

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

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

2:00 PM

September 7, 2021

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet TH Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director;
David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick
Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Darrin Sargent, Police Captain;
Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Peter Britz, Environmental
Planner; Stefanie Casella, Planner 1

MEMBERS ABSENT:

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the August 3, 2021 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Britz DD unanimous.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. The application of **Banfield Realty, LLC, (Owner)**, for property located at **375 Banfield Road** requesting Site Plan review approval to demolish two existing commercial buildings and an existing shed and construct a 75,000 s.f. industrial warehouse building with 75 parking spaces as well as associated paving, stormwater management, lighting, utilities and landscaping. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 266 Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Cornati Bill Wilcox and bob graham with applicant. Coranait been here a few times made almost all of the changes asked for. 2 open comments 1 review form drainage and the other environmental realated. Did review the road not yet reviewed drainage. Is going to the state for AOT. Those are the highest set of standards for state stormwater. Not sure need the

CMA review with the state review coming. Wilcox can explain where at state site. Wilcox site is a pre 1981 landfill series of investigations back to early 200s. ground water quality lead in soil pcbs in soil espastos and surface water quality issues. NHDES august sent letter reviewed presivou reports. Working with them and EPA. Ground water quality low concentrations of lead. Samples wells for lead. Lead in soils some concentration exceeding state. Believe real action plan and const. ecapsulate lead in soil under building and pavement. Will assess level of lead outside of the construction zone. Espestos if identified will be managed by licensed contractor. Only founf in a handful of test pits off site. Pcds real action plan done in 2000s. very low levels across stie. Working with EPA on guidance on how to manage. State of NH will be managed below building and pavement. Outside the wetland boundary will go backto review at a later time because outside dev parcle. Epa and NHDES buy in on this. Pre 1980 landfill will move solid waste found onsite. Ground water sporatci contaminats working to det distribution. Dev no ground water don't need gorund water management plan during const. Coranati a lot of the review will happen during construction. Wilcox once real action plan reviews by Des will have site manager for that and all reports and updates go to DES.

Britz – one concern evidence of surface water site sat for 10 years some migrated off site. How will now storm water flow effect surface water leaving site. Need to understand what is in the surface water. Sample for pcas. Wilcox – did not smaple for pcas putting a plan together with risk assessor. Overall dev right now goes into sil and discharges as landwater. Storm water management program capturing all stormwater before infiltrates to ground water so should be a net improvement. Britz – concern haven't had a chance to asses the surface water again. Rather see resulst of ground water. Not as concerned about soils on site as I am about surface water and water leaving the site. Coranati – see results. Will need to comply with state requirements. Will have to handle contamination in disturbed surfaces. Wilcox – scope of work being drafted. Britz – woul dlike and update on that before signing off on that.

Coranati – not infiltrating and have a volume reduction off site. Storm wate r will be factor of surface water. Britz want to make sure surface leaving site is not a concner.

DD – how reduce volume leaving site. Coranati – R-tank. Rate reduction waiver. DD – CMA review environamtal and drainage study together to review the wholistic design. That is what we are waiting on.

Coranati – work with planning dept to set up third party agreement. Britz - can send one.

DD – roadway and asphalt placed may want to send survey crew back out. To assess sight distance? 2::16.

TAC Comments:

- Third party drainage and environmental review is not yet complete

PUBLIC HEARING

No one.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Brtiz moved to postpone, DD unanimous.

- B.** The request of **North Mill Pond Holdings LLC (Applicant), and One Raynes Ave LLC, 31 Raynes Ave LLC, and 203 Maplewood Ave LLC (Owners)** for property located at **31 Raynes Avenue, 203 Maplewood Avenue, and 1 Raynes Avenue** requesting Conditional Use Permit as permitted by Section 10.1112.62 of the Zoning Ordinance and according to the requirements of Section 10.1112.14 to allow 111 off-street parking spaces to be provided on-site and 25 spaces to be provided on a separate lot where a total of 159 are required and Site Plan Review approval for the demolition of three existing buildings and construction of the following: 1) a 5-story mixed use building with 65,650 gross floor area and 17,565 sq. ft. building footprint including 8,100 sq. ft. of commercial use on the ground story and 60 residential units on the upper stories; 2) a 5-story 128-room hotel with 63,400 gross floor area and 13,815 sq. ft. of building footprint; 3) 27,000 sq. ft. of community space as well as associated paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping and other site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 123 Lot 14, Map 123 Lot 13, Map 123 Lot 12, Map 123 Lot 10 and lie within the Character District 4 (CD4) District, Downtown Overlay District (DOD), Historic District, and the North End Incentive Overlay District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins Evan Tormey. Crimmins met last month and received 10 comments. Many were acknowledged would become stip of approval. Three action items HDC meeting. TEC finish. Adjusting front lot line buildout exhibit which did. Tormey – also reducing parking spaced. Crimmins surprised to see comments.

Third party review storm water required. Crimmins largely unchanged since submitted back in march. DD – error we did not have any comments for this.

HDC size of the building massing. Crimmins – project has been design and complies with ordinance. Tormey will continue process with HDC but don't anticipate change to site plan. Cracknell – think it's important at HDC in dec and came back. Project does not appear near the finish line with HDC. Informal work sessions but seems like there is some serious concern about the size and volume and how it looks. Heartburn in various places about surface water and size of building. Concern about surface parking and building. If HDC does not approve full extent proposed then there would be a reduction in parking demand and if that happened would lessen. It's an eyesore but if that's a concern here and other Portsmouth boards. Would be nice if HDC was more supportive of where heading in respect to that volume. Appreciate removing three spaces. Next comment also mine. Put in lift system now and further reduce parking. Last comment ast well about trying to tackle same issue from another vantage.

The visual impact of that parking. If going to have that parking low stone wall or some other screening to screen whatever parking is out there. Tormey – kept building and structures would of buffer. Stone wall would be perm impacts in the buffer. Nick – all paved all permanent. Not going to convince me wall is a problem with surface parking all in there. Tormey – keep parking out of the 50. Significant improvements in storm water with parking. Could grade to lessen impact of the visual. Done an enhanced planting plan in the area to have a better buffer between path and parking and path and water. Would entertain topography over stone wall to better screen the parking. Cracknell – no problem with stone wall vs. berm. But if berm is preferred then better what proposing. If reduce parking further by putting in the lift system now would reduce parking. Tormey – specific parking spaces eliminate. Cracknell – the ones perp to Maplewood ave. the 16 spaces on the left side. One space that is on the 50 as well. Wall is more important on the Maplewood side. Trying to help facilitate success with HDC and other boards as well.

DD – stone wall actual structure. Cracknell – concern reasonable but this might be a big deal for CC to put in something permanent there. But don't see why stone wall vs. berm one would be better than the other. Tormey – know that sonotubes with fence in the buffer subject to intense review. Concern about animal passage. CC may not be amenable. Cracknell – maybe a combination stone wall and berm. Britz – wall would be closer than the parking. Berm doesn't have to be a bad thing. Their point is amount of paving try to tackle that. CC concern 2:31. Not sure right answer but giving feedback. Ways to reduce pavement. Look at how the lift system would change the site. Tormey – remove those spaces or leave as future reserve. Would CC want to see again. Britz – sub redesigned plan up to you. Cracknell – no one offended if those 16 spaces disappear so if add in future go through process with amended site plan. Tormey – future reserve approved because shown on initial site plan. Cracknell – would prefer to not do it that way. Is that the only way can do the 16. Tormey - have to show where future reserve would go. Britz – 25 on lift part of future reserve. Tormey – yes.

DD – first 8-9 spaces plenty of room between buffer. Crimmins – yes can grade berm to screen parking. Tormey – open to that as a stipulation. DD – show on the landscaping plan.

Tormey under the building. Under mixed use building. 2:35.

Howe? - 14. Spaces. doesn't subtract out space. Tormey – right those 8 spaces can become 14 spaces.

Cracknell TEC say project won't work without 16 spaces. Tormey yes. Crimmins – changed approach looked at shared parking across st and onsite to achieve req spaces. Reserve 25 spaces won't be built at this time. Applicant operate hotel valet. If parking crunch in future would install. Cracknell so no waivers. Tormey asking for cup. Cracknell wiggle room with TEC to reduce parking any further and be successful getting cup. Tormey – feel we are at where we need to be. Originally had a lot more parking now share across the street and lift reserve. TEC told what we needed which was 3 less than showing.

DD – berm would do a lot to hide that. Bring it up to elev 14 will screen parking and can be landscaped on the far side of the path and build separation. The corner on the end of bank of

16 and 6 that you see. Cracknell -plenty of room between path and 16 spaces. Not opposed of the berm only opposed if resistance to other city boards. Either would work. Nervous go and approve all this parking and building could be smaller and it won't need all that parking. Need a condition or suggest reduction in parking. If reduction in parking. Surface parking reduction.

Tormey – should parking req be reduced then parking can be eliminated from a certain areas yes open to that stipulation. Cracknell reduced by board or size of the building. Tormey yes and will add screening.

Howe – how is this tied into parking. Possible 2:43. DD parking on both sides tight down there doesn't really function on both corners. Howe – concerned increase 2:43 trucks can't get out. Crimmins – traffic stuff done with that as one way.

PUBLIC HEARING

Bratter – kids in HS owned conversion van now daughter owns 7 passenger car. When in the back can't sit back here not comfortable. That's problematic with dev. Trying to put in way too much. Massive amount of parking. Lift system is good idea but still short when they're done. even if changed units and made them bigger and sold them. Beautiful piece of prop with good view. Personally think solve parking need to reduce number of units which would allow use space in more efficient way. Nothing more annoying than coming home from work and not being able to park at your own house. If have to park across the st. may not be happy. Less units would make for better parking. Lift system on demand system. Reduce units.

Liz Hewitt 169 McDonough St. hope this committee will hold off saying something with conditions. Project should go smoothly through HDC and be blessed by HDC and con comm. Nobody agrees with project. Said didn't want to see any surface parking and building was too big and. If make changes will impact parking. Should not be here yet. Thought just had to go to the HDC meeting but they will have to go back. That can impact this project significantly. As a resident hard to watch all sitting here discussing when should not be here this month. Would like this postponed until HDC and con comm.

Close.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Howe what is outstanding just parking? DD – 2:49. That and parking 2 issues.

Britz not done and may change. Planning would not approve a project that could change at this point.

Cracknell typical HDC approves long after planning. Nothing barring this from moving forward. HDC is only barred on acting project itself if requires variance. Most projects go to multiple boards simultaneously. If do move forward need to carefully stipulate and may need to re-review if not

comply. HDC not well received but also not done. need to include parking lift system in baseline parking plan, surface spaces 24-25 spaces in the lift should be identified as reserve parking. Any surface parking between water and building should be reduced through planning cup, shared parking, or if HDC reduces volume of the building.

Britz – appreciate that notion more complicated. Can't go through planning. Cracknell can go previous to HDC it's their risk. 2:54. Cracknell – can move forward now with stipulations or can wait many months before coming back. Building volume and design not our jurisdiction. Can cover the parking in relation to volume in stip.

Cracknell moved to approve, DD.

Howe – not sure why that road is in the plan. DD – talked about making road wider for 2 way initially. Howe – that is a problem if it's going to be 2 way.

Cracknell going to take many months for HDC to review this. 3 weeks to address Raynes Ave. nowhere near building permit. Retract motion. Continue to one month to have that issue resolved. Then applicants can switch parking and address berm idea. Roadway.

Cracknell, DD postpone to November.

Brown PTS after tac next month. Britz can postpone again?

Unanimous.

- C. The request of **Gregory J. Morneault and Amanda B. Morneault (Owners)** and **Darrell Moreau (Applicant)** for property located at **137 Northwest Street** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide 1 existing lot with 18,134 square feet of lot area, 19 feet of lot depth, and 537 feet of street frontage into 2 lots as follows: Proposed Lot 1 with 7,500 square feet of lot area, 44 feet of lot depth, and 179 feet of street frontage; Proposed Lot 2 with 10,634 square feet of lot area, 25 feet of lot depth, and 357 feet of street frontage. The existing residence will remain and be on Proposed Lot 1 and a new home will be constructed on Proposed Lot 2. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 122 Lot 2 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District and Historic District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Cahnon represented the application. Proposed subdivision and lot subdivide a single family house. Here because requirement subdivision any sheet 1 coversheet. Subdivision plan shows the easement created to benefit the city. First is existing water line part of water project done at time of construction of new bridge water main brought into bypass. The second easement on the right side of the plan. Area is encroachments of the pump station onto the property. That pump station put into the easement and section of the lot to provide for turnaround. Allows city

to access pump station. Plan shows easement to allow for access and plowing. Applicant agreed to put in paved turnout for the city. Existing conditions shows topography and next sheet shows the site plan. Placement on the lot and 100 foot buffer. buffer runs from the lower righthand side and through proposed house. Structure is placed in location allows for. Push to west lot narrows and structure not possible. Gravel turnaround will be moved and that will be reseeded. Then paved turnout on the other side. Raising up catch basin to make it more accessible turnout. Property has garage on the east side to line up with existing driveway. This application put garage on the west side of home and moves drive further from buffer. It provides for addition of sun room on east side and yard. Lines up proposed driveway the driveway across the street. So will not shine lights into home across st. ground plan flatter so not a lot of grading needed. Building up to grade on east side. Turn off for 2 garage spaces. Walkway to front door. In buffer need cut from city. Passed out cut plan with highlighted colors to show pervious area to be moved. Catch basin in the area with turnout has single discharge pipe goes to south east into mill pond. Show signs of erosion so will put in some armor to stabilize the outlet. Usual detail sheets.

Chagnon Project received variance lot depth. Did show proposed structure on the lot and had setback relief granted by zoning board. showed variance plan improved. Revised house location moved east and narrower. Variance for 3 foot front yard and 6.5 foot rear yard variance.

Chagnon – open space 69%.

Next comment about curb cut - may be which side of the house driveway should be on. Concern on northwest st. can put garage doors on the side. If there is a concern can add a fence or shrub screening.

Next comment about 100 buffer. Chagnon – think qualify for cut because equally significant amount of impervious gravel in buffer removed and returned to natural state. Will be moved away further from wetland resource. Here for subdivision approval part of that info on what will be built and happy to share. But this point the applicant spent a lot of money and done work to move process along. Looking for feedback to planning regarding subdivisions.

Cracknell – location of the garage only issue that's worth making considering here is how HDC will perceive garage doors coming up northwest st. agree there is a way to screen that. Prop driveway location fully align it with what's across the road. If you use prop right now 2 cars in garage and no one can fit in drive and in and out of site. would not be opposed to lengthening drive to parking in front of the garage. Hard to get out of garage in one space. Way designed make drive deeper or create better turnaround. Fence or more trees. What would be appropriate short stone wall along driveway. Screen the turnaround area. Better than fence. If I lived there would want to park in front of the garage and still get out.

Chagnon designed for people to pull in garage. 30 feet is pretty standard back up for garage. Can look at that. Applicant – comment well taken. Adding turnaround prevents backing into st. will utilize it. Cracknell – 2 more spaces helps substantiate expense of the wall.

Britz – get comment about moving house further and agree with gravel removal. Catch basin plan for that. Chagnon – raise the rim. 3:20. Britz if there is a way to move it 10 feet will be better. Chagnon –

TAC Comments:

- 1.5” water service is not warranted in DPW opinion

PUBLIC HEARING

No one.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

DD, howe. Cracknell 3:22 recc stipulations. Unanimous.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The application of **Monarch Village, LLC (Applicant)**, on behalf of **Neveesha Hospitality, LLC (Owner)** for property located at **3548 Lafayette Road** requesting Site Plan Review and a Conditional Use Permit as permitted under 10.5B41.10 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for the demolition of 6 structures; the redevelopment of 6 existing structures to create 6 units in building 8, 15 units in building 2, 5 units in building 4, 2 units in building 5, 9 units in building 7; the construction of 4 new structures to create 12 units in building 3 with a 4,303 square foot footprint, 24 units in building 6 with a 7,048 square foot footprint, a 250 square foot storage structure and an 825 square foot storage structure; creating a total of seventy-five (75) residential units with 123 parking spaces where 113 spaces are required. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 297 Lot 6 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-21-90)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Saari from Altus Engineering. What’s changed since work session then get into the comments. Site plan added a 5 foot wide sidewalk to link building 1-2 parkign and multi use path on route 1. Covered parking and two storage buidilgns.

TAC Comments:

- Additional sewer flows need to be mitigated that their proposed project would add to the sewer basin (use similar to stipulation put forward for #3400 Lafayette and use that here)
 - Saari – what need. DD – additional sewer flows existing vs. proposed ask for mitigation to take that out of the sewer station. Sewer pumping station at mx flow.
- Need to connect into SMH 5158. An additional SMH 1 will need to be moved farther into the driveway to accommodate this connection. There is not enough space next to the

existing force main to construct SMH 1 as shown. Eliminate the existing 6" connection in the driveway location.

- Saari – can do that. 6 inch referring to existing main line. Can do that.
- Existing sewer connection from Building 8 to SMH 5158 must be abandoned
 - Saari – not sure it goes there. Think it's already covered.
- Existing water service to property needs to be abandoned in Lafayette Road
 - Saari on dmeo plan.
- Need proof of easement with flowage rights for drainage between CB#7 to US Route 1 across adjoining lot
 - Saari.- that is right now line start on prop on north and comes down prop. Originlay dev in 30s and only easentn can find. Not touching anything over the line and redoing catch basin but outfall as is. DD – basins overflow if pipe fails then will flood site. If you don't have rights to the pipe. Saari – think it's coming from tortilla flats site. Will look again. DD – need to investigate the line more and need to fully understand offsite flows and how getting picke dup. Saari will tlak to abutting prop owner.
- Fire service does not appear to connect to Existing Building 2
 - Saari – 15 inch need fire serveice. Howe – anything more than 3 untis. 3:36.
- Separate building 1 and 2's sewer services and building 2 and 3's sewer services. Sewer laterals should not be combined.
 - Saari – ok.
- One way direction flow.
 - No issue reversing

Hopefully soon see it. Working on it.

Landscaping plan calling out a couple areas from community space. People will use how ant to use it. Existing patio and will have picnic tables. Crcknell – need ot show where will be. Hard tie seeing how it's useable by anyone who doesntnt live ther. It's weak put some time inot it with landscape plan. SAAari ok.

Buidlign identified. Saari – two new apts. Everything else existing. Will label.

8 foot ped. Saari – can widen to 8.

Confirm building side types. Saari – have some play with arch for 2 new. Everything else existing. Working on the elevations. 3:40.

Detail bike pakring. Saari have 20 space sin bike racks. Thorough site.

Parking lelss should be consider. Saari will lose some parking with covered parking. Will lose 3 spaces. Crcaknell do that or no. saari open ot that discussion.

Details storage buildngs sill get that.

Space near crowasal, saari will removed.

Saari – covered parking last min add. Wihat will need. Normal support. Need to know what kind of detail needed. Not required. Britz – solar panels up there. Saari ok. Cracknell- need a detail on that. 3:43

Cracknell – strage buildings. Saari – wood fram const but will add details. Doors on driveway.

Howe – revering direction. Saari right now clockwise but will reverse it.

DD – shown in fornt should be in 12 foot reserve strip. Saari – ok will move. DD strip reserved closer to sidewalk. In this particular area doubt Lafayette rd. 12 foot strip more important to city. Easement for Dot. Saari – ok.

DD -8 ich existing pipe from abutting prop to here. Can't find it on the site but takes care of drainage. 3:46. Other guy has not found the outlet. DD – need access to their prop to figure it out. Othr guy that's fine.

Cracknell storm water traffic third party review. Saari – no problem with that.

Cracknell all these units and one 10 by 20 dumpster. Saari – two dumpsters in there and may need to pick up more than once a week.

PUBLIC HEARING

3:49 Steven Townsend? 35 lafayette road abutter. Keep mine short. Concern with property line and how dileneate from one section to the other. Building 1 and building 2. Prop line between wher think culvert is draining out. 5-6 feet from prop line. Asked ot have picnic tables moved because on our prop. Concerned about the other picnic area near concrete blocks. Concerned with 75 units we have 25 units. Worried peope will migrate to our oicnic area without a fence or something there. People put stuff in back of building concner about storage of stuff in the abck of the buildings. Other issue seen without delineation suring redev process. People with tents said worked at rest and in process finding a place to live. In redev that will stay away. Put in something ot delineate between the two properties. Last concern pin placement drilled into rock and see double flag further north. Not sure lines are accurt. Don't know if double flag was moved. May or may not be an issue. Couple things as good neighbors put in fences and clean up area. Other gusy no issue with dilenation or cleaning upback of buildings.

Closed hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Howe – still somethings to work out. 3:55.

- B.** The request of **Elizabeth B Larsen Trust, (Owner)**, for property located at **668 Middle Street** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide 1 existing lot with 81,046 square feet of lot area, and 69.83 feet of street frontage into 3 lots as follows: Proposed Lot 1 with 18,646 square feet of lot area and no street frontage; Proposed Lot 2 with 18,756 square feet of lot area and no street frontage; Proposed Lot 3 with 43,644 square feet of lot area and 69.83 feet of street frontage. The existing buildings will remain and be on Proposed Lot 3. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 147 Lot 18 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) and Historic Districts. (LU-21-23)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Coranati spoke to the application. This is a front end subdivision. Over size dlot for this area of town. Frontage on Chevrolet and middle. Two structures onth eprop. Front on middl 3 family old house converted to 3 apts. Behind that an old carriage house that is renovated to single family home. Frontage on chev. Keep both structures as is and att two frontage lots on chve. Been to zoning for variances. Same thing happened basically next door. Keep the access for the front house and carriage access of middle leave as is. Carriage has a little driveway off chev asl well with fence and gate. Garage is on the rear of the building. That's where the access goes to. Kept frontage on chev for that. Still can keep that access. Then two oversized lots on Chevrolet. Working with abutters to keep dev away from them and agreed with that. Exising dweelinfs would be condos. Then make these 2 diff condo buildings. Front would contain 3 units and back just one unit. Parking already set up for their units. No proposals yet to build one two lots but sewer ends down the road a little ways. Does not continue down chev. Porposing to extend the sewer line to provide access. Pushing sewer manhole down road.

DD – sewer run so comes immediately off road. Across lot 2 with access easemtn to lot 1. Come out of manhole.

Coranati – is there an easement. Same sewer easement across the front. Provide easements as well. DD – just paved chev ave and put in new sidewalk. Currently after year sowrth research. Chev ave is not centered in right of way so partially in land so trying to get easements os eventually all owned at least in easement form by the city. Asking for an easement for the road that follows sewer line. Access for lot 1 and 2 for sewer. owener working on adjusmntnets for 30 foot easement to adjust with abutter so hopefullcan work with her on that as well. Eliminate 30 foot wide easemtn and put in another one.

TAC Comments

Coranait site plan review approval required. Coranati – didn't think site plan review was required. Owner – not proposing to build on the lots currently. Just want to subdivide then van go through requirements at that time. Cracknell – unless deed restrict the lots to single family. 2 units or more trigger site plan review. Owner – not required for single family or duplex. Language. Cracknell if do 2 two families need site plan approval. Restrict it to avoid conversation then need site plan approval. Owner – request condition of approval. Cracknell – any future dev on either dev on either lot requires site plan approval. Anything other than single family on lots 1-2 need site plan review. Owner pk.

Cracknell – exclusive use area. Cleaner if convey out to people who have agreements with. Possible that setback considered a side yard. Conservatively called it out as rear. If it's a side only reured 10 anyway. Convey it out in 2 piece. Still have room for single family unit. Cleaner than everyone using each others property. Owener – preference to leve way it is with easement. Crcaknell would just clean it up to do itthat way. Owner – will look at it.

- Need right of way and utility easement over Chevrolet Ave approx. 6' off of the edge of pavement.
 - Coranati -
- For areas where the sewer main is outside above easement (road) then easement for sewer over lot 1 and lot 2 securing rights for lot 1 to put service over lot 2 will be required.
- Applicant will need to mill and overlay full road width for length of disturbance area and repair sidewalk as needed, subject to DPW satisfaction (temporary pavement at time of construction to existing pavement depth and then after a winter season complete full mill and overlay).
- Need storm water mitigation on proposed lots 1 and 2 when designed.

PUBLIC HEARING

No one.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

DD Cracknell moved with stip,

DD need to make sure all parcels have access to proper drainage. Cracknell does it make sense to tether to driveway permit so public works will see some of the open ended infrastructure questions. DD – will need 2 driveway permits at some point. Will want to see it sooner. 4:17.

Britz – would think we should see what DD asking before planning. DD – should be easy but needs to be done before subdivision plan recorded. Britz – who will confirm it. DD – public works will.

Unanimous.

- C. The request of **The Sagamore Group, LLC** for properties located at **1169 Sagamore Avenue and 1171 Sagamore Avenue** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition of 3 existing principal structures (3 single family units) and 3 existing accessory structures to be replaced with 6 single family structures and 2 2 family structures to total 10 living units and 22 parking spaces where 15 is required. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 224 Lot 14 and Assessor Map 224 Lot 15 and lie within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) District. (LU-21-167)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Coranti two parcels with 3 single family homes on them. Dev all the way around it. South is condos west and north sea star cove. Remove existing structures on the site 3 existing curb cuts on sagamore. Removing 2 of three curb cuts. One in the middle of the site to provide access. Then loop driveway for ease of turn around out of property. One way circulation around the site. 6 single families and 2 all condo units. All facilities on site private. Access to sewer and water and gas. Propane for gas. Each unit 2 car garage and space in drive for 2 vehicles. 2 parallel spaces for visitors in the middle. Also mailbox kiosk location and a one way pattern around the site. Counterclockwise. Storm water Mike been working on this site to discuss layouts. Existing storm water heads off in multiple directions. Existing retention pond for property. Low point on sag and some out to sag a diff way. Designed 4 rain gardens and all corners of prop. They bring flow to central underground containment pond. Then provides cool storage. Rain garden treatment with underdrains into pipes to detention pond then discharge between units. All privately maintained handled by condo assoc. prelim meeting with TAC comment about extending sidewalks. Surveyed along sagamore all the way to sea star cove entrance and have designed sidewalk through there. Couple of odd scenarios. Low point of the road creates issue for adding a sidewalk there as funneling storm water into the curbcut. Designed tip down to allow storm water to get off sagamore into low lying area. Didn't know if there was any thoughts for that. City owns land to the east. Britz – culvert there? Coranti – looks like there should be one there. We looked. COT will look through old records. Old entrance to the moose lodge. Mike – fairpoint comm has an easement through there as well. Coranti will investigate what can do. Need to figure out something if going to run sidewalk

need to plan for storm water for that area. Coranati met with DOT and will look at a cross section of sagamore and talk about how far want sidewalk from center line.

DD 4:32.

TAC Comments:

Third party review of traffic. Coranati – would we reach out to them. DD – no we pick a third-party engineer for you. Mike – peer review condition of planning approval. No objection to do it.

Britz in addition to storm water and traffic need a wetland scientist as well. Coranati ok. Provided traffic analysis. DD – state road state permit. Coranati so storm water and wetland and state will do traffic review.

Second comment removal of trees. Coranati – mike – appropriate to put up overview of GIS. Wetland and tree comments. Not a lot of trees on the property. On the back rear of the site. Plan remain on southwest side and north east. Trying to maintain what's there. Most of the site is cleared. Robust landscaping plan proposed with the site. Comment about wetland buffer. Offset wetland across the road. GIS show delineation and buffer. Radius goes 1 foot on northeast side of the property. City flagged it. Can locate the boundary and the 100 foot radius. Coranati will have or scientist flag it. Britz – locate the trees. Mike- located trees on the property and shown on the plan. Will have more planted.

DD – have to leave Joe in general looks like a lot of mitigating through chambers but all storm water directed into hole in the ground. Combo with the issue with the sidewalk drainage may be necessary to do improvement across st. not sure what happens if get major storm and hole is frozen what happens to that water. Creating a lot of structure and if rain garden fill up and underdrain stop working hole can fill. That's what's driving storm water review. Things to think about part of sidewalk design so all water not concentrated along curb into neighbors property. Hole in ground a lot of risk. Rest of comments on the page.

Coranati rest of the comments straight forward.

- Provide easement to City south of driveway along Sagamore Ave for sidewalk, as needed for City to construct future sidewalk.
- Drainage flow at south east of property must be redirected into the detention pond at south east of property. Drainage flow cannot be directed towards sidewalks or proposed sidewalk easement areas.
- Need third party drainage review.
- DOT sidewalk agreement will be needed for construction and City maintenance.
- Need third party inspection of utilities and drainage.
- All propane tanks should be in front or side yards.
- Confirm proposed water main material. Detail and plan conflict.

- Extend SMH 3 farther into property and have sewer services connect to sewer main, not SMH.
- Provide proposed water demands including potable and irrigation.

Coranati – snow storage in the middle and in front of each of the units. Howe 4:42.
Coranati – all buried.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mark 1167 sagamore ave. I have not been contacted. There is some wetlands that are being ignored. Also present owners filled it in. that's why can't see water. Kids used to play hockey etc. I think if that area was cleaned there would be a large flow. Suggesting wetland scientist check it out. Mentioned blasting will that be happening. Ledge runs into my property. If cute amount of units downwwn would not need to blast and would not create as much runoff. Sidewlaks will also create a lot of water. Concerned about blasting and a lot of buffers by the back condos. Chinburg spent a lot of time to figure out how to get water away. Concerned about the wetlands that have been filled in.

Bill roland 1169 sagarmoe president of homeowner assoc downhill form dev. Have not had a chance to do analysis want to do. First time seen water plan which has been the primary concern. Hired john chagnon who was the engineer who designed water system for our condo dev and asked him to look at this design and ensure will function ot extent. Upper left back of two houses below the st then 8 houses across the st. we are concerned the most about the 2 abutting prop. Collectively concerned about the water. Currently most of the water comes onto our prop already. Swale collect water culvert under our street into rain gardens and over flows into tucker cove. In the last 2 weeks with rain have had capacity of our system going into tucker cove. Very concerned about goes from 18% impervious to 54%. 3 items to think about on the water. Uppe rleft on our prop. From what we see not going ot be adversely effected. Big area of concern to the north and esat wetland are a more on our prop than on prop being dev. Whatever done there and liabilities are ours. Put that with sidewalks and prop to north that's quite problematicve. First discussion with chagnon is under some circumstances over berm to other collection system. Are up there major concern to use. Third area of water lowerlef tjust of the map. This is collection point 4 walking the terrain drops couple feet from collection pond to boundary of properties. Surface runoff down driveway. In today's 18% factor. Wont be treatedjust run down driveways between two houses. Don't know what the process is but gald a 3rd party engineer involved. Risk in this area. Second subject of landscape plan some folks concerned about the sidewalk. Would like to walk down to tuckers cove. Big bike st. as put in sidewalk take that into consideration for bike paths. Cumulative effect on traffic. One dev makes all the diff. would like to think about traffic flashing yellow light. Hard to get out of our st now with this and other dev on sagamore. Chagnon shares and validates concerns.

No one.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Britz move to postpone 3rd party wetland and storm water, Cracknell. Unanimous.

Coranati wetland off site bigger than 10,000 sf has a setback only think in buffer ris off sit improvements. Britz work in buffer on your property. Coranati will we need a cup for sidewalk in road. Britz – anything on your property. Work in city right of way. 4:57.

V. ADJOURNMENT

[Cracknell , britz 4:57 unanimous.](#)