

**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 2020-21, 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**

**DECEMBER 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

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Approval of minutes from the November 3, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the November 3, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Newport. The motion passed unanimously.

**II. OLD BUSINESS**

A. 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.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Patrick Crimmins and Robbi Woodburn spoke to the application. Mr. Crimmins commented that they were last at TAC in June. The plans were revised based on the comments that were received during that meeting. The drainage analysis, grades, turning movement diagrams and buffer plans were updated. The trip generation memo was updated as well, and an environmental summary memo was added to the packet. Building B was pulled back to be in line with building C. The building footprints were modified so they were pulled back out of the 50-foot buffer. The parking previously extended 100 feet further down. That has been pulled back to provide the minimum parking required. They will apply for a CUP from the Planning Board because some of the parking will be on the shared roadway. The corner radius at Bartlett St. was revised based on comments and provided and more detailed landscape plans were included. There were concerns about runoff temperatures so a detention system was added to allow the storm water to cool before discharging to the pond.

### TAC Comments:

1. It seems unlikely that parking spaces 600 feet from building are likely to be used.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that he agreed that someone from building C won't want to park that far away. People will park near the buildings they live in and there will be reserved basement level parking. The intent is to limit amount of parking based on previous comments.
  2. Mr. Eby noted that the comment was referring to the spaces near the lumber store and the shared parking on the street. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were counting 19 spaces on the road and it does include those spaces. They would be options for visitor spaces. There is more than sufficient parking without including those, but the plan is trying to meet the parking count. Ms. Walker commented that Mr. Eby has a valid point and that should be considered in the parking CUP review.
2. All access aisles for HP spaces should have NO PARKING signs if possible.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that the plan would be updated to include the signs.
3. Snow removal should be hauled off site when snow banks exceed 3 feet in height, not 6 feet.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that the note would be revised.
4. Sidewalk near fire lane at end of parking lot should connect to multi-use path.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that it doesn't connect now to minimize buffer impact. Ms. Walker responded that there should be connection point to the path. They should think about how the plan will connect the sidewalk to the path. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would edit it.
5. DO NOT ENTER sign should be on right hand side of road, inside the middle circle.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that would be revised.
6. W11-15a signs should be W11-2.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that would be revised.
7. 9 spaces are designated as Visitor Parking. Where will the remaining 25 Visitor Parking spaces be located and will they be signed?
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that this would be addressed in the CUP. They are not anticipating signing any parking as visitor parking. There may be some areas identified

around the circle because the leasing office will be near there. Mr. Britz questioned if the parking included what was required for the mixed-use building. Mr. Crimmins responded that the mixed use would include an office and it was accounted for in the parking count.

8. The group of 34 spaces in the surface lot is actually 37 spaces. The label should be corrected.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that would be updated.
9. Tip down ramp is needed on north side of driveway at Bartlett Street intersection.
  1. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would look at that.
10. Please provide a detail on the proposed roundabout indicating whether there is a mountable curb or apron and if concrete or granite pavers are proposed should be provided.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were anticipating a landscaped island with curb. The turning exhibits show trucks can get around the circle without the mountable curb. Mr. Howe commented that it's a tight turn for the truck to get around. Ms. Walker commented that the island could be smaller. Mr. Cracknell commented that they could make a mountable curb like a cobblestone ring and then make the landscape smaller. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.
  2. Mr. Desfosses questioned if tractor trailers would be turning around in it. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were not planning for that, but the truck management will be discussed with the team internally. Ms. Walker commented that it would be good to consider if any loading area was needed or how large truck delivery would be handled.
  3. Mr. Howe questioned if there would be a restaurant in the office mixed use building. Mr. Crimmins responded that there would not be.
11. Recommend straightening out the alignment of the proposed sidewalk/trail that is adjacent the roundabout on the Bartlett Street side.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that the intent was to minimize the buffer impact. They were asked to move landscaping, so it was flipped. Mr. Cracknell noted that it was likely to be a high traffic trail and people will want to cut the corner. There should be a bypass, so people don't have to come to the tip down. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
12. On Landscape Plan additional trees should be provided within the long double-loaded parking lot. It is recommended that the Elm tree proposed to be located within the Dover Street View Corridor be moved outside the view corridor. Additional shade trees should be considered adjacent the transformer in the parking lot, the front of Building A, and within the 35 spaces proposed to be located along the active rail bed.
  1. Mr. Cracknell noted that it was big lot and seemed a little thin on landscaping. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would work with Robbi Woodburn to see if there's a better option. Mr. Cracknell commented that it would be nice to have 2-3 shade trees on the rail bed side. Mr. Cracknell questioned if the transformer had to be in that location. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were trying to keep it central to the buildings and worked with Eversource to pick that location. Mr. Desfosses commented that the power has to come in from Bartlett St. Mr. Crimmins responded that it comes off a riser pole from Bartlett St. Mr. Desfosses responded that Eversource can't do it that way because it will require a massive upgrade to the area. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would set up a meeting with Eversource and DPW to coordinate.
13. In order to confirm the proposed building heights within each of the character district it would be helpful to include the building elevations in the plan set.
  1. Mr. Crimmins confirmed this would be included in the next package.
14. What happens to the existing sign on Bartlett end? Does it get repurposed/reconfigured?

1. Mr. Crimmins responded that would remain where it is. Any signs going on the sign will need to go through the appropriate approval channel with Portsmouth.
15. Can the telephone manhole in the existing sidewalk actually get lowered? It is shown where a handicapped ramp would need to go (but is not currently shown). This area needs to get explored to determine what radius and configuration is possible out there. Further, guardrail will likely need to be constructed on the bridge and around the new drive radius in order to create a compliant/proper intersection.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they will look at the manhole cover to see how it best fits.
16. Traffic impacts are shown to be minimal but the increased pedestrian activity generated warrants a discussion of whether a contribution to the upcoming Bartlett St sidewalk project is warranted.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that it was a net decrease from what was previously approved, but they will discuss internally. Ms. Walker noted that the comment more just a heads up of what TAC will want to review and what the peer review will.
17. Provide a proposed roadway Plan/Profile sheet. Include roadway cross-section. Does the applicant still intend this road to be private?
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they update the plan. The applicant intends for it to be a private road.
18. The underground storage structure is currently shown as being constructed with CMP pipe. We question if this is appropriate considering the saltwater outfall and potential for back flooding inside the system. This should be plastic.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
19. The stormwater system is shown crossing multiple lots. Cross easements will be required over multiple parcels to guarantee future flowage rights.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
20. The City's outfall structures that currently exist on the edge of the existing Ricci parking lot are being impacted by the sidewalk. Show in detail, the work required to move, alter or raise the covers so that this is possible.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they will work on what details are needed.
21. The drainage system is on multiple lots. We will need to know who is responsible for all future maintenance activities, yearly stormwater reporting (PTAP), etc.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
22. A construction dewatering plan will need to be developed and approved.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
23. There should be a clearly defined berm on the entrance drive into the basement so it is understood that the parking lot water shouldn't be going down the ramp.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they can detail further the cross draining in the opposite direction. Flow ducts and additional line work can be added to emphasize the high point. Mr. Desfosses commented that if the basin plugs then, there is not a lot of room before the basement floods. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would look at it.
24. Ownership delineation and maintenance responsible party(s) for the proposed drainage system(s) must be clearly identified in the Stormwater O&M Plan. Sections of the proposed drainage system(s) associated with the outfalls are interconnected and cross multiple lots/properties. The lots (both existing and proposed) are individually owned and are subject to a change of ownership in the future. Appropriate easements must be provided.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed and noted they would work with the landowners to clarify who is responsible for what.

25. Submit copies of the Stormwater Maintenance Report in accordance with the O&M Plan to the City on an annual basis.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
26. The water supply system is shown crossing multiple lots and retaining the existing system for the existing uses. Cross easements will be required over multiple parcels to guarantee future parcel rights.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed. Cross easements are needed for the water service over the private road.
27. Move the water main away from the stormwater chambers or otherwise reconfigure the chambers to provide adequate room between utilities.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would look at opportunities to reconfigure the underground system footprint to provide separation from water.
28. The final water model needs to be run based on the new configuration.
  1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
29. Please provide a water demand analysis. Water demand analysis (average daily and peak demand) needs to include irrigation demand if applicable.
  1. Mr. Crimmins noted that this would be provided in the next package.
30. The water main detail needs to show the main placed in protective polywrap and installed with 3 continuity wedges per joint.
  1. Mr. Crimmins noted that the detail would be updated.
31. The water line under the RR will need to be sleeved and the valve on the McDonough St side replaced.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that a note would be added to make sure it is sleeved.
32. Plans need to indicate that the proposed water main is private and a private water main maintenance agreement with the City is required. Ownership and maintenance responsibility must be clearly identified since it crosses more than one property. Provide appropriate easements.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would look at landscaping for this area.
33. Recommend that an in-line valve location be considered to prevent shutting off water to entire development in case of maintenance/repair of water main.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would look at that.
34. There is a proposed tree located on top of the City's main sewer. This tree cannot be placed there. The tree also blocks the view port in the building.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they have looked at this and it would be addressed in the next packet.
35. Please note that the City is not responsible for repairs to proposed improvements shown within the City's existing sewer easement if repairs to the City's sewer pipe are needed.
36. The basement is to be constructed below the high water elevation that the pond could achieve. Construction of the foundation should be a 'dry' basement.
37. A third party inspector will be required for all utility work including stormwater systems.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that this was understood.
38. The remaining parcel along the tracks should have access rights through the residential parcel to get to the proposed roadway.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that this was understood and would be included.
39. All grassed areas should be provided with 6" of loam to facilitate the use of less irrigation.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that this was Included in the notes.
40. What is the finish floor elevation for the underground parking?

1. Mr. Crimmins responded that it was elevation 7 and that would be added to the basement level site plan.
41. Please note that trash/recycling pickup is responsibility of developer/owner. Explain how trash/recycling will be addressed.
  1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were anticipating it would be stored in the buildings. They will need to vet it further as a team and that will tie into the loading areas comment. Ms. Walker commented that it was important to know because TAC will want to know the dumpster location or where the trash storage is in the building.

Ms. Walker commented that the trail will be a public trail but there likely will be a desire to enter into a trail maintenance agreement. The expectation would be that the developer would do the maintenance at least initially.

Ms. Walker requested that they comment further on the fire access on the pond side of the building. Mr. Crimmins responded that they will look at opportunities especially where fire trucks want to sit to provide acceptable width for the fire department's ladder trucks. The path would be designed to allow for a truck to drive on it and there will be places where the trucks can park with a greater base width. There will be 10 feet of pavement and extra 4 feet of buffer surface. The corners are wider to allow for the truck swings. The goal is to balance impacts to the buffer and provide what the FD needs.

Mr. Britz requested more detail on the path. Mr. Crimmins responded that it would be a paved path with a wider pervious surface lawn area with gravel under the grass. They will make sure areas are cleared appropriately. There will be a rain garden and other treatments for storm water management. Mr. Britz questioned why it would not be a porous surface. Mr. Crimmins responded that for a porous surface there were maintenance concerns, restrictive soils below, and it would not be as acceptable for a fire lane. The area is achieving the same storm water treatment with its current design.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if they were intending to build the buildings concurrently. Mr. Crimmins responded that they would start with building A and B and work their way to C. Mr. Marsilia commented that there will be a requirement for phased drawings along with a detailed schedule.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there was going to be any lighting on the path. Mr. Crimmins responded that they have not shown it. Ms. Woodburn questioned if the City was planning to light the rest of the trail. Ms. Walker responded that they have not decided but there has been reluctance from the public on lighting. Mr. Desfosses commented that the original parking plan would have removed a forested area where a lot of trash, debris and homeless camp are now. Mr. Desfosses questioned if that forested area could still be removed. Ms. Walker questioned if that area was part of the development. The safety concern is understood but it is likely people in the neighborhood would want to keep some forested areas. It is a fair conversation to have with the property owner. Mr. Britz noted that there have been a lot of the comments from the Conservation Commission focusing on the extent of vegetation removal out there. However, the concerns about the trash and tents etc. are also valid. It's a tough balance. It's not part of their development but worth looking at. It may make sense to include a planting plan with some openings. Ms. Walker commented that it was likely a good topic to have for the design of the trail.

Mr. Howe questioned where the egress was for the basement parking was. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were working through the floor plans and will call out the areas in the next packet. Mr. Howe

commented that the fire lane in the back will need to be 10 feet wide and the 4-foot shoulder should all be on the building side to withstand the outriggers.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Elizabeth Hewitt of 169 McDonough St. commented that the application continues to be put on the agenda without addressing all the issues. The fire truck access on the back of the buildings still does not have a resolution. The development received a 4<sup>th</sup> floor on the buildings for the multi-use path on the pond. Ms. Hewitt questioned how it was community space if it was also fire access. The multi-use path is in the 100-foot buffer. The Conservation Committee members were opposed to impervious surface in the buffer. They were not in favor of the path being 10 feet wide. The path is not a sure thing. The fire truck cannot make the turn to get to the front buildings. It should be separate from the path. The access for fire safety should be outside the buffer. The soil report has not been released to the public. The grade plans and finished floor elevations need to be provided. This project should not be approved without this information. The project is providing the bare minimum parking that will potentially push parking onto McDonough St.

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. agreed with Ms. Hewitt's comments. The building height elevations need to include the parking lot. This will impact properties on McDonough St. in a big way. The developers will need to fill the area to make it flat. After all that fill the restrictive soils should not be a problem for porous pavement anymore. Once the fire trucks go past the rain garden and make a left at building C there is no way off. Ms. Bratter did not agree with taking down trees on end of Cabot St. That area should just be picked up and maintained. Ms. Bratter submitted a letter with further comments. It is counterproductive to come to TAC when the Conservation Commission comments have not been addressed.

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

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Ms. Walker clarified that both TAC and the Conservation Commission were advisory boards to the Planning Board. Ultimately approval is going to be up to the Planning Board. Mr. Britz commented that this application came before the Conservation Commission at their last meeting. There were a lot of questions and concerns about the vegetation on the site in the 100-foot buffer and impact in the buffer. The applicants have reduced impact to no closer than 50 feet. There were questions about the public trail and access for fire. The Commission questioned if the path needed to be 10 feet wide and if it could be porous. The application is due to come back to December. A site walk is being scheduled before the meeting. Ms. Walker commented that the paved portion has to be 10 feet wide and then there will be gravel to make it wide enough to allow for fire access. Best practice from planning is to have a 10-foot as a bare minimum for the path to be utilized by pedestrians and bikes. The City is cognizant that it's located in a sensitive area. A lot of comments need to be addressed before this moves forward.

Mr. Howe moved to postpone this application to the next regularly scheduled TAC Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

B. 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.

### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Howe moved to postpone this application to the next regularly scheduled TAC Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Madison Commercial Group, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **150 Mirona Road** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a 5,500 s.f. accessory storage building with associated paving, utilities and drainage infrastructure. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 253 Lot 2A and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District.

### **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Eric Saari from Altus Engineering spoke to the application. The prior approval from 2011 shows a similar storage building that didn't connect to the existing office. This proposal is for a 5,500-sf storage building with 2 floors and access to the office building. A connection was added to the adjoining parcel which is under the same ownership. More pavement will need to be added in one area to make it work. There will be a 24-inch pipe that goes right into a detention pond. The sewer utility connection was relocated to extend to the street. The domestic line can be one inch from the new to the existing.

Mr. Howe commented that there needs to be an easement to provide access between the parcels. Mr. Saari responded that they could not do an easement because the parcels were in common ownership. A note can be added outlining if either lot went to a new entity then cross access easement will be needed. The note on the plan should be triggered if either parcel is sold. Ms. Walker noted that it can be a condition of approval and they can verify with legal if anything else needs to be added.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if the wetland in that area could be cleaned up from the trash and debris. Mr. Saari confirmed they would clean it up. Ms. Walker noted that they could add a condition about regular maintenance on that wetland.

Mr. Howe questioned if there was now a fire service line. Mr. Saari confirmed that was correct and there is a hydrant.

TAC Comments:

1. In the *Fire Apparatus Turning exhibit*, please show travel from Mirona Rd to the rear of the building and back out to the road again.
2. Fire department access cannot go through an adjacent lot, unless there are is an easement in place ensuring that the access is maintained in perpetuity.

**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, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following stipulations:

1. Plans shall be updated to address curbing changes needed to accommodate Fire and Emergency access around the site and on adjacent lot.
2. A note shall be added to the plans that cross-easements are required for fire department access through adjacent lots, should either lot transfer ownership in the future.
3. Plans shall be updated to note annual wetland clean-up and maintenance is required to clear debris.

The motion passed unanimously.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:19 p.m.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee