

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

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

*Members of the public also have the option to join the meeting over Zoom
(See below for more details)**

2:00 PM

November 5, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability; Chad Putney, Fire Prevention Officer; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief, Vincent Hayes; Planner I

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector

ADDITIONAL STAFF PRESENT: Stefanie Casella, Planner II; Kate Homet, Environmental Planner

MINUTES

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from October 1, 2024 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

[8:01] P. Britz proposed an edit to the October minutes to include himself as present in the attendance list. He then made a motion to recommend approval of the minutes with the one edit. D. Desfosses 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

[9:12] Mike Garrepy from Garrepy Planning Consultants came to present this application. He noted that his team had received the comments from Altus and are okay with them. He went on to address the concerns from Altus about the retaining wall. He noted Altus and staff's concerns with the sand system maintenance and stated that monthly or seasonal maintenance would be a responsibility of the future landscaping company.

[13:22] P. Britz asked about the inspection of the sand system and the possibility of building a different type of stormwater system that would not require this level of maintenance. A discussion continued about the maintenance schedule and how to enforce it.

PUBLIC HEARING

[16:33] P. Stith opened the public hearing.

[16:58] Tim McNamara of 579 Sagamore Avenue Unit 19 came to speak. Mr. McNamara noted his concerns about traffic, a potential error in the scale bar on the plans, concern about the positions of buildings 3 and 4 and the Board of Adjustment's analysis of this. Additionally, he mentioned concerns over possible radon levels from blasting, the accuracy of the proposed tree line if there are scale bar issues, increased stormwater intake at Tidewatch, trees, parking, rooflines, drainage and concerns about the aesthetics of the proposed boulder wall.

[36:41] P. Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[37:01] P. Britz addressed some of the public comments made during the public hearing.

[38:40] S. Wolph commented on his initial concerns about parking and noted how important it would be for residents to utilize their garage spaces to meet the parking rules.

[40:37] V. Hayes asked if it would be helpful to have a condition precedent that requires clearly marking out the existing tree line that is to remain prior to the commencement of site work. P. Britz and D. Desfosses discussed the handling of the sand filtration system and proposed maintenance.

[43:50] D. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

The following changes will be made prior to Planning Board submission:

1. *The stormwater maintenance manual shall be updated for the submission to the Planning Board.*

Conditions:

1. *Trees to remain are clearly marked before site work can commence.*

2. *Monthly and annual reporting of stormwater and drainage infrastructure as defined in the stormwater maintenance manual to the Department of Public Works.*
3. *Engineer to certify that stormwater mitigation system was monitored during construction, is installed as designed and that the system will function in compliance with the proposed drainage study and plan.*
4. *Developer to pay for the installation of the fire hydrant extended to the site. The hydrant was installed exclusively for the benefit of this site. The cost to install was \$20,900.*
5. *Developer to provide fair share contribution for catch basin installed up gradient to the Tidewatch intersection. The catch basin was installed partially for the benefit of this site. The fair share contribution is \$15,208.*

P. Britz 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

[48:16] Neil Hansen (Tighe & Bond), Brett Bentson (architect), Andrew Hayes (owner representative) and Patrick Crimmins (Tigh & Bond) came to present this application. Mr. Hansen proceeded to go through the staff comments and address them.

[50:29] P. Britz asked about the offsite hotel and whether the applicants have spoken to the hotel owners about needing to amend their own site plans for the proposed access changes. Mr. Hayes said that they were aware. C. Putney asked about the existing fire hydrant on that property that was not shown on the plans, and he wondered whether or not it would be staying. Mr. Hansen responded that they were not planning to remove any hydrants from the Hampton Inn property.

[51:42] P. Stith asked if the applicants had confirmed with Weston & Sampson on the sewer, Mr. Hansen responded yes.

PUBLIC HEARING

[52:01] P. Stith opened the public hearing.

[52:16] Tim Phoenix from Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley & Roberts came to speak on behalf of the New Frontiers church. He mentioned that the church is working with the developer on access and sewer easements that need to be cleaned up or replaced. In addition, the church is concerned about

the Planning Board approval happening before they can finish their legal agreements and finalize documents. They also have concerns about the concept of a street going through a residential parking lot and the liability associated with that.

[55:23] P. Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[56:29] P. Britz made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

The following changes will be made prior to Planning Board submission:

- 1. R4-7b Keep Right signs to be used at traffic circle, and place signs inside the raised median island, not on the right-hand side of the roadway.*
- 2. NO PARKING signs must be installed at the head of each handicap parking space access aisle that is 8 feet wide, in a location that does not block the accessible route.*
- 3. When W11-2 signs are used at crosswalks, they must also include a W16-7P sign below them.*
- 4. Detail highlighting changes in wetland buffer impacts since conservation commission approval will be included.*

Conditions:

- 1. A CMMP will be required for construction. Portions of that plan will be a proposed utility and access sequencing plan for the two nearby lots that are dependent on this parcel for their utility and access needs. The Department of PW will need to sign off on the proposed plan prior to the CMMP being authorized.*
- 2. Applicant must replace the 6" water main in Woodbury Avenue from Gosling Road to the 16" main on Woodbury Avenue with a new 12" DI pipe installed to City standards.*
- 3. A 10' multi-use path on Durgin Lane must be constructed by the developer all the way to Woodbury Avenue. Multi-use path tip downs are to be concrete with tactile panels as appropriate. Developer will provide a final layout, drainage and striping plan for final review.*
- 4. Continue narrowing Durgin Lane to 28' to provide a grass strip along the road in the area adjacent to the Durgin Plaza parking lot.*
- 5. Third party oversite engineer is required.*

D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. 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

[59:46] Eric Weinrieb came to present this application. He explained the changes made since the previous application in October and then proceeded to go through staff comments.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:05:09] P. Stith opened the public hearing.

Stephanie, a potential property owner at 576 Sagamore Avenue, who had recently signed a purchase and sale agreement for the abutting property, came to speak. She requested more time to review the plans and expressed concerns for the property lines, existing trees and a historic rock wall. Mr. Weinrieb responded to her comments.

[1:10:50] Richard Wilder, a rear abutter to the applicant living at 58 Walker Bungalow Road, came to comment on the application. He expressed his concern about the potential for increased stormwater flow and flooding at the riprap apron.

[1:15:24] Alden Sweet of 72 Walker Bungalow Road, came to speak. He noted his concerns for the existing drainage issues and proposed stormwater overflows, as well as traffic and safety. He also stated concern for impacts from blasting if they need to eliminate existing ledge.

[1:19:02] P. Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:19:10] Mr. Weinrieb responded to comments made during the public hearing.

[1:20:25] S. Wolph asked Mr. Weinrieb if the stormwater system was being oversized to deal with extreme weather events and greater rainfall averages. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they complied with the City requirements using a Cornell study and a 15% threshold which is also what is done with AOT standards and the design is for a 50-year standard.

[1:22:12] D. Desfosses recommended approval of the application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:

The following changes will be made prior to Planning Board submission:

1. Applicant to provide a letter demonstrating compliance with Site Plan Review Regulations 6.2.1, 6.3.4, 6.3.8, 6.3.9, 6.3.14, 6.4, and 6.11.

Condition Precedent:

1. Trees to remain are clearly marked and erosion controls in place before site work can commence.

Conditions:

1. Applicant will provide a maintenance agreement for right of way.
2. Sewer will require NHDES sewer extension application.
3. A W14-2a sign will be used rather than a W14-2.
4. Engineer to certify that stormwater mitigation system was monitored during construction, is installed as designed and that the system will function in compliance with the proposed drainage study and plan.

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

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Shaines & McEachern Company (Owner)**, for property located at **282 Corporate Drive** requesting site review approval from the Pease Development Authority for site improvements related to a new commercial use, including stormwater management, utilities, lighting, and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 315 Lot 2 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District. (LU-24-169)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon came to present this application along with Austin Pietschman of Port City Air and Mike Mates of the PDA. He explained the parcel history, the proposed use by Port City Air, and the upgrades that need to occur on site. He also noted the jurisdictional wetlands on site and their pending application to the Pease Development Authority for a wetland conditional use permit. Mr. Chagnon proceeded to go through and address staff comments as well.

[1:33:45] Z. Cronin noted that it would be required that the applicant coordinate with the City's grease trap compliance person and maintain the required maintenance logs. D. Desfosses noted that the proposed grades for the catch basins in Corporate Drive that are stated on the plan set should be removed as they imply that the applicant's contractor will be doing that work, when in fact that is City jurisdiction, and it cannot be modified privately. He would like to see those areas on the plans re-identified as planned grades and not proposed.

[1:35:10] P. Britz asked for clarification on where the plantings are to be placed as it was not obvious on the landscaping plan. Mr. Chagnon noted that it is shown in the clouded area designated on plans. He described the layout of the landscaping plan.

D. Desfosses then requested Mr. Chagnon and his office comply with full ADA rules for all aspects of the site work, including sidewalk slopes. Mr. Chagnon responded with their proposed plans for what they can do. They will confirm their compliance.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:38:09] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[1:38:43] P. Britz asked if they would be submitting their wetland permit to just the PDA since the site is in the Airport Business District. Mr. Mates responded that the applicant would be submitting their PDA Wetland Conditional Use Permit to the City which would be referred to the Conservation Commission and would then receive a recommendation at the Planning Board which would be sent back to the PDA Planning Board for review. He noted that it is located within the Business Commercial Zone, not the Airport Business District, so it would go to the City first. A discussion continued about the process moving forward and the deadlines for the applicant to submit to the Conservation Commission and Planning Board.

[1:42:34] P. Britz made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the PDA with the following stipulations:

1. *Plans will be updated to reflect NO PARKING signs will be installed at the head of each handicapped parking space access aisle that is 8 feet wide, in a location that does not block the access route.*
2. *Plans will be updated to reflect any disturbance in roadway aprons will result in reinstalled aprons as they currently exist to ensure that the sidewalk system stays ADA compliant.*
3. *Applicant will coordinate with grease trap compliance at DPW.*
4. *Plans will be edited to reflect accurate plan grades in right of way.*
5. *A PDA Conditional Use Permit will be submitted to the Portsmouth Conservation Commission and Planning Board for review and recommendation.*

S. Wolph seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** The request of **Go-Lo Inc (Owner)**, and **Peter and Michael Labrie (Applicants)**, for property located at **2059 Lafayette Road** requesting to demolish the existing mixed use building and construct a new 8-unit residential building. Said property is located on

Assessor Map 268 Lot 13 and lies within the Mixed Residential Business (MRB) District. (LU-23-191)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[1:43:51] Eric Weinrieb, Mark Gianniny, Peter Labrie and Michael Labrie came to present this application. Mr. Weinrieb went on to describe the proposal and its associated proposed lot merger, and he proceeded to address staff comments received prior to the meeting along with Mr. Gianniny.

[1:56:27] P. Britz mentioned that he hoped the applicants would consider converting the site to electric instead of the proposed gas. He also asked about the proposed rain garden and how it would be oriented. Mr. Weinrieb noted that it would be centered in the middle and reduced on the sides. He was still working on the grading for that and potentially making it a little bit shallower. P. Britz recommended increasing plantings near the road to increase buffering from the road.

Chairman Stith noted that the applicants will need to supply a parking demand analysis for their proposed parking CUP.

PUBLIC HEARING

[1:58:42] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing.

S. Wolph requested that Mr. Gianniny update the code referenced on Sheet A1 to the 2017 code as well as the electrical code that was referenced in the plan set.

No one from the public spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[2:01:09] P. Britz requested that the applicants add fencing to protect the existing trees prior to the start of sitework.

Z. Cronin noted that he could concede on the request for a concrete sidewalk and that it could remain asphalt but that it should extend to Coolidge Drive. D. Desfosses noted that the applicants are proposing to reroute some drainage and wanted to confirm that they had checked the capacity of the storm drainage pipe to ensure there is room for additional flow being sent in that direction. Mr. Weinrieb responded that he had not yet done an analysis of that culvert. Additionally, D. Desfosses noted that the current drainage pipe takes a 90-degree corner at Coolidge Drive which may be an issue if additional flow is added. Mr. Weinrieb agreed to investigate these two impacts.

[2:04:17] V. Hayes asked the applicants how access to the site would go during construction. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it was depicted on the site preparation plans C1, C3 and C4 which will be the existing driveway for the beginning of the project. Once more construction is completed, it will be moved up to the Hoover Drive entrance.

[2:06:24] D. Desfosses noted that he was okay with moving the application forward with conditions. A conversation continued about necessary easements and stormwater monitoring during construction. D. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval with the following stipulations:

The following changes will be made prior to Planning Board submission:

1. *A CUP will be needed to provide 175% of required parking.*
2. *Applicant will include existing vegetation and trees on landscape plan (what is to remain and what is to be removed) and demonstrate compliance with Section 6.2.1 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.*
3. *Applicant will demonstrate compliance with Site Plan Review Regulation 6.11 and note landscape irrigation source and plans.*
4. *Install new 5.5' asphalt sidewalk on Hoover Drive from Lafayette Road to Coolidge Drive to the satisfaction of DPW.*
5. *Change proposed drain manhole on Hoover Drive to in-line catch basin with sump.*
6. *Note added to plan reflecting MEP engineer to determine sizes of proposed fire and domestic water services.*
7. *NO PARKING signs must be installed at the head of each handicap parking space access aisle that is 8 feet wide, in a location that does not block the accessible route.*
8. *Plans updated to reflect tactile panels at the ends of the multi-use path must extend the full width of the path.*
9. *Plans will be updated to reflect the current preferred alternative route for the DOT Route 1 project provides for a 10-foot-wide multi-use path along the site, not 8 feet.*
10. *Applicant will consider bike racks that provide two points of contact with bikes.*
11. *All plans reflect compliance with the City's most up to date building codes.*
12. *Offsite plans will be provided for Hoover Drive that is approved by DPW.*

Conditions:

1. *Trees to remain clearly marked and fenced in before site work to commence.*

2. *Engineer to certify that stormwater mitigation system was monitored during construction, is installed as designed and that the system will function in compliance with the proposed drainage study and plan.*
3. *Access to utility room will be provided to DPW for water meter access.*
4. *New plantings will not block sight lines at driveway and vegetation will be cleared within Hoover Drive ROW to provide necessary sight lines.*

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

C. The request of **City of Portsmouth (Owner)**, for property located at **680 Peverly Hill Road** requesting TAC input for two building additions and associated site improvements related to stormwater, lighting and utilities. Said property is located on Assessor Map 254 Lot 8 and lies within the Industrial (I) and Municipal (M) Districts. (LU-24-189)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Belden of Altus Engineering and Joe Almeida of the City of Portsmouth came to present this application. They had previously been before the Committee for a work session. The applicants proceeded to go through the proposal and noted that they would not need to go through to the Planning Board, just receiving review from TAC.

[2:16:00] C. Putney noted that the applicants need to ensure that the second floor's single exit travel distances should not exceed the requirement.

P. Britz asked about the turning distances and if one is needed for a semi-truck. C. Putney noted that if the shown fire truck can make the turn, then a tractor trailer should be able to make the same turn. Mr. Almeida noted that the bigger challenge for this site will be trucks leaving the bays will need relief and have been given room on the lot to show those trucks being able to exit.

D. Desfosses noted that there was a lack of staff comments but that was because staff had been working closely with the engineer on this project already.

[2:18:39] S. Wolph asked about the multi-stall configuration in the gender-neutral toilets and if that is standard practice for stalls. Mr. Almeida noted that they are walls and not partitions. The walls would be floor to ceiling with doors and the only shared space is for the hand washing station.

PUBLIC HEARING

[2:19:58] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

It was determined that no recommendation was needed and the meeting adjourned.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.