

**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 2020-20, 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**

**NOVEMBER 3, 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

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A.** Approval of minutes from the October 6, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to accept minutes from the October 6, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Howe. 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. Howe moved to postpone this request 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.

## SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Alex Ross spoke to the application. This site has an existing office that has been there for 40 years. There was concern about the parking configuration at the previous TAC Meeting. DPW did not like that the parking was parallel to Edmond Ave. because it created a wide, long driveway. The plan was revised to narrow the driveway and spaces 10-12 were moved to the where the rest of the parking is. It will be stacked parking in that configuration. The ZBA has approved the required variances. It is a better set up with all the parking together and pervious pavers.

### TAC Comments

1. Parking space 12 should be a foot wider to allow driver to open door next to retaining wall.
  1. Mr. Ross responded that they could make the space wider, but this set up does not have a retaining wall. It is an infiltration trench.
2. The 100 foot contour goes all the way around the parking spaces. How will stormwater leave this area?
  1. Mr. Ross responded that it is a low spot in Edmond Ave., but with pervious pavers it does currently drain. It will continue to drain especially with more pervious pavers put in and the infiltration trench.

Mr. Britz questioned which soil scientist will supervise the plantings and when the plantings would go in. Mr. Ross responded that it was too late in the year to plant, so it will be done next season. Soil Scientist Mark Jacobs will oversee the plantings.

Mr. Britz noted that there were areas on the plan that did not say what plants were being installed and questioned when those details would be filled in. Mr. Ross responded that Mark Jacobs didn't want to designate specific plantings until he was at the site. Mr. Britz questioned if they could include plantings before the Planning Board. Mr. Ross confirmed a note could be added, and he would consult with Mark Jacobs.

## **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. Howe moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

## **III. NEW BUSINESS**

A. The application of **The Fritz Family Revocable Living Trust, Owner**, for property located at **0 Patricia Drive** requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval to subdivide a lot with an area of 137,549 s.f. and 414.15 of continuous street frontage on a private road into two (2) lots as follows: Proposed lot 1 with an area of 92,908 s.f. and 150 ft. of continuous street frontage on a private road; and Proposed Lot 2 with an area of 44,641 s.f. and 264.15 ft. of continuous street frontage on a private road. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 283 Lot 11 and lies within the Single Residence A (SRA) District.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Mike Garapee from Garapee Consultants spoke to the application. This application has been to the Conservation Commission and they recommended approval. The site is an old right of way off Martha's Terrace. The original intention was to connect the road through to the existing Patricia Drive. The roadway was constructed, and the pavement is 24 feet in width. There is some drainage in place with catch basins and outlet pipe. The road is cracked and has been overgrown with grass. The 100-foot wetland buffer line runs through part of the property and part of the existing road. The proposal is to remove the existing pavement and replace it with an 18-foot paved surface over the existing gravel. The road will be a private way and provide access to two lots. There will be drainage improvements with a detention pond at the end of the road, a level spreader, and a natural filter strip.

Ms. Walker clarified that in order to comply with the zoning ordinance the lots need to have frontage on the street. This needs to be a private street. The road that was never completed was a subdivision road. In order for anything to be built the road needs to be approved and finished to the satisfaction of the City.

Ms. Walker commented that the current layout of lots technically comply with the subdivision requirements, but it will be most likely questioned if this meets the spirit of the subdivision regulations by the Planning Board.

TAC Comments:

1. There should be a way to turn around at the end without driving on private property.
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that there is a turnaround of sorts, but they can create a more formal hammerhead for a turnaround.
2. Please clarify if you are proposing this as a private or public road.
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that this would be a private road.
3. The application should address various issues related to the management and design of the road including, but not limited to: City DPW services (trash/recycling, snow plowing), Emergency Services, Standards of Construction, Maintenance Responsibilities, Easement Requirements, Municipal Water Service requirements, Stormwater- treatment, management, & maintenance. Per review of Plans submitted, these items not clearly identified/indicated.
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that the trash and recycling would be brought to the Martha's Terrace intersection for pick up. A private contractor would be hired for snow maintenance.
4. Water service as shown not acceptable. Each water service requires a separate service shut-off typically located at the City's Right of Way line (which needs to be determined) and accessible at all times by DPW. Location and design will depend final design of access from Martha's Terrace.
  1. Mr. Garapee requested feedback from the DPW on what would be acceptable. The plan would be revised accordingly.
5. Stormwater Management/Drainage Report must be provided. Individual house lots also need Stormwater management design. Ownership and maintenance issues must be clearly stated.
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that they will do an infiltration trench type system for the two lots. It may be a shared infiltration trench to treat storm water. That will be incorporated into the grading plans.
6. Access road does not meet Design Standards for residential street, a waiver will be required.
  1. Mr. Garapee confirmed they would be asking for waivers.
7. 0.5% grade is too flat to grade pavement
  1. Mr. Garapee commented that the intent was to remove the existing pavement and pave over the existing road. Modifying the grades was not part of the plan.
8. Pull boxes will be required by Comcast/Eversource. The depicted location of the service split for these utilities is too close to the existing retaining wall to be practical. Move junction point away from property corner.
  1. Mr. Garapee confirmed they would work with Eversource and the other utility companies to locate the utilities.
9. The plan does not address the encroaching fences, how will they be dealt with?
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that there was a fence encroachment. They will approach the neighbors to have them move their fence onto their property.
10. The plan does not address the grades in the yards and private drives. Show this information please. Of particular concern is the grading interface between the front house and the rear house's driveway.

1. Mr. Garapee responded that they will complete a grading plan to address the concerns for the driveway and drainage.
11. The 4000 sf SLA on the front lot takes up the entire buildable area.
  1. Mr. Garapee responded there is ample room on both lots for the septic systems and houses.
12. Utility trench detail shows primary voltage conduits but no transformer is shown on plan. How will power be provided?
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that they will show the transformer location after meeting with Eversource.
13. Provide cross section details on the interface between the City Street and the new road
  1. Mr. Garapee confirmed that could be provided.
14. Provide limit of clearing plan.
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that can be marked more clearly.
15. Provide septic system plan with grading.
  1. Mr. Garapee confirmed that would be provided.
16. Please provide narrative about how the common driveway storm water is being treated before releasing it. It seems like there is just a depression at the end for it to sit in with no real treatment proposed.
  1. Mr. Garapee responded that could be provided. The goal is to improve an existing roadway that has little usage and no real drainage. The proposal will include curbing on the southerly side of the new road and all runoff will be directed to a small detention pond and then released to the level spreader.
17. Please upgrade the level spreader detail if it is to be used to show non erodible materials for the level spreader area.
  1. Mr. Garapee confirmed this would be revised.

Ms. Walker commented that there were other encroachments on the property and questioned if they would be treated the same as the fence. Mr. Garapee responded that the shed and walkway encroachments have existed for some time and are not impactful. They will be left as is. The fence is impactful to the development of the lot.

Mr. Walker questioned what the plans were for the existing trails on the property. Mr. Garapee responded that they will not do anything in the prime wetland buffer. The trail that impacts the development of the lot will be abandoned.

Mr. Britz questioned if extending the impervious surface with the hammerhead turn around would require an amendment to the wetland applications. Mr. Garapee responded that it would be outside of the buffer, so it will not require an amendment. Mr. Britz questioned if the house and septic fit on each lot. Mr. Garapee confirmed they did, and it would be shown on the revised plans.

Mr. Howe questioned if there would be sprinkler systems for the houses. Mr. Garapee responded that there was no plan for sprinklers at this time, but they can be added if that was required. Mr. Howe responded that it would be a requirement if the road can't meet fire lane requirements. Mr. Howe questioned what the what the total length of the road was to the back house. Mr. Garapee responded that the road is a little over 300 feet and then another 200 feet to the back

house. Mr. Howe commented that a sprinkler system would require another water line. Ms. Walker questioned what the width of the road should be for the Fire Department. Mr. Howe responded that it should not go under 18 feet. They should also look at the distance from the nearest hydrant to the furthest building.

Mr. Desfosses questioned what the plans for the existing retaining wall were. Mr. Garapee responded that it will remain. Mr. Desfosses questioned if they could give the land to the house that built the wall, so the new homeowners aren't burdened by it. Mr. Garapee confirmed they could do that if it was possible. Ms. Walker commented that the subdivision exists, but it doesn't mean it cannot be revised. Proposing to change the property lines would require that homeowner to be a co-applicant.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the water service would need a 4-inch main and all the taps would be near the end of the cul-de-sac. They would need to provide an easement to the City for the valves and metering. The detention pond is probably not going to meet requirements. A rain garden might with under drains going out to the area. The grade of the road needs to be increased to 2 % off the road with a little more grade to get to the end.

Ms. Walker questioned if the Planning Board preferred this to be a public road would it change the Committee's comments on the road. Mr. Desfosses responded that they would have to look at the materials. It would probably require a full road rebuild. The retaining wall would be an issue. Ms. Walker questioned if the hammer head would be acceptable for the City. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was fine as long as the City plow could turn around in it.

## **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 postpone this request to the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Bromley Portsmouth, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **1465 Woodbury Avenue** requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of an ATM and two (2) on-site parking spaces, with associated paving, concrete pad and electrical service. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 216 Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Michael Carrera spoke to the application. Mr. Carrera commented that the proposal was to build a remote walk up Citizen's Bank ATM on a small parcel of land. Two parking spaces will be provided. The ATM was situated to the south and one of the provided spaces would be handicap. There will be a precast concrete curb around the area.

TAC Comments:

1. Need a NO PARKING sign at head of access aisle.
  1. Mr. Carrera confirmed that would be added.
2. Vehicles backing into a main drive aisle of the parking lot is not desirable. Could the design be rotated 90 degrees and provide a drive aisle and turning area to access the parking spaces?
  1. Mr. Carrera confirmed that could be rotated.
3. Or place the ATM in the parking lot on the other side of the aisle and use existing parking spaces. The proposed location will also likely generate pedestrians crossing the drive aisle, which could be avoided by placing it in the existing parking field.
  1. Mr. Carrera responded that they were not able to move the ATM into the parking lot because of restrictions.
4. Please see marked up plans for clarification
5. Correct the alignment of existing parking lot access aisle edge per the sketch. The existing curbing juts out 3' into the lane restricting traffic movements inappropriately.
  1. Mr. Carrera responded that would be corrected.
6. Correct conduit layout as shown on attached or explain why conduit would be installed on such a non-traditional path.
  1. Mr. Carrera responded that would be corrected.
7. We believe the revised power pole in the sketch has adequate room for attachment of electrical and communications. The pole shown on the drawings for utility attachment is already overburdened. Please confirm with Eversource and Communications people that this is appropriate.
  1. Mr. Carrera responded that they were in the process of confirming with Eversource if that proposed pole was appropriate. If it is not, then Eversource will confirm which they should connect to.
8. Correct existing City utilities depicted on the plan as shown on attached.
  1. Mr. Carrera responded that the note would be corrected.

Ms. Walker questioned if a variance was required for this. Mr. Carrera confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Eby supported the rotation. Ms. Walker questioned if it would impact any utilities. Mr. Carrera responded that it shouldn't. The drive aisle is an accessory to the main drive aisle. The other main entrance to the property is on Commerce Way. The intent was to have a patron come from Commerce Way to turn in and then go out to the main aisle.

Mr. Howe commented that it is a very busy parking lot, and they should not put in anything that makes it worse. Ms. Walker noted that they should see the modifications before it went to the Planning Board.

**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 postpone this request to the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Howe. The motion passed unanimously.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Walker declared the meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee