

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

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

2:00 PM

August 3, 2021

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peter Stith, Acting Chair, David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Darrin Sargent, Police Captain

MEMBERS ABSENT: Juliet TH Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector;

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Stefanie Casella, Planner 1; Chad Putney, Fire Prevention Officer

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the July 6, 2021 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the July 6, 2021 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** 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. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this application to the September 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

- 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 from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. Mr. Crimmins noted that they included a response sheet that outlined the actions that were taken on the comments from last month, and they can answer any questions from the Committee if needed.

TAC Comments:

- Please respond to the peer review comments provided by TEC dated July 28, 2021
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they submitted a response this morning. There were only 3 comments that warranted some further analysis. The plan has been revised based on TEC's recommendations and it did not change the traffic study results.
- How are the building block length requirements along Maplewood Ave. met?
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they have included a front lot line build out exhibit that shows how they calculated the numbers for that.
 - Mr. Cracknell agreed that they have met the requirements but suggested making the community space a different color. That way it won't show as frontage. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would update that.
- The façade modulation requirements will be addressed by the HDC but need to be consistent with the maximum of 80 feet.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that this comment was acknowledged
- Subject to HDC approval, the 5th floor section setback 50 feet from the frontage of 203 Maplewood Ave. and 31 Raynes Ave. is permitted due to the lot merger with 1 Raynes Ave.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that was understood. Mr. Cracknell commented that this was three lots pulled together. That is what creates the building that's

proposed. Merging the lots allows the building in the height of the building in the lower height district provided it's 50 feet back from the street.

- Subject to Conservation Commission and Planning Board approval, the 50+ parking spaces, dumpster enclosure, and trail improvements will all need approved under a Conditional Use Permit for being located within the 100 foot wetland buffer along the North Mill Pond. Although a 13% reduction of impervious surface is proposed more surface parking will result with the proposed project. I would suggest the three parallel parking spaces along the northern side of the 5 story building be replaced with additional landscaping.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they could remove those spaces and still meet the city's parking requirements.
- A 60 millimeter pinehall brick should be used for the vehicular unit paver along Maplewood Ave.
 - Mr. Cracknell clarified that it should be 80 millimeters to allow for emergency access. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.
- The proposed privacy gate/ fence is acceptable as a screenwall.
 - Mr. Crimmins agreed.
- What is the proposed material for the timber decking? IPE should be considered and public access provided.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they have not selected a material yet. They are more than happy to consider that as a material. Public access will be provided for the pier if it is restored.
- The optional kayak launching deck is recommended.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that this was understood.
- The dumpster enclosure, paving patterns, privacy gate, trail entrance plantings, landscape plans, seating niches, kayak storage area and launch are all suitable improvements for the community space.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that this was understood.
- The engineer/developer needs to demonstrate in writing that the application meets all the requirements of Article 7 of the City's Site Plan Review regulations as these relate to stormwater management. Particular emphasis should be on compliance with Section 7.4- Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan (SMECP), and Section 7.6- Post Construction Stormwater Management Design Standards (Paragraphs 7.6.1, 7.6.2 and 7.6.3). Note that 7.6.3 refers to the "Pollutant Tracking and Accounting Program (PTAP)", that is part of the City's MS4 Program requirements.
 - Mr. Crimmins agreed. The plans and drainage study do address the items in 74 and 76. A lot is overlapping with AOT regulations, and this project will require an AOT permit. Mr. Crimmins agreed with the tracking program comment and confirmed they would sign up prior to the certification of occupancy.

Mr. Putney requested more information on the parking lifts. Mr. Crimmins responded that he would forward the parking system video to him.

PUBLIC HEARING

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. commented that it looked like landscaping was blocking the dumpster area in the plans. Mr. Cracknell confirmed that the plan shows gates and access. Ms. Bratter commented that at the last meeting Juliet Walker said residential parking wouldn't be assigned per unit and no tandem parking would be used by the hotel. That was not addressed today. The peer review noted that there was a lot of parking on the street and in the Foundry Garage. Those numbers have changed since other developments have gone in. The parking director should be included in this discussion. There are some missing answers to the peer review comments. The biggest complaint from the different Boards that have seen this is that it's a large project on toxic land. The snow management should be done in tandem with the plow truck.

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

Mr. Cracknell commented that they just got the response from the traffic peer review, and have not had time to look at it thoroughly. Ms. Bratter raised some issues about the site and traffic study. It makes sense the peer review would be looking at the revised responses. They should forward the questions raised by Ms. Bratter to be addressed as well. Mr. Cracknell commented that this should move to the Planning Board after it goes to the Historic District Commission. They have jurisdiction over the building design and height. It would be helpful to see if all this volume sticks. Parking is all dependent on how many units there are and how big the building is.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this application to the September 7, 2021, Technical Advisory Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The request of **Green & Company (Applicant) and Philip J. Stokel and Stella B. Stokel (Owners)** for property located at **83 Peverly Hill Road** requesting Conditional Use Permit approval for an Open Space Planned Unit Development according to the requirements of Section 10.725 of the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Review approval for the construction of 56 single-family homes and a new 2,950-foot public road with related utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 242 Lot 4 and lie within the Single Residence A (SRA) and Single Residence B (SRB) Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Colwell and Jack McTigue from TF Moran, Mike and Jenna Green, Attorney John Bosen, and Gregg Mikolaities from August Consulting spoke to the application. Mr. Colwell reviewed the comments and their updates from their last meeting in July.

July TAC Comments:

- a. The applicant should be required to construct the multiuse path along the frontage of their property and up to the already existing Middle Road pedestrian sidewalks system in accordance with the McFarland Johnson preliminary plan.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that the proposed multiuse path is still in design and the final construction costs are not determined. The path will also impact abutting property owners. The applicant would rather contribute to an escrow account instead of constructing it.
- b. Sewer Extension Permit and Alteration of Terrain Permits must be approved by DES
 - i. Mr. Colwell confirmed those applications would be filed after TAC approval.
- c. Please provide an additional 5' wide roadway and ancillary uses easement to the City on both sides of the proposed 40' ROW in case additional room is needed in the future for road or sidewalk repairs or utility expansions.
 - i. Mr. Colwell confirmed that 3-foot-wide easements were provided in the right of way.
- d. The design of the block retaining wall system to be used from roughly station 1+25 to 3+10 shall be approved by the City prior to installation. The wall is to be permitted by the building inspector's office and needs to be inspected by the City during construction. The PE of record will also need to sign off that the wall is constructed properly before the City will accept the final product.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that they added the label to the walls.
- e. Please add a vegetated buffer of at least 10' along the cemetery edge.
 - i. Mr. Colwell confirmed this has been added. There was also a comment last night about extending the width of the buffer to 20 feet. The 10-foot buffer can be expanded to 20 feet.
- f. The sewer main should not be located within 5' from the back edge of the retaining wall.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that they agreed with the comment and moved it to the north side of the road. The drainage remained on the south side.
- g. The lighting standards should have breakaway 'transformer' type bases.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that this item has been addressed
- h. Where is the grass paver path?
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that the grass paver path is highlighted in green. It goes through the middle of the loop. There is gravel maintenance path for BMPs. The grass paver path goes on one side or the other of the gravel path. This will allow vehicles to access the area for maintenance.
- i. Light pole base detail shown is not appropriate. Use Eversource standard details
 - i. Mr. Colwell confirmed that they have been in touch with Eversource and appropriate details will be included.

- j. All catch basins in the roadway shall have poly liners
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that poly liners were added to the roadway and catch basins.
- k. All castings, manholes, pipe and methods of installation shall meet City standards
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that notes were updated to address this.
- l. All water services shall be 1” minimum size. All curb boxes shall be per City standard, not ‘buffalo’ as currently depicted. Only 2” services require tapping saddles please fix detail.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that the size has been revised.
- m. Gravity sewer service and main details should be changed to State standard details.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that the gravity sewer service state standard details are included in the plan.
- n. Please provide a response to the TEC peer review memo dated June 22, 2021
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that they provided a response to the TEC peer review memo. This was addressed at the last meeting. There was an additional memo with one issue that needed to be addressed. That item was to include a future shared use path. That was discussed in the first comment.
- o. The final plan set will need to have a final review by TEC prior to Planning Board review
 - i. Mr. Colwell agreed.
- p. ConCom review of this plan is required prior to PB review per Section 10.727.22 of the Zoning Ordinance
 - i. Mr. Colwell confirmed that they have filed for the August meeting.
- q. A conventional subdivision plan should be provided as part of the submission to PB in order for the PB to determine compliance with Section 10.727.312
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that this was submitted to TAC.
- r. Please provide a draft development agreement as required by the zoning ordinance. A template is available from the Planning Department.
- s. Has the recommendation from Weston & Sampson’s review been incorporated into the plan set?
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that the recommendations from the Weston and Sampson review included in plan set.
- t. Please review for consistency with the City’s Peverly Hill Road improvement project and show how the project will tie into the proposed improvements.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that they submitted an additional exhibit that shows how the sidewalks will tie in. They left the area without other improvements to allow for construction for the multiuse path. The sidewalks will tie into that on Peverly Hill Road.
- u. Public access easements shall be required for the proposed ped/bike path connection.

- i. Mr. Colwell responded that it was a public road so easements should not be necessary. They did provide a 15-foot-wide easement for the bike path to the park and rail trail.
- v. Please provide construction details of the proposed ped/bike path connection.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that details for the gravel path portion are included.
- w. The site drainage is still being reviewed by City staff. It would be helpful if the applicant could provide detailed written confirmation that the application meets all of the requirements of Article 7 of the Site Plan Review regulations as these relate to stormwater management, with particular emphasis on sections 7.4 and 7.6.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that all post development flows meet or decrease stormwater flows. They will provide a statement with the final calculations. They work for all storm events. Mr. Desfosses commented that they should include the size of the slope. Mr. McTigue confirmed it was accounted for in the calculations. Mr. Desfosses questioned if there was an erosion risk. Mr. McTigue responded that it was not steep enough to be erosive. Mr. Desfosses responded that they should include a detail showing 2% slope for the existing gravel road.
- x. The proposed gravel maintenance access road to the stormwater system should provide a turn around for vehicles.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that there were three turnarounds. They are 10 feet wide and 20 feet long bump outs. Mr. McTigue noted that there was a 4-foot trail that turned into grass pavers to reduce the size of the gravel path. Vehicles can still drive on the grass pavers. Mr. Cracknell commented that it was odd to stop the grass pavers in the middle of the loop. Mr. Colwell commented that the landscaping hides the gravel path. Mr. Green commented that the grass pavers were not an inexpensive option. It softens the look in the important areas. Plantings will hide the gravel pathway. It will not be visible from the homes. The grass pavers will be maintained by the homeowners' association. Mr. Cracknell questioned if it could all be a gravel road with landscaping on both sides the whole way. Mr. Green responded that the path is very close to the houses at one point, so it would be hard to do landscaping there. There will be landscaping where it is possible. The 4-foot path with 6-foot grass pavers will make it less of an eye sore. Mr. Cracknell questioned who would maintain this. Mr. Green responded that the homeowners' association would. Mr. Desfosses commented that anything inside the ROW and city easement will be maintained by the city. Mr. Green noted that the grass pavers will be mowed by the association.
- y. The addition of the trail and open space is a community benefit from this project. Is there maintenance longterm/shortterm anticipated for the trail from the site to the former railroad right-of-way?
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that maintenance for the trail will be maintained by who holds easement, so when the conservation easement is conveyed to the city it would be their responsibility.

- z. Please provide a statement listing the green building components planned for this project
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that the statement listing the green building components was submitted with this last plan set
- aa. The termination of the proposed grass paver should provide for a turnaround of maintenance vehicles
- bb. The proposed landscaping along the cemetery buffer should be staggered within the required setback zone.
 - i. Mr. Colwell agreed they would be staggered. The plan is to save the mature trees. The buffer can be expanded to 20 feet of landscaping. Extending the buffer another 10 feet will not impact the slope. Mr. Cracknell questioned how many trees will be removed and if they would be replaced. Mr. Colwell responded that they were not removing any trees. The only thing being removed was shrubs. The plan is to plant 3-3.5 inch caliper trees.
- cc. The sidewalk should be concrete
 - i. Mr. Colwell agreed.
- dd. One of the proposed 4 parking spaces at the pocket park/ trailhead should be accessible given public access is encouraged.
 - i. Mr. Colwell responded that was updated.

Mr. Colwell noted that it was suggested by fire to widen the road at the hydrants and that has been done. It was widened with pavers instead of asphalt. Mr. Desfosses responded that the preference would be to widen it with asphalt for ease of maintenance. Mr. Colwell agreed. The hydrants were put at the high points and another one was added. It was suggested that they add electric and gas under the sidewalks. The sewer is in the north lane and water is in the south lane. Mr. Desfosses responded that they could not put gas under the sidewalk. The entrance of the water main should come out and go south of the catch basin to keep 10 feet of separation from the sewer. Mr. Colwell agreed and noted that the gas can go down the center line.

Mr. Colwell reviewed the comments for today's meeting.

August TAC Comments:

- Recommended stipulations of approval
 - Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant will provide a financial contribution (to be held in escrow) for construction of the shared use path as designed by the City extending from the new roadway to the intersection with Peverly Hill Road. The City will determine the recommended contribution prior to review by Planning Board.
 - A conventional subdivision plan should be provided as part of the submission to PB in order for the PB to determine compliance with Section 10.727.312
 - Applicant should provide detailed written confirmation that the application meets all of the requirements of Article 7 of the Site Plan Review regulations as these

- relate to stormwater management, specifically that the post-development flows all meet or decrease the pre-development stormwater flows.
 - Update subdivision and site plan review checklists prior to submission to PB.
- Plan set still shows the extension road on the Conceptual Design pages (pages 15 & 16) of the submittal.
 - Mr. Desfosses questioned if those plans should be part of this plan set. Mr. Colwell responded that it was included separately, but Ms. Walker requested they send this to the Committee. Mr. Cracknell noted that it demonstrates the compliance with the residential density but showing the subdivision plan is not appropriate and not easily defended. It's not needed and should not be included. Mr. Colwell agreed. However, it was needed in the last PUD for Banfield Rd. It seemed the ordinance required it. Mr. Cracknell commented that it should be clear that they are not using a conventional development plan to demonstrate density in the Planning Board. The open space requirement is more than met. They need to deemphasize the conventional layout and emphasize the formula.
- The proposed vegetative buffer along the cemetery should be increased to 20 feet in order to protect existing vegetation along the property line. A hurricane fence should be erected along the buffer prior to the commencement of any site grading or tree removal.
 - Mr. Cracknell noted that this was discussed above. The revised plans work with no issues. It's fine to leave it the way it is at 10 feet.
- The 100 foot buffer should be staked and fenced prior to the commencement of any earthwork.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed.
- An easement and/ the fee should be provided to the city for access to the parking area, trails and the protected open space.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they cannot do both an easement and a fee. Mr. Cracknell noted that the Legal Department has to review whatever instrument is chosen. It makes the most sense for the city to get it in a fee because of the proximity to the rail trail and the fish and wildlife public access. This area will not be getting a lot of use from the public. It is less problematic if the city has ownership in the back space. It has to be restricted to passive recreation which means the city won't build any structures out there at any time. Mr. Colwell responded that it was their preference to do an easement. The homeowners will be stewards for the property. Mr. Green confirmed that they can work with the legal department.
 - Mr. Desfosses commented that there needed to be bigger arcs in the tree clearing plan to create a wider path to allow vehicles back there. Mr. Colwell agreed.
- The applicant will need to construct the shared use path as there is no other alternative to get pedestrian out to the sidewalk network. The signal crossing equipment to get across Peverly Hill at Middle St will also be required to be functional.
- Road profile sheets must show geometry, Sewer manhole numbers and inverts,
 - Mr. Colwell agreed.

- The centrally located stormwater area’s easements need to be definitive (metes and bounds).
 - Mr. Colwell responded that the easements are shown in the general areas, but the metes and bounds will be set post construction.
- 3rd party inspection selected by City, paid for by developer will be required for the road, utilities and storm drainage.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed
- Final calculations regarding both the gravity and force sewer systems need to be provided.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that this was included in the plan set.
- Water mains shall be cl 52 CLDI wrapped in polyethylene with continuity wedges as per City Standards
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they would revise the detail.
- Design of Irrigation systems for houses must be approved (smart controls)
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they would add a note and questioned if they wanted a specification on the spot controllers. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct.
- The sewer force main seems to be excessively deep in areas, please explain.
 - Mr. McTigue confirmed they would look at it more.
- NHDES Sewer extension permit is required.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed and confirmed they would file after Planning Board approval.
- Force main’s entry into the gravity sewer must be detailed properly to disperse the flow correctly. This detail is currently missing from the plan set.
 - Mr. McTigue confirmed they would include the detail.
- The engineer/developer needs to demonstrate in writing that the application meets all the requirements of Article 7 of the City’s Site Plan Review regulations as these relate to stormwater management. Particular emphasis should be on compliance with Section 7.4- Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan (SMECP), and Section 7.6- Post Construction Stormwater Management Design Standards (Paragraphs 7.6.1, 7.6.2 and 7.6.3). Note that 7.6.3 refers to the “Pollutant Tracking and Accounting Program (PTAP)”, that is part of the City’s MS4 Program requirements.
 - Mr. Colwell confirmed they achieved that hour drain analysis and would include it in a memo.

Mr. Desfosses commented that they needed to install a walkway up Peverly Hill Road. Mr. McTigue responded that they would have to cut into the existing road to accomplish this. Mr. Desfosses noted that was understood. Mr. Colwell commented that it did not make sense to build that before construction. Mr. Mikolaities questioned if they could put in a temporary path. Mr. Desfosses responded that they could put in a temporary path that meets the standards. It would need to be a 6-foot asphalt sidewalk up to the corner of Peverly Hill Rd. and Middle Rd. There needs to be a pedestrian push button to get across Peverly Hill Rd. It is easy to add a pedestrian push button to an existing signal. The signal there should be able to accommodate that. Mr. Colwell questioned if the path would fit in the existing ROW. Mr. Desfosses responded that it should.

Mr. Britz questioned who would maintain the bio retention area and gravel wetlands. Mr. Colwell responded that the homeowner's association would be responsible.

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 for consideration at the August Planning Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following stipulations:

- Applicant will construct a temporary shared use path to connect to the existing sidewalk network and install crossing equipment to cross Peverly Hill Road at Middle Rd.
- Applicant should provide detailed written confirmation that the application meets all of the requirements of Article 7 of the Site Plan Review regulations as these relate to stormwater management, specifically that the post-development flows all meet or decrease the pre-development stormwater flows.
- Update subdivision and site plan review checklists prior to submission to PB.
- Road profiles will show geometry, sewer manhole numbers, and inverts.
- Final calculations regarding both the gravity and force sewer systems will be provided.
- Cross slope percentages will be added as details.
- Pavement will be used instead of pavers for areas of road that are widened at hydrant areas.
- Water main shall be cl 52 CLDI wrapped in polyethylene with continuity wedges as per City Standards and called on in detail.
- Design of Irrigation systems for houses will use smart controls and noted on plan set.
- NHDES Sewer extension permit will be obtained.
- Force main's entry into the gravity sewer will be detailed in plan set.
- Reroute water main at entrance to provide separation from sewer line.
- Show expanded tree clearing for City vehicle access.

The motion passed unanimously.

- D. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** 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. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this application to the September 7, 2021 Technical Advisory Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

- F. The request of **Ricci Construction Company Inc, (Owner)** and **Green & Company Building & Development Corp. (Applicant)** for property located at **3400 Lafayette Rd** requesting Conditional Use Permit for a Development Site in accordance with Section 10.5B40 of the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Review approval for construction of a 50-unit multi-family residential development that includes community space and related landscaping, drainage, paving, utilities and other site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 297 Lot 11 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District and the Natural Resource Protection (NRP) District.

Mr. Cracknell moved to take a two-minute break, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Coronati spoke to the application. Since the last TAC meeting they met with city staff and made a couple significant changes to the plan. Previously there was a duplex at the end of the roadway, but it has been reallocated in the development. An extra unit was added on to two different buildings. Some of the roads have been realigned to make that work. There was also previously a trail system meandering through the wetland buffer. That was relocated to be closer to the proposed dwellings. A decorative fence was added along the pedestrian walkway. All of the greenway area would be revegetated with trees, bushes, and a conservation seed mix. There is an 8-foot-wide path that now connects to a proposed sidewalk. A crosswalk was added on the road. The 8-foot sidewalk goes all the way down to Route 1. This was a sizeable change to the layout. The wet pond was elongated, and plantings were added to provide more screening. There was a suggestion to make the front of the 12 units pavement and that has been added to the plan.

TAC Comments:

- What is the status of your application for required variances?
 - Mr. Coronati responded that two variances have been applied for.
- Your community space areas need to fit one of the types identified in the Ordinance, “dog park” and “trail” are not one of the types listed in Section 10.5A45.10. Please update your table to list only community space types identified in our ordinance.
 - Mr. Coronati confirmed they would update the terminology.

- You answered one of TAC’s comments from last month with a question “Where are we going to put the 8’ pedestrian walkway”? It is not TAC’s job to design the project for you, but it is your job to comply with the Ordinance. Your plans still do not appear to be in compliance with this requirement of the zoning ordinance.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that this question was included in error.
- Will-serve letters are required for all utilities.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that they were working on obtaining them.
- The proposed trail system should extend to Lafayette Rd. and provide public access.
- The dog park should be relocated to the interior island and be designed to support both amenities, drainage, and a state-of-the-art solid waste disposal/ sanitary system.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that the trail system does extend to Lafayette Road. The belief is that the public would go from Coach Road into the site then take a left down to the sewer easement. The other portion would be for the residents.
- The proposed dog park area should be redesigned as a pocket park given its proximity to the wetlands and the abutting townhouse units.
 - Mr. Cracknell noted that this was just a suggestion. It would be further away from the wetlands, and they could move the 4 visitor spaces somewhere else. Mr. Coronati confirmed that they would think about it.
- Trailhead connections and wayfinding signs should be included for residents on the eastern side of the development to access the recreational trails.
 - Mr. Coronati confirmed they would add it.
- The proposed recreational trails should maintain a consistent width from the curblineline to the main trail.
 - Mr. Coronati agreed. Mr. Cracknell commented that it was a good idea to provide protection for the townhouse decks and wetlands. It may make sense to bring the fence along the back and wrap it.
- Deeded public access should be offered for access to the proposed open space and undeveloped portion of the property that abuts city-owned parcels.
 - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- The entryways, garage doors and the first floor elevations should be revised to better separate the ground floor garages from the upper floor and create a better sense of entry for the townhouse units.
 - Mr. Cracknell noted that this was an architectural comment that has been discussed and resolved.
- Some water main size labels are still missing
 - Mr. Coronati responded that this was updated. Mr. Desfosses questioned if they did a fire flood test out here. Mr. Coronati confirmed that they did. They are figuring out how to boost it now. Mr. Desfosses commented that they will need two separate pressure zones unless they are boosting the domestic water too. Mr. Coronati confirmed that they would continue to look into it.
- The engineer/developer needs to demonstrate in writing that the application meets all the requirements of Article 7 of the City’s Site Plan Review regulations as these relate to stormwater management. Particular emphasis should be on compliance with Section 7.4-

Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan (SMECP), and Section 7.6- Post Construction Stormwater Management Design Standards (Paragraphs 7.6.1, 7.6.2 and 7.6.3). Note that 7.6.3 refers to the “Pollutant Tracking and Accounting Program (PTAP)”, that is part of the City’s MS4 Program requirements.

- Mr. Coronati responded that they need an AOT permit for this, so they will be more than compliant with local regulations.
- The City will require the developer to hire a 3rd party company to identify areas of ground water infiltration that can be eliminated from the local municipal sewer collection system. After agreement from the City on the targeted areas, the developer will need to permit and construct via whatever means are approved (repair/replace/reline) areas of the sewer successfully in order to create capacity for this development in the sewer system. The amount of infiltration to be removed must be a value equal or greater to two times the amount of waste predicted from the development.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that they have talked to DPW about where to look for infiltration and will continue to work with DPW on this.
- Third party inspection of all utilities and stormwater shall be required.
 - Mr. Coronati agreed.

Mr. Coronati noted that there was a request to meet the visitor parking. Parallel spaces were added along the side of the road near the mailbox kiosk to make a total of 10 visitor spaces.

Mr. Putney noted that it did not make sense to put a hydrant all the way at the end across from unit 20. Mr. Coronati responded that there was another one near unit 39. Mr. Putney commented that they needed to have a blow off hydrant at the end, but it would make more sense to put a hydrant near unit 19 or between unit 15 and 16.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the water system was not fully designed. All water mains will be calculated by size, so winging it may not work. Working with Weston and Sampson on this will be important.

Mr. Britz commented that it would be nice to have a way to get through the development with a sidewalk. Mr. Cracknell noted that it would make sense to move the sidewalk to go through the snow storage area instead of where it is now. Then a crosswalk can be created to the trail. Mr. Coronati commented that the main function of that sidewalk is to provide access to some of the units. Mr. Cracknell suggested adding a raised traffic calming measure that would slow traffic to make it safer walk in the road and leave everything else the way it was.

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. Cracknell noted that it will be important to see all of the details on the limit of work as well as the fencing and trailhead signage.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if the water design would change based on what's outstanding. Mr. Desfosses responded that they may have to add a building if they have to boost it. Mr. Cracknell commented that they would want to see a detail on that. Mr. Green noted that it could be added at the end of one of the buildings. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was fine as long as it met code.

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board for consideration at the September Planning Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

- o Applicant will update community space area terminology to be consistent with Ordinance terminology
- o Trailhead connections and wayfinding signs will be included for residents on the eastern side of the development to access the recreational trails.
- o Deeded public access will be provided to the proposed open space and undeveloped portion of the property that abuts city-owned parcels.
- o Water main sizes will be labeled.
- o Applicant will provide written statement that demonstrates conformance with Article 7 of the City's Site Plan Review regulations.
- o Applicant will hire a 3rd party company to identify areas of ground water infiltration that can be eliminated from the local municipal sewer collection system. After agreement from the City on the targeted areas, the developer will need to permit and construct via whatever means are approved (repair/replace/reline) areas of the sewer successfully in order to create capacity for this development in the sewer system. The amount of infiltration to be removed must be a value equal or greater to two times the amount of waste predicted from the development
- o Applicant will hire a third party to inspect all utilities and stormwater systems.
- o Applicant will provide a fire hydrant flow rate plan that shows acceptable pressure as determined by city DPW and Fire Department.

The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The application of **Warner House Association, Owner**, for property located at **150 Daniel Street**, requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a two-story Carriage House with 576 square foot building footprint that will include new utility services and the installation of stone walkways. Said property is shown on assessor Map 106 Lot 58 and lies within the Civic, Historic, and Downtown Overlay Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon noted that the project proposed was for the Carriage House. It is a historic location, and they are here for approval. The project been through the HDC and ZBA.

TAC Comments:

- The extra water service will not be approved. Only one water service per lot.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was discussed at the workshop. If it's not to be, then that is fine. They will adjust plan to show the new service.

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. Cracknell moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board for consideration at the August Planning Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

- B. Application of **Spaulding LLC, Owner**, for property located at **180 Spaulding Turnpike**, requesting Site Plan review for the renovation of the existing show room and the expansion of the customer service and office areas increasing the total square footage by 4,795 square feet. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 236 Lot 39 and lies within the General Business (GB) district.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering and Bill Hughes from Seacoast Mazda spoke to the application. The site plan shows the building renovation. The corporation is asking for the facility to be brought up to corporate standards. The plan is to take down the one-story addition and replace it with a slightly larger addition encompassing the entire front. The service drive up is currently outside. This addition will bring the service inside.

Mr. Hughes commented that a sprinkler system will be added to the building. They will put a sales trailer in the upper right corner and a service trailer in the left far corner during construction. All employees will park next door.

Mr. Britz requested more detail about the trailers. Mr. Hughes responded that they would be temporary trailers while construction was going on. Mr. Chagnon added that they are taking out the show room during construction. The trailers would provide space for the sales to happen during construction. Mr. Britz noted that the trailers were all in the wetland buffer, but they

were not included in the wetland CUP. Mr. Britz questioned how long they would be there. Mr. Hughes responded that they would be there for 7 months. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they would add it to the CUP application.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board for consideration at the August Planning Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Stith adjourned the meeting at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee