

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

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

**2:00 PM**

**December 3, 2024**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Peter Britz, Director of Planning & Sustainability; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Vincent Hayes; Planner I

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Mike Maloney; Deputy Police Chief, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer

**ADDITIONAL STAFF**

Stefanie Casella; Planner II, Kate Homet; Environmental Planner

**PRESENT:**

**MINUTES**

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. Approval of minutes from November 5, 2024 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Chairman Stith announced that the November minutes would be available at the next regular meeting for review.

**II. NEW BUISINESS**

- A. The request of **Jeffrey S. Nawrocki Revocable Trust (Owner)**, for property located at **299 Hanover Street** requesting a parking Conditional Use Permit from Section 10.1112.14 to allow three parking spaces where 11 are required. Said property is located on Assessor Map 125 Lot 10 and lies within the Character District 4L-1 (CD4-L1) District. (LU-24-160)

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Jeff Nawrocki, the property owner, came to present this application. Mr. Nawrocki gave a brief overview of the existing property, its use, and his proposal to change the downstairs level from an

office space to an apartment. A discussion continued about parking needs and the installation of a sprinkler system.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

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

V. Hayes asked about the need for the dumpster which was shown on the site plan. Mr. Nawrocki responded that it was from an older plan and was leftover. He would be needing a dumpster temporarily for the construction phase but would get an encumbrance permit for that.

P. Britz made a motion to find the parking demand analysis acceptable. Z. Cronin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** The request of **One Market Square LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **1 Congress Street, 21 (15) Congress Street** requesting a Parking Conditional Use Permit from Section 10.1112.14 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow 21 parking spaces where 53 parking spaces are required; and Site Plan Approval to merge the lots of 1 Congress Street and 15 Congress Street for a mixed-use development with associated site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 117 Lot 14 and Map 117 Lot 12 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD-4), Character District 5 (CD-5) and Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts. (LU-22-12)

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Mark McNabb, Tracey Kozak, John Chagnon, Marie Bodi and Terrence Parker came to present this application.

Mr. Chagnon explained the proposed redevelopment project, the building connections existing today and proceeded to go through the details of the plan set. After reviewing the proposal, Mr. Chagnon and Mr. McNabb went through and addressed all the staff comments that had been sent out prior to the meeting. Mr. McNabb also addressed the project's issues with lot mergers and building coverage.

Mr. Britz noted that they do not have a work session before the Committee but yet the applicants were presenting another option that had not been submitted. Mr. Chagnon responded that they were seeking to get Committee feedback on a different scenario. They continued to discuss the issue of two separate buildings, the building footprint, the separate lots, the need for utilities, elements of the proposal's design, egress points, etc.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

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

P. Howe asked about the proposed egress on the second floor and the single exit. The other exit looked like it dumped into an office space. Ms. Kozak responded that this submission had a doorway missing and a stairway would serve the office space off of Haven Court and an additional stairway on High Street would connect as well. P. Howe noted that he was looking for an exit for the residential space, not the office. Mr. McNabb responded that their final plans would show a hallway that connects but there is no layout shown yet. A discussion continued about the building code and egress needs.

P. Britz noted that the application was confusing because it talks about creating co-living space yet the plans do not show this. He noted that it would be very confusing for the Planning Board to review this. Mr. McNabb disagreed and said they had to have a confusing narrative because they want to keep the conversation of co-living alive to encourage it to get passed. Mr. McNabb noted that co-living would not be in front of the Planning Board as part of this application.

Chairman Stith brought up the building coverage definition and Mr. McNabb discussed what he viewed as two options to move forward without TAC's recommended approval of their definition or with. P. Britz noted that the Planning Board will have to wrestle with this as the Committee interprets the definition as it is written. P. Britz noted that he did not feel like he could personally recommend what Mr. McNabb suggests due to the way the Zoning Ordinance is written because they need to follow the ordinance as it is written.

Chairman Stith gave a potential motion for recommending this application go forth as two separate buildings unless the Planning Board has a different interpretation or the applicant seeks a conditional use permit for the building footprint. S. Wolph motioned this forward and D. Desfosses seconded the motion.

V. Hayes noted that this would need a CMMP. Chairman Stith noted that that was already a part of the original approval. Chairman Stith noted that comments 5, 6 and 7 could be carried over as conditions of the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The request of **Durgin Square LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **1600 Woodbury Avenue** requesting amended Site Plan approval for the addition of EV charging stations in existing parking lot with associated equipment and transformer. Said property is located on Assessor Map 238 Lot 16 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-24-182)

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

A representative of AGI, Ionna and the landlord for this property came to present the application which was a request to provide EV charging in an existing parking lot. The representative described the proposal, the location, the amount of chargers and infrastructure needed for this project.

D. Desfosses noted that the applicant would need a license for the utility pole and power line that crosses the city street. This would need to be requested from the City Council.

The representative noted they would be going underground across Durgin Lane to which D. Desfosses noted that Eversource would need to obtain a license for the pole and the applicant would need a license for the conduit going across Durgin Lane. There would be impact fees as well due to the road being recently paved. It was noted that this project would need to be bonded with a site review agreement.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The public hearing was closed.

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

A conversation continued about the install process and who would be responsible for the different installations associated with this proposal.

It was mentioned that the staff comments provided for this application should be revised before going to the Planning Board. Chairman Stith reviewed the conditions out loud that came from the staff comments and Z. Cronin added additional stipulations from DPW comments. P. Britz made a motion to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Board with the recommended stipulations. D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.