

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

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

**2:00 PM**

**January 4, 2022**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Peter Britz, Interim Planning Director, Environmental Planner; Peter Stith, Chairperson; Principle Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Darrin Sargent, Police Captain; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Stefanie Casella, Planner 1; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**ADDITIONAL  
STAFF PRESENT:**

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A.** Approval of minutes from the December 7, 2021 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Desfosses moved to approve the minutes from the December 7, 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 (LU-20-259)**

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

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this application to the February 1, 2022, Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

- B. REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The request of **The Sagamore Group, LLC, (Owner)**, 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. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** (LU-21-167)

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

Mr. Cronin moved to postpone this application to the February 1, 2022, Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

## **III. NEW BUSINESS**

- A.** The request of Elizabeth B. Larsen Trust of 2012 (Owner), for property located at **668 Middle Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of two two-unit structures and improvement to the existing structures to create a total of eight units on three lots with associated utilities, connections and site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 147 Lot 18 and lies within the Historic and General Residence A (GRA) Districts. (LU-21-23)

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Joe Coronati, Mike Garrepy and Tim Phoenix spoke to the application. Mr. Coronati commented that they have received subdivision approval only from TAC. There was discussion about the uses of the 2 lots and the density. Each lot will have a 2-family unit on it. They are here today for a site plan review of the duplexes on each lot. The duplexes will be facing each other and have one common drive off Chevrolet Ave. They have coordinated with Ray Pezzullo at DPW to talk about utility connections. They are looking at different options to extend the sewer line to the property. Each duplex will have a 2-car garage. The units are step vertically and horizontally to work with the grades. They have been working with the abutters. There will be a retaining wall along the southern property line. The utilities will come up the common driveway. They have submitted a drainage report. There are a couple different ways they will handle storm water. There is no formal outlet or access to the catch basins along the frontage. They will be infiltrating the storm water and holding it in concrete holding tanks then that will filter into a rain garden. Then roof water will be infiltrated. The front of the site along Middle St. will not be changing at all. The existing

structures will stay in place. They will be condo-ed and each building will be a separate condominium. One has 3 units, and the other is a single use.

TAC Comments:

- Site Plan Application Required Information
  - o Green Building Statement not provided
    - Mr. Coronati confirmed that they would provide that.
  - o Note 4 on C1 does not reference GIS data and coordinate system
    - Mr. Coronati confirmed they would update note 4.
- Site Plan Specifications
  - o Architectural Plans are referenced in checklist but not included in submission
    - Mr. Coronati confirmed they were included in the plan submission. Mr. Cracknell commented that he would talk about this at the end.
- Site Plan Specifications – Required Exhibits and Data
  - o Architectural Plans are reference but not included
  - o 3. No truck turning template as provided
    - Is this needed?
    - Mr. Coronati responded that the site was small, and they just had a driveway. They were not anticipating bringing in large trucks that need to turnaround. Mr. Howe commented that they needed a fire hydrant within a certain amount of feet of the front door. Mr. Coronati noted that it was 160 feet from Chevrolet Ave. to the back of the site. Mr. Howe commented that the street should be marked no parking to make it a fire lane, or the buildings should be sprinkled. Sprinklers are not required but they are recommended.
  - o 14. Note 2 on C1 does not speak to open space
    - Is there open space proposed?
    - Mr. Coronati commented that there is limited common space around the condos and a common area that would be considered open space. Mr. Britz commented that the limited common area could be considered an additional subdivision. The only area that should be carved out are the buildings. They should not have yards. Mr. Coronati clarified that they needed a subdivision plan if they wanted yards. Mr. Britz confirmed that was correct. Mr. Cracknell added that the Legal Department thought it was beginning to look like 5 lots because families had exclusive use areas around them. They would act like a subdivision. Mr. Phoenix commented that he would work with City Attorney Sullivan, but in the past, they have put it in the condo docs.
  - o 17. Note 3 on C1 does not seem to speak to Special Flood Hazard Areas
    - Project is out of 100 yr flood zone
    - Mr. Coronati responded that they were not in the flood zone. Mr. Britz commented that it just needed it to be in the checklist.

- The City requests \$5,000 per new dwelling for development of sidewalks on Albany Street/Malt House Drive.
  - Mr. Coronati commented that they did not front on either of those streets and questioned if this was typical. Mr. Desfosses commented that the City was working on acquiring Malt House Drive and were looking for additional funding for sidewalks. The plan is to provide sidewalks for the residents in the area. Mr. Garrepy commented that they planned to extend the sidewalk through Chevrolet Ave. Mr. Desfosses commented that they put in new sidewalks on Chevrolet Ave. this past summer.
- New proposed condo units should have Chevrolet Ave addresses.
  - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- Condo Units A and B should have Middle Street addresses.
  - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- Water service proposed for Condominium A should not be brought into the garage, bring into a warm space instead.
  - Mr. Garrepy responded that would be corrected.
- State how many individual condominium units will be in Condominium Units A and B.
  - Mr. Coronati responded that there were 3 units in the front building and one in the rear. They can clarify that on the plans further. Mr. Howe questioned if A and B were part of the project. Mr. Garrepy responded that that the subdivision application was advanced to the Planning Board, but they needed to submit a site plan for the two lots they were creating. Mr. Howe questioned where the access was for the existing buildings. Mr. Garrepy responded that they access it on Middle St. There is garage access for the single unit off Chevrolet Ave. Mr. Howe questioned if they were doing work on Building A. Mr. Garrepy responded that they were not doing any work on the existing buildings.
- State existing and proposed utility service sizes to the existing 3 unit dwelling and existing single dwelling.
  - Mr. Coronati responded that they hired a utility locating company. They located everything except for the sewer on Building B. Mr. Desfosses commented that they were pretty certain the sewer ran from the front. The plan needs to show them tying into the new sewer line. All three services need to be on the same line. They should show all the sewer lines on the plan. Mr. Desfosses questioned what size the water line was. Mr. Coronati responded that it was a 1 inch coming off Chevrolet Ave.
- Conversion of Existing 3 Unit Dwelling to Condominium A may require upgrade in water service.
  - Mr. Desfosses clarified that if it becomes a condo, then the Building Inspector may require that. Mr. Wolph questioned if the units would be rentals. Mr. Garrepy confirmed that it would have one owner and the units would remain rentals.
- Provide confirmation that fire protection is not necessary for existing and proposed units.
  - Mr. Coronati responded that they have addressed this above.

- 2" ductile iron does not exist. Use 2" copper or 4" ductile depending on flow needs.
  - Mr. Coronati questioned if HDPE was allowed. Mr. Desfosses responded that it was after the shut off. There will need to be individual shut offs for each house. Mr. Coronati confirmed that was on the plan.
- Move flushing hydrant to side of shared driveway.
  - Mr. Coronati confirmed that would be updated. Mr. Britz noted that it should be out of the way of the plow.
- Proposed Right of Way for common drive grantee not to be City of Portsmouth, should be to private lots.
  - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- City will need blanket easement over both new lots for valves, leak detection, and metering.
  - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- Move proposed private sewer manhole farther into shared driveway and have proposed unit 4 connect into the common main, not into the sewer manhole.
  - Mr. Coronati confirmed that would be updated.
- Reconfigure sewer connection in street to have the private sewer main come into the proposed right of way sewer manhole at no less than a 90 degree angle.
  - Mr. Garrepy responded that they were working with the abutters to get an easement for this.
- Include insulation between the proposed sewer and the 36" PE drainage pipe.
  - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- Provide easement for sewer from Station 0+00 to station 0+50.
  - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- Provide easement showing flowage rights for storm water across Map 147 Lot 19-1.
  - Mr. Coronati responded that the rain garden did not have anywhere to flow to. Mr. Desfosses commented that they could tie into the drain line down the road. Mr. Coronati agreed. Mr. Britz noted that they needed a storm water connection permit. Mr. Desfosses commented that the basements needed to be above the seasonal high-water table.
- Show outlet for rain garden with outlet control structure.
  - Mr. Coronati responded that this was addressed above.
- Steps for back deck on Unit 3 overlap with rain garden.
  - Mr. Coronati confirmed they would move the steps.
- Plans need to be in State Plane Coordinates and NAVD 88 Datum.
  - Mr. Coronati agreed.
- Drawings are incomplete and DPW does not recommend this project moves forward to the Planning Board. Project must return to Technical Advisory Committee.
- Move garages back on Unit 3 & 4 to allow for parking in front of garages.
  - Mr. Cracknell commented that if they moved the buildings back, then there would be more parking available in the driveway as well as the garage. Mr. Coronati agreed.

- Add additional landscaping between units and Chevrolet Avenue.
- Show landscaping & architectural plans looking from Chevrolet Ave.
- Show mailboxes, solid waste storage and mechanicals (if any).
- Provide shared driveway easement off of Middle Street and proposed driveway off of Chevrolet.
- Proposed Limited Common Areas create illegal subdivision.
- Blowoff hydrant in the way of snow storage area.
- Add 4' sidewalk in front of Unit 3 & 4 connecting to Chevrolet Avenue; move units back to accommodate sidewalk. Use Vertical Granite Curbing.

Mr. Cracknell addressed some of his additional comments. The applicant should consider adding a 4-foot sidewalk with a vertical curb on the right-hand side. The exposed foundations will be 50 inches out of the ground, so a robust landscape plan along Chevrolet Ave. will be important. There are still outstanding questions about how the mailboxes would be set up, trash pick-up, and snow removal. Those items should be considered. The trim casings should be widened on the window dormers instead of siding. They should add a second light on the garages, so there is one over each garage door. They should add Azek boards under the porches. They can still landscape the front of the lattice. The plan shows drawings that look like a standing seam on the main lower roof, but it looks like asphalt. They should put in a standing seam on the lower roof and the front. Mr. Garrepy noted that they would take that under advisement.

Mr. Garrepy commented that they were hoping to move forward with the subdivision part only to the Planning Board knowing they can't do anything with the 2 lots until the site plan is approved. This would provide the ability to sell the two existing buildings into new ownership. Part of the process is to do the site plan review. The subdivision is fairly simple, and they have the variances. Mr. Britz responded that it made more sense to keep it together as one project. Mr. Garrepy noted that they did a similar process for the Ocean Rd. project. The lot line adjustment was approved and then they continued with the site review separately. It worked well because they were able to sell the house. Mr. Britz noted that it should all go as one. They need to know what they will be put there. Mr. Garrepy commented that the lots are sized for duplexes. If they wanted to change that, then they need to change the plan. The site plan approval could take another 6 months. Mr. Desfosses commented that there were still a couple issues with the water service to the existing buildings that needed to be worked out. Mr. Phoenix commented that they were not necessarily expecting a final answer today. Mr. Cracknell commented that at the next TAC meeting they can have a final list of the subdivision stipulations to move it forward. Mr. Garrepy confirmed that they would work on the outstanding issues. Mr. Cracknell added that they should write a clear request for the next meeting.

## **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 continue to the February TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** The request of **Cate Street Development (Owner)**, for property located at **428 US Route 1 Bypass** requesting amended Site Plan Review approval to provide 56 additional parking spaces, revised stormwater collection and treatment system, and the reconfiguration of an existing structure for a proposed commercial use. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 172 Lot 1 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-19-18)

## SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Britz noted that they could discuss Item B and Item C together and vote on them separately.

Rick Lundborn from Fuss and O'Neil, Attorney John Bosen, Tim Minor, and Gregg Mikolaities spoke to the application. Mr. Lundborn noted that they were here in November for a work session. They discussed putting in parking along the railroad and clean up the old Suzuki Dealership site. They will be adding tandem spaces and adding 61 spaces on the land they acquire from the railroad. The plan is to reconfigure the old Suzuki Dealership and remove 4,400 sf of pavement. A treatment swale and level spreader will be added. The additional parking will be along the railroad and storm water will be collected by 2 catch basins and go through a jelly fish filter. There will be a short retaining wall on the back side of the parking lot. There is a lot line revision in order to provide space to add parking. All of the parking is being proposed to be added to the development site. The landscaping island between the existing parking and the additional parking has been widened. It will provide an area for trees. The area between the buildings and the parking lot to the east will have additional landscaping and trees. They pulled as much pavement back along the Bypass as possible and there will be landscaping in that area.

Mr. Minor commented that he designed the landscaping for the West End Yards, so he used the same pallet and carried it through to this site. They tried to use native plantings as much as possible. They will plant 3-inch caliper shade trees. Shrubs will provide more massing to make a bigger impact along the Bypass. The shrubs will be a mix of evergreens, deciduous, and ornamental grasses. The planted islands and landscaping around the parking will have lower material to prevent sight line issues. The base will be shredded bark mulch unless noted otherwise. Mr. Howe commented that it needed to be noncombustible or fire resistance mulch. Mr. Minor confirmed they would use that.

Mr. Desfosses questioned who was in Building B. Mr. Bosen responded that there was no tenant right now. They had a potential retail tenant but that fell through. Tenants have a need for more parking. Mr. Desfosses commented that they needed to locate a grease trap for the site. Mr.

Bosen commented that the user they were talking to was not a restaurant. Mr. Desfosses commented that fire suppression was stubbed to the property line. There was no fire suppression in the building. Mr. Bosen commented that they would need to go through a change of use approval. Mr. Britz commented that it could be an administration approval. Mr. Desfosses questioned if there was any use that would not require fire suppression. Mr. Howe responded no. Mr. Desfosses commented that they should add fire suppression and a grease trap on the plan. They should show water treatment around the building to make sure it is built with BMP's. The jelly fish filter is split by the lot line. Mr. Lundborn responded that they could slide that back and put in an easement. Mr. Desfosses noted that they should bring the jelly fish to the edge of the parking lot to allow for better access for cleaning. The retaining wall is directly on the property line. It will be hard to build without a temporary construction easement. Mr. Lundborn agreed. Mr. Desfosses questioned if the jelly fish filter would be surcharged all the time. Mr. Lundborn responded that it enters and filters from the bottom. The inlet pipe has a baffle that redirects water into the chamber under the filters forces the water up through it. Mr. Desfosses commented that the maintenance plan should include the details for the jelly fish filter.

Mr. Desfosses commented that there was a 5-foot drop off the side of the wall, so they should add a railing or fence to that. Mr. Lundborn agreed. Mr. Desfosses questioned if there was lighting in the back. Mr. Lundborn responded that there was not. Mr. Desfosses commented that they needed to light the back side of the building and the parking somehow. Mr. Lundborn agreed. Mr. Desfosses questioned how trash would be handled for the building. Mr. Lundborn responded that it would have a dumpster. Mr. Desfosses commented that it would need to be screened.

Mr. Cracknell commented that he was still having trouble reconciling adding all this parking with the original design and intent of the urban space of the West End Yards. Originally the intent was less suburban and less parking heavy. This is hard to support. If all of this parking is needed, then they should consider covering it with a shed roof to look like a rail building. They should also put solar panels on it. The vertical height should support the ability to install parking lifts in the future. There needs to be some kind of offset to having a bigger sea of asphalt. The spaces next to the dog park are not good because they will not allow for any kind of expansion. Building D is almost in isolation from the rest of the project. It should be integrated with the rest of the facilities for vehicles and pedestrians.

Mr. Bosen commented that when they presented West End Yards, they did not own Building D. When the building went up for sale, they bought it. The use has not been developed, but they have talked to some potential tenants. Everyone thinks the parking is thin. That's why they are here. The railroad is in the middle of being sold. They have a small window to buy this land. Mr. Desfosses commented that no one is suggesting not to buy it. Mr. Cracknell commented that adding parking before having a tenant for Building D may be putting the cart before the horse. It may be improving the marketability, but they also need to integrate Building D with the whole site. There should be another connector to the parking lot and pedestrian linkage between D and C.



Mr. Mikolaities commented that the additional parking was for multiple buildings on the site. Building A is fully leased. They are finding out that they are using more parking than anticipated. The top of Building C will be a medical use office space. They want more parking spaces. Mr. Cracknell responded that it was helpful to understand the allocation break down. It's hard to look at this when it's been a holistic project. Mr. Mikolaities commented that they built Buildings A, B, and C on spec. Building A is fully leased, and B is preleasing. The retail demand for Building C is strong because people can see it now. The upper level will probably be a medical office use. The lower floor will be a Buffalo Wild Wings and a couple other retail spaces. Building D was going to be a dry goods retailer that would have needed 25 spaces, but that fell through. Right now, there is no user for Building D. The railroad is selling land and they are trying to close in March. Right now, Building D is a spec building. Mr. Britz commented that if they integrate the site, then it would operate differently. Mr. Mikolaities commented that they could add a drive and walkways. They have been careful to meet the requirements of ordinance. They will add a grease trap as a placeholder. Mr. Bosen commented that they were trying to make the railroad deal make sense. Mr. Cracknell commented that regardless of whether or not they have a user for Building D, they will need to make changes and come back with details. They need to consider an offsetting mitigation for adding impervious and parking. They should look at solar panels and ways to make it blend with the rest of the site's design. Covered parking would fit the character.

Mr. Mikolaities questioned if there was a setback requirement for a parking structure. Mr. Cracknell responded there probably was, but they could make it work. The requirements may be different for an open structure. Mr. Lundborn commented that there may not be a setback because it's a development site.

Mr. Bosen commented that integrating the site made sense. Mr. Lundborn confirmed they would look into solar panels. Mr. Britz commented that they should consider putting it on top of Building D as well.

Mr. Howe commented that they should look at the truck turning template showing the access. Mr. Lundborn confirmed they would. Mr. Howe noted that two spots may be problematic.

Mr. Cronin questioned if some parking spots would be permitted. Mr. Lundborn confirmed that the ones that could block each other in would be assigned to leaseholders.

#### TAC Comments:

- Owner authorization from all land owners needed
- New Subdivision Checklist needed for LLA
- Zoning classifications need to be added to the plan set
- 20' drainage easement shall be for Millport Inc., not City of Portsmouth.
- Show detail for proposed retaining wall. Separate building permit will be required.
- Provide temporary construction easement for retaining wall construction.

- Confirm proposed water quality unit is water quality unit 3 shown in detail.
- Verify manufacturer required headloss is met by this proposed design for jellyfish filter.
- Provide easement for drainage from lot 1 to lot 2 across to outlet.
- Clarify existing vs proposed conditions on plans.
- Show location of proposed grease trap and fire service to Building D.
- If site work is being completed for Building D then additional requirements are necessary.
- Site work application necessary due to new site work.
- Confirm parking does not exceed 120% of the minimum requirement, otherwise will need parking CUP.
- Integrate Building D site into overall development site.
- Show existing & proposed conditions plan with how shared parking works.
- Provide photos of existing conditions along railway corridor where proposed parking will be located.
- Detail on proposed retaining wall facing the parking.
- Provide cross section of parking area along railway.

## **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 commented that there were some things to work on. They were concerned about this much parking. This may need a CUP. Mr. Lundborn confirmed they would investigate it. Mr. Britz noted that it would be helpful to have a plan that showed everything happening on the site. Mr. Cracknell commented that there should be a table or narrative about why all of that is proposed. It would be good to clarify what they are trying to do.

Mr. Cracknell moved to continue to the February 1, 2022, TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The request of Cate Street Development LLC (Owner), and Boston and Maine Corp (Owner), for properties located at 428 US Route 1 Bypass, 406 US Route 1 Bypass, and 55 Cate St requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Lot Line Revision) to convey 31,187 square feet from Map 165 Lot 14 to Map 172 Lot 2, Map 172 Lot 1 and Map 165 Lot 2 which will result in a total of 52,820 square feet lot area for Map 172 Lot 2, 126,500 square feet lot area for Map 172 Lot 1, and 260,789 square feet**

lot area for Map 165 Lot 2. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 172 Lot 1, Map 172 Lot 2, Map 165 Lot 2, and Map 165 Lot 14 and lie within the Transportation Corridor (TC) and the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-19-18)

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

Mr. Cracknell moved to continue to the February 1, 2022, TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Cracknell moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:05 p.m., seconded by Mr. Howe. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey  
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee