

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

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

2:00 PM

June 4, 2024

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief, Vincent Hayes; Land Use Compliance Agent/Associate Planner; Shawn Wheeler, Fire Prevention Officer

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor;
Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

[6:14] Chairman Stith opened the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the May 7, 2024 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

[6:30] P. Britz made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. E. Eby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:35] Chairman Stith noted that two items had been postponed, 635 Sagamore and 100 Durgin Lane.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. The request of **RIGZ Enterprises LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **806 us Route 1 Bypass** requesting an Amended Site Plan Approval and a second 1-year extension of the previously approved site plan approval granted on June 23, 2022.

Said property is located on Assessor Map 161 Lot 43 and lies within the Business (B) District. (LU-22-81)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[7:29] Alex Ross of Ross Engineering came to present this application with the builder, Dave Grzybowski. He briefly explained the reasoning for needing to present before the Committee again and then addressed the staff comments:

1. *Consider installing wooden fence in conjunction with 822 Route 1 Bypass approval.*

The Planning Board had previously recommended a solid fence instead of a chain link fence to help with noise. There was a newer fence installed at the 806 property recently that was agreed upon by the abutters and the fence for this property has not had any complaints and is far from the building.

2. *Does the applicant have permission from owner at 493 Dennett to conduct work on property?*

They are not planning on doing any work on the property. There is a utility pole that is on the property line which they will access from their side.

3. *How do you intend to resolve the doctrine of merger issues for drainage and access?*

They have been working with Tim Phoenix and his office who have been working with the City to put an easement plan in place and to clarify access and drainage. This will be hashed out with the City Legal Department.

4. *Drainage easement may need to include a maintenance provision for the Jellyfish.*

They will make sure they have provisions for this in the legal documents.

5. *Please include a lighting plan.*

This has been sent. It was also a part of the original packet.

6. *Drainage easement to City required for drain pipe crossing the property.*

Yes, this will be done.

7. *All sewer connection fees must be paid for sewer connection to Stark Street. This includes the previous cost of installing the connection from the main to the property.*

They have been in discussion with people at DPW and this will be connected, and the fee paid for.

8. *Existing sewer service to Dennet Street must be disconnected and capped. This may be done behind the curb to not disturb the pavement on Dennet.*

This is fine and they can add notes to this effect.

[12:15] P. Stith asked for clarity on any work proposed on 493 Dennett Street. Mr. Ross responded that the gravel bed in the corer was existing. Mr. Ross noted that they can have a zoomed in sketch plan that shows the scope of work compared to the lot lines in that area.

[13:25] P. Britz asked about the existing fence. Mr. Ross noted that the fence behind the building at 806 is a chain link fence with black strip ties in it for screening and that had been installed within the last three years after discussions with neighbors. P. Britz asked what the long-term maintenance would be for the fence and if it was a permanent installation. Mr. Grzybowski noted that it is a permanent fence made of vinyl and an aluminum chain links.

PUBLIC HEARING

[15:38] Chairman Stith opened up the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[16:05] P. Britz asked for clarification on whether there would be an easement to the jellyfish filter. Mr. Ross stated that the same entity owns both properties so the cleanest way to do that would be to make another LLC and to do an easement. He believes that the jellyfish maintenance would all be under the 822 address because the jellyfish collects drainage from 822 and then 806 is tied into it. Z. Cronin noted that the City does need an easement for the ability to flow and for access due to the drainage that is being rerouted around the buildings and down into Burkitt and then Dennett.

[19:32] Z. Cronin made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

1. Show how you intend to resolve the doctrine of merger issues for drainage and access.
2. Drainage easement may need to include a maintenance provision for the Jellyfish.
3. Drainage easement to City required for drainpipe crossing the property.
4. All sewer connection fees must be paid for sewer connection to Stark Street. This includes the previous cost of installing the connection from the main to the property.
5. Existing sewer service to Dennett Street must be disconnected and capped. This may be done behind the curb to not disturb the pavement on Dennett Street.

P. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The request of **635 Sagamore Development LLC (Owner)**, For property located at **635 Sagamore Avenue** requesting Site Plan approval for the removal of the existing structures and construction of 4 single-family dwellings on one lot with associated site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 222 Lot 19 and lies within the Single Residence A (SRA) District. (LU-22-209) **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

C. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The request of **Oak Street Real Estate Capital (Owner), 100 Durgin Lane Owner, LLC (Applicant)**, for property located at **100 Durgin Lane** requesting Subdivision approval of a lot line adjustment and Site Plan Review approval for the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of 360 rental housing units in a mix of 3-story and 4-story buildings with associated site improvements including parking, pedestrian access, community spaces, utilities, stormwater management, lighting, and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 239 Lot 18 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-24-62) **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

III. NEW BUISINESS

A. The request of **Christ Church Parish, (Owner), Portsmouth Housing Authority (Applicant)**, for property located at **1035 Lafayette Road** seeking Conditional Use Permits from Section 10.5B41.10 for a Development Site, from Section 10.5B72 for density bonus incentive for increased dwelling units per building and a Conditional Use Permit from Section 10.1112.14 to provide less than the required parking and Site Plan Review Approval for construction of a 4-story, 44-unit multi-family residential building to the south of the existing church building, conversion of the first-floor of the existing church into office space and construction of a 7-unit transitional housing addition. The lower level of the existing church will be renovated for the daycare and the church will be relocated to the existing rectory building on the site. The project will include associated site improvements such as parking, pedestrian connections, access to public transportation, utilities, stormwater management, lighting, and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 246 Lot 1 and lies within the Gateway Center (G2) District. (LU-24-92)

[21:15] Chairman Stith introduced this item.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[22:25] Craig Welch of the Portsmouth Housing Authority, Neil Hansen from Tighe and Bond, Robbie Woodburn of Woodburn and Company Landscape Architecture, Sarah Hourihane from Lassel Architects, North Sturtevant from JSA Design and Kathy Beebe from Haven came to present this application. Mr. Welch noted his excitement for the affordable housing project and thanked the Committee members for their thoughtful comments ahead of time. He noted that one

of the comments requested a ground penetrating radar study which the applicants have provided and he gave a brief explanation of all the parties involved in this study.

Mr. Hansen gave a brief overview of the existing site and its uses, along with current access points and proposed access and uses. He also went over proposed parking, a setback for the burial grounds and the proposed additions.

[27:35] Mr. Hansen proceeded to go through and address the comments from staff while asking clarifying questions and receiving input from various Committee members.

[41:48] P. Britz asked about the proposed infiltration basin on the highway side and why it was shown with grading off the property. He wondered if they would need to go to NHDOT to get approval for. Mr. Hansen responded that yes, they will be working with them on this.

[42:24] Ms. Woodburn gave a general overview of the landscape plan and noted that they were planning to keep their landscaping budget within reason due to the majority of the projects funding going to housing needs. There are existing trees on site, some to be removed, and they have made an effort wherever possible to supply new trees. They are also trying to highlight and protect the existing burying ground which is proposed to have a simple fence surrounding it along the 25' buffer. She proceeded to go through more details on the specific planting areas. She addressed one of the staff comments regarding parking lot landscaping requirements for the character district and noted that it did not apply here as this was gateway.

[46:45] Ms. Hourihane presented on the proposed buildings, new units and the repurposed buildings, noting that they were drawing design inspiration from the wooded urban forestry area behind the parcel. She proceeded to go through the floor plans, life safety plans, fire code compliance, ADA compliance, bicycle storage, passive house certification for one of the buildings and proposed solar arrays.

[51:47] E. Eby requested that the applicants provide the interior dimensions and the type of racks used for the bicycle room. Ms. Hourihane said they could do this.

[52:08] S. Wheeler asked if there was separation provided between the offices and the daycare/residential or if they would be separate buildings. Ms. Hourihane responded that it would be separate buildings, one as residential and the other as mixed use.

[52:42] Mr. Sturtevant noted that they were working with Haven to have seven transitional housing units within the addition building. He went on to describe the floor plans of the existing church and proposed addition off the church for Haven and for Little Blessings Daycare. The existing congregation will be moving into the rectory for their use. He then went through the elevation drawings.

[59:01] Chairman Stith asked if the steeple would be removed. Mr. Sturtevant responded that they were currently looking at retaining the primary plinth box and putting a simpler form or dome over it. The pyramidal form of the steeple would likely be taken off.

1:00:15] S. Wolph asked if the church currently had an elevator. Mr. Sturtevant responded that there is currently a lift and the shaft shown on the plans will be where a proposed elevator would go. The existing lift is being removed. The different access routes were then discussed along with a full structural analysis which is to come.

[1:02:01] P. Britz asked how long a resident would be living in the transitional housing apartment. Ms. Beebe responded that it would be a varied amount of time, it could be anywhere from a couple of weeks to six months. The seven units for transitional housing are not counted as part of the 44-unit calculations for the residential building.

[1:03:18] Mr. Hansen then responded to the remaining staff comments that had been previously sent:

- How will you resolve deed restriction on property
 - o *Mr. Hansen responded that the PHA council is looking into this.*
- Please provide an easement plan
 - o *As of right now, they are not proposing any easements except for the blanket easements.*
- Please provide community space plan showing compliance with 20% requirement for the G2 district
- *Mr. Hansen responded that under the density CUP requirements, the Planning Board can modify the standards and they will be requesting a modification of the standards because they are providing 100% workforce housing instead of 20% workforce housing, in lieu of 20% community space. A sidewalk on the property will connect to the Urban Forestry Center trails and the Burying Ground would be accessible and they are working with the Black Heritage Trail now so that these paths can serve in lieu of formal community space as well.*
- Detectable Warning Surface (DWS) detail – Detail and Site Plan conflict. Detail calls for 3' wide DWS with 3" extra concrete on both sides, for a total of 3.5', however, the Site Plan curb ramps appear to be 5' wide. Per federal ADA requirements and State of NH R.S.A., DWS must be the full width of the curb ramp.
 - o *They will revise as noted.*
- Please send deeds and existing conditions plans to Jaimie McCarty to update the lot conditions accordingly.
 - o *This has been completed and confirmation from Mr. McCarty will be sought.*

[1:07:00] E. Eby asked if the rectory building conversion would be a part of this project's construction. Mr. Hansen noted that it would be a future construction project.

[1:07:14] P. Britz asked if they had to apply for an NHDES Shoreland Permit for this application. Mr. Hansen responded that they did not because they kept the construction just outside of the 250' shoreland buffer.

[1:08:32] P. Britz noted that the plans showed the gravel parking lot with striping and wondered if they would be striped. Mr. Hansen responded that they would not be striped. These spots are closer to the highway and Mr. Hansen noted that they may be able to swing those spaces to the south of the existing building while staying behind the burying ground setback and possibly behind the building structure. Mr. Hansen also noted that there would be a 10 x 12' shed on the lot as well for storage of maintenance equipment.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:10:08] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chairman Stith noted that it sounded like the application needed to be continued. The Committee proceeded to go through all the issues discussed and any outstanding items for next time.

[1:11:10] Z. Cronin made a motion to postpone the application. P. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** The request of **Lonza Biologics (Owner)**, for property located at **5 Technology Way (Formerly 70 Corporate Drive)** requesting Amended Site Plan approval for the addition of Phase Photovoltaic Cell (PV) Solar canopies over the previously approved temporary surface parking lot. Said property is located on Assessor Map 305 Lot 6 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District. (LU-23-108)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[1:12:18] Neil Hansen of Tighe and Bond came to present this application in which Lonza is requesting amended site plan approval as they are looking to add solar to the Iron Parcel through their ongoing sustainability initiatives. This application is for solar carport canopies above the previous approved surface parking lot. As part of the overall project, Lonza is looking to put rooftop solar Building #1 and the Cub on the Iron Parcel as well. While discussing with PDA, it is apparent that the carports are the only portion of these solar installs that would require amended site plan review. In addition to the carports, there will also be 18 EV chargers included in the first row of parking. The lighting plan had to be revised to remove pole lighting and have lighting fixtures mounted to the support columns for the solar canopies and additional landscape screening has been added at the request of PDA.

[1:14:49] P. Britz noted that the details showed three different styles and wondered if there were three different styles on the plan. Mr. Hansen noted that the T-configuration would be used in the center aisles for the two bays of parking and the L-shaped canopies will be on either side of the

parking lot based on which side the footings are on for the T-configuration. A discussion continued about the drainage on site and whether this project would impact anything there.

[1:15:56] E. Eby asked if it was just the support columns sitting where the T-Canopy carport would be and if everything else associated with it would be underground. Mr. Hansen responded that the concrete portion will be flush and just the steel support column will be above ground. P. Britz asked if the carports would be high enough to plow under. Mr. Hansen responded that they would be 14' at the lowest dimension so yes. A discussion continued about snow accumulation on top of the panels.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:17:05] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing.

Ken from the design team spoke via Zoom and noted that the snow will melt more rapidly on top of the panels compared to surrounding snow. This should cause more rapid melt of any accumulated snow on the roof of the carport. E. Eby asked if there was a maintenance program for the carport. Ken responded that yes, there is a plan for maintenance, and they should be able to stay clean without the need for scrubbing. The installation will be a 570-kilowatt DC system which steps down to around 400 kilowatts for an AC system.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:20:12] E. Eby made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board. P. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

[1:20:34] Z. Cronin made a motion to adjourn the meeting. P. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate E. Homet
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee