

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

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

2:00 PM

October 1, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability; Paul Garand, Assistant Building Inspector; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief, Vincent Hayes; Planner I

MEMBERS ABSENT:

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

Kate Homet, Environmental Planner

MINUTES

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the September 3, 2024 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

E. Eby made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, P. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. 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)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[6:10] Joe Coronati (Jones & Beach Engineering) and Mike Garrepy (Garrepy Planning Consultants) came to present this application. They proceeded to go over the changes that had

occurred since their last meeting with the Committee, including changes made to the proposed drainage plan.

[12:23] Z. Cronin stated that the Committee still needs the third-party review on the new drainage and stormwater calculations. Mr. Coronati requested that the Committee move their application to the next stage with the Planning Board subject to the applicant getting any third-party review comments addressed. P. Britz stated that it was a challenging site due to the stormwater. D. Desfosses agreed that the stormwater was controversial, and he would like to wait and see if the third-party agrees with their engineer.

[13:57] E. Eby asked for changes to be made to some of the traffic signage which Mr. Coronati agreed to do. He also requested that the applicants install a permanent, solar-powered traffic speed sign at the top of the hill to replace the current temporary one. The City would maintain it after installation. E. Eby will send Mr. Coronati a detail of this.

[16:25] Z. Cronin asked that the applicants install another water shutoff isolation valve just before the blowoff hydrant and D. Desfosses noted that the plans should only show one water line going to each structure and asked the applicants to proposed removing less trees behind the proposed units and put a retaining wall where the proposed 60' contour is.

PUBLIC HEARING

[19:24] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing.

Tim McNamara of 579 Sagamore Avenue Unit 19 came to speak about this application. Mr. McNamara mentioned that he wanted to make sure that the third-party reviewer has enough time to review all the proposed drainage changes. He expressed concern for the path of stormwater, the proposed blasting to plant trees at least 3' down, the changes proposed to the bioretention pond would result in a greater tree loss along the property line, the decks on Units 3 and 4 were not presented to the BOA, and finally expressed his concern for traffic and parking impacts.

[30:23] Anne Hartman of 579 Sagamore Avenue Unit 2 expressed her concern for the existing drainage problems at the Tidewatch community. She also noted that the proposed removal of permeable surface would impact Tidewatch, and she wanted the Committee and applicants to consider the long-term impacts to abutters from this project.

[34:01] Tony Stewart of 579 Sagamore Avenue Unit 45 spoke to the existing overwhelmed stormwater infrastructure in the Tidewatch community and wanted data on how this proposal will impact those stormwater systems. Additionally, Mr. Stewart would like to see the applicants use more aggressive storm predictions to prepare for stormwater impacts.

[36:30] Chairman Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[36:46] Z. Cronin noted that the Committee still needs to see the third-party stormwater review and an agreement between their review and the accuracy of the latest analysis. Z. Cronin made a motion to postpone the application to the following meeting. D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** 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)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[38:43] Brett Bentson, Neil Hansen, Patrick Crimmins and Andrew Hayes came to present this application. Mr. Bentson explained the changes in the current application reflected the changes that the Conservation Commission had voted on. Mr. Hansen then went through and addressed all the staff comments.

[54:14] P. Howe told the applicants that in the event that more pressure is needed for fire protection on the upper floors, the applicants will need to have fire booster pumps. He does not know if is necessary as the applicants are still working on the flow tests. Mr. Bentson responded that they should have more information on that soon. P. Howe also asked about the easement from the abutting hotel property to the subject property and asked if it would qualify as a fire lane because that would be necessary for fire unless they wanted to install turnarounds. Mr. Hayes said he will confirm that.

[56:39] P. Britz mentioned that the easement plans will need to be reviewed by this Committee before proceeding to the Planning Board.

PUBLIC HEARING

[57:34] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[58:02] D. Desfosses noted a few items that need to be addressed:

1. Interim construction plans need to be a part of a CMMP if it comes to that.
2. A sewer and water plan will be needed.
3. The water main on Woodbury Avenue is not optional, nor is the multi-use path. The water main must be replaced as part of this project and the sidewalk/multi-use path must be built as part of this project.

Z. Cronin noted that they want to confirm the water models with the upcoming flow tests and the monitoring devices within the sewer flows should be providing data shortly that they can assess. Without that information, he recommended that this application be postponed until the next meeting. D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Francis E. Mouflouze Revocable Trust of 2015 (Owner)**, for property located at **550 Sagamore Avenue** requesting a subdivision and site review approval to demolish the existing single-family residence and subdivide the lot into three new parcels, each with a single-family dwelling, and associated site improvements, including a private roadway, stormwater management, utilities, and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 222 Lot 11 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (LU-24-166)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[1:02:02] Eric Weinrieb (Altus Engineering), Michael Green and Jenn Green (Green & Company) came to present this application that previously came before the Committee in June as a work session. Since then, the applicants have surveyed the property, developed site plans and subdivision plans, delineated a small, isolated wetland, noted the lot size and explained how it would apply to zoning compliance. Mr. Weinrieb gave a brief overview of the proposal and noted that they would be requesting waivers for a 40' wide right of way where 50' is required, asking for 20' of pavement where 32' is required for a 5' wide sidewalk and a street property line radius of 50' where 60' is required. He noted potential ledge issues and stated that all the stormwater had been designed to not allow for infiltration and discussed the drainage infrastructure. Lastly, he stated that they agreed with all the staff comments received.

[1:11:42] D. Desfosses asked if the raingarden could be moved up closer to the house and further from the rear property owner. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it was the wish of the applicant to have a larger backyard, but he thought they could find some compromise there. D. Desfosses asked for it to be moved at least 15 - 20' away from the property line which could also allow for some tree growth between the rear property and the proposed rain garden. A discussion continued about drainage easements between properties.

[1:12:58] P. Britz asked what the applicants had in mind for protecting the wetland. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they are proposing a retaining wall to run off the edge of the pavement and then in towards one of the structures to provide a barrier. P. Britz asked if there were plantings proposed and Mr. Weinrieb responded that he had forgotten to attach the planting plan in the original submission, but that there were no plans for plantings between the edge of the retaining wall and the wetland. A discussion continued about the water table levels and basements below ground, and concerns over dewatering.

[1:17:09] P. Howe said that given the width of the road and the truck template, he believes it would be appropriate to not have parking. Mr. Weinrieb responded that this was already noted on the site plan.

[1:17:31] E. Eby said that for the proposed ‘no outlet’ sign it would be better off to not use the diamond-style sign but rather a street name sign for better visibility. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they would provide a sign without the diamond.

[1:18:34] Z. Cronin noted that DPW is paving Sagamore Avenue, likely next year in this section, and asked when the applicant proposed to connect to the water, stormwater and sewer connection. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they will try to be in the ground in the Spring.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:19:26] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing.

[1:19:48] Jim Lee of 520 Sagamore Avenue spoke on this project. Mr. Lee recounted the project’s past at the BOA, he noted concern for potential drainage issues, he believed that the delineated wetland is a vernal pool and he raised concerns for speeding on this road and the safety hazards from traffic on Sagamore Avenue.

[1:23:23] Dick Wilder of 58 Walker Bungalow Road, a direct abutter, came to speak on this project. He lives on the property directly behind the subject property downhill. He noted his concern about stormwater drainage onto his property and the neighboring properties and he worried about the strain this could put on the current culvert structure.

[1:25:51] Christana McKnight of 546 Sagamore, a direct abutter, spoke on this project. She wanted staff to know that abutters such as herself already experience drainage impacts, despite being at higher elevations than this proposal.

[1:27:08] Chairman Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:27:18] Mr. Weinrieb responded to the abutters’ concerns.

[1:30:10] D. Desfosses asked about the sight line sheet and a dot potentially in the way. Mr. Weinrieb responded that there was one privately owned tree that extended into the City right of way with its vegetation. E. Eby said that he was comfortable with the sightlines and noted that anything hanging into the City right of way would be cut back if over than 5’ in height.

[1:32:06] P Britz wondered how big of an issue the basements would be, but he would also like to see an easement plan, elevations, drawings of the site, and the planting plan which would be useful for reviewing. P. Britz moved to postpone the application and D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** The request of **HPII Boston Portsmouth LLC C/O Hammes Realty Services LLC (Owner)** for property located at **1900 Lafayette Road** requesting amended site plan for the addition of a new parking area with associated site improvements including storm water, landscaping and lighting. Said property is located on Assessor Map 267 Lot 8 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (GI) District. (LU-24-148)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[1:35:01] Jack McTigue (TF Moran) came to present this application for expanding a parking area. He mentioned that this application had previously come before the Committee in a work session to discuss the proposal for a parking lot expansion and then he went on to discuss open space calculations and the staff comments.

[1:36:26] D. Desfosses mentioned that when the building was originally built, they put in a substantial amount of drainage which is why DPW is okay with the lot drainage proposed.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:37:05] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:37:19] D. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board, P. Howe seconded the motion. E. Eby asked about the blue paint mentioned on the plans for parking stalls and Mr. McTigue said he would remove that as it was a carryover. The vote was unanimous.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.