of space 12 has a utility pole. The plan shows where two protection bollards could be installed. Space 12 can be designated as employees only because they will know what's going on. Mr. Eby agreed that would work. Mr. Desfosses noted that this configuration was so different from anything else they have approved. The solution is not appropriate. There should

be parallel spaces along the road. Mr. Ross responded that he discussed the possibility of parking in the right of way with Mr. Eby, but it doesn't seem like it's an option. Mr. Desfosses questioned if there was a variance for the head in parking off the road. Mr. Ross responded that was an existing situation. Spaces 1-6 were on the plan for the ZBA. Mr. Stith confirmed there was a variance for that. Mr. Desfosses noted that spaces 10, 11, and 12 will block sight distance for the head in parked cars that are backing out. Mr. Ross responded that the lot will have a mix of residential and office parking. A lot of the residents park in the gravel area of the lot. The intent is to pull all parking on the site. Ms. Walker noted that they need to provide on-site parking or get a CUP from Planning Board. Mr. Eby commented that this does improve sight lines because a car would not have to back up as much to see. Mr. Desfosses questioned if all head in parking would be safer. Mr. Ross responded that they can't fit that because of the slope. Ms. Walker commented that they should include some way of discouraging parking on the street.

4. The gravel area between the roadway and the parking must be surfaced. This area will need a license to construct and maintain as the City will not maintain the area as it exceeds maximum driveway width.
 1. Mr. Ross responded that they could pave the gravel area and stripe it to designate it as no parking to deter usage. Mr. Cracknell questioned what prevented additional spaces from being added in front of the walkway that goes up in front of the building. Mr. Ross responded that the utility pole and walkway present an existing condition. If spaces 10-12 were rotated 90 degrees, then they would be cutting deeper into the hillside. The goal is to keep parking away from the building and keep a low-profile retaining wall. Ms. Walker questioned if they needed all of the parking. Mr. Ross responded that this was discussed at the last meeting. They were originally approved at the ZBA for 9 spaces. Mr. Eby noted that an alternate option would be to do a parking demand study and show demand. They could make a case for why they don't need all the spaces. Ms. Walker agreed with Mr. Desfosses that this solution was forced. If they can show that the demand is not there, then that would be an alternate approach. Mr. Cracknell noted that one to two spaces would fit in the paved area next to the six head in spaces.
5. The pervious pavers seem to possibly extend into the ROW. If this is true, they will need a license to construct and maintain.
 1. Mr. Ross responded that spaces 1-6 exist currently and those pervious pavers do extend into the right of way. They can cut back the pavers and install asphalt. The same approach will be done for spaces 10-12. Mr. Desfosses clarified that there would be regular pavement in the right of way and pervious pavers on the private lot. Mr. Ross confirmed that was correct. Mr. Ross questioned if spaces 10-12 should be rotated to match 1-6 if the parking analysis were to show a need for 12 spaces. Ms. Walker questioned if it would impact the variance. Mr. Stith responded that it would not impact the variance. Mr. Eby responded that it was fine with either way. Mr. Ross noted that there was no way to avoid additional parking if they were trying to meet regulations. During peak times the parking lot is full. Mr. Desfosses brought up concerns about snow storage for this new plan.

Mr. Ross responded that it would be stored at the end of spaces 1-6. That is how it is handled currently. It will just be bigger. Mr. Desfosses commented that would more than double the amount of snow going there.

Ms. Walker clarified that the owner would maintain the wetland buffer planting area even though it would be in the right of way. Mr. Ross confirmed it could be added as a note. The area would be maintained to ensure plants take hold.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if the tandem parking would be employee parking. Mr. Ross responded that it would be residential. Employees can use spaces 1-6 and 10-12. Ms. Walker questioned how many employee spaces were needed. Mr. Ross responded at least two spaces. Ms. Walker questioned if it would help to make spaces 10-12 employee parking. Mr. Eby confirmed that it would because they would know how to park there.

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. Eby commented that designating spaces 10-12 as employee parking and installing the bollards by the pole would be a good solution. Ms. Walker questioned if all of the area in the public way would be paved. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct and commented that spaces 10-12 should be in front of spaces 1-3. Ms. Walker noted that would send them back to the ZBA.

Ms. Walker commented that she was reluctant to send someone back to the ZBA. It would be preferable to communicate concerns to the Planning Board. Mr. Desfosses was concerned about the functionality of the spaces and the snow storage. The plan is not following driveway ordinances. It would be better if the employee parking was in front of spaces 1-3 and the gravel area went away. Mr. Ross responded that they can look at that. The owner was opposed to going back to the ZBA, but hesitant to proceed to the Planning Board if there were concerns.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this item to the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 2:40 pm, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee