

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

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

2:00 PM

May 7, 2024

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Planning Manager; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Chad Putney, Fire Prevention Officer; 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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

Stefanie Casella, Planner II; Kate Homet, Associate Environmental Planner

[3:56] Chairman Stith opened the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the April 2, 2024 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

[4:116] S. Wolph made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Z. Cronin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **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**

[4:26] Chairman Stith noted the applicants had requested to postpone as they are still working on third party reviews.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- a. The request of **Friends of Lafayette House (Owner)**, for property located at **413 Lafayette Road** requesting Site Plan Review Approval for a 635 square foot addition with associated site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 230 Lot 23A and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (LU-24-61)

[4:37] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[4:57] Joe Coronati of Jones & Beach Engineering, came to present this application. He noted that the last time he was before the Committee, it was requested that the utilities be located, which has been done. There will be no utilities in the way of the new addition, it will all be interior. The newest site plan set has been submitted which has their requests for waivers in it. They will provide a green building statement and they will request the two waivers as noted by the staff comments.

[7:30] C. Putney noted that the applicant will have to extend the sprinkler and fire alarm system. Mr. Coronati agreed.

PUBLIC HEARING

[7:38] Chairman Stith opened the public hearing. No one spoke. The hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[7:59] D. Desfosses made a motion to send this application to the Planning Board. 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)

[9:29] Chairman Stith introduced this application.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[10:14] Brett Benson (architect), Patrick Crimmins (engineer), Andrew Hayes (owner representative), and Nick Aceto (landscape architect) came to present this application. Mr. Benson proceeded to explain the proposed development with a slideshow. This highlighted the project objectives and project summary, which detailed the proposed 360 residential apartments, a clubhouse building, 567 parking spaces and three acres of community space. He also reviewed the main points heard at their previous Planning Board, TAC and Conservation Commission work sessions.

[14:05] Mr. Crimmins listed the required permits the project would need to meet, including a lot line revision, a site plan review permit, a conditional use permit for site development standards, a conditional use permit for noise and a wetland conditional use permit. He went into the existing conditions on site and how the lots are proposed to be rearranged with easements relocated. He proceeded to go through different sections of zoning requirements that this project complies with and how the site reduces existing impervious surfaces and attempts to reduce wetland buffer impacts. A fire truck turning plan was shown as well as a grading and drainage plan for the proposed site which describes the stormwater and sewer plans in greater detail. The buildings will be heated with electricity, which should reduce their demand for natural gas.

[24:48] Mr. Aceto went on to describe the community space exhibit, layout and materials, the proposed planting plan, and the photometric plan.

[28:57] Mr. Benson addressed previous wayfinding comments, EV parking, the noise overlay district, potential solar locations, and the proposed floor plans.

[34:54] P. Britz asked if they had considered doing more of a townhouse design for the buildings. Mr. Benson responded that some of the buildings are centered around an entry courtyard but in discussions with the team, they want the sidewalks to feel public and bustling and open to the public to feel like a neighborhood. This pointed them towards feeling as if they needed to create layers of semi-private and semi-public spaces so that it does not feel like a front door is right on top of a busy sidewalk.

[37:45] Chairman Stith asked the six parking spaces that are in the shared community space. The committee will need to look at that more closely to make sure it still meets the definition of a community space. Mr. Hayes responded that their intention with those parking spaces was the ability to program that space for the community at large, for example hosting food trucks. From a traditional parking perspective, they would be open to limiting the use of those spaces there.

[38:50] P. Britz noted that he could not see the full outline of the lot depicted on any plans. Mr. Crimmins responded that it was not depicted in these exhibits, but it would be a part of the lot line revision plan coming up. P. Britz asked if they were counting their frontage off Gosling Road for this project. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were using their Durgin Lane frontage. P. Britz asked if they would build out the proposed circle shown on the plans. Mr. Crimmins noted that it was there due to a staff comment about needing a truck turnaround. They had looked into it but the lot lines constrain it to half a cul de sac, and not a full cul de sac. The implementation of a turnaround there would also mean more impervious surface in the wetland buffer. They would be open to installing it if the staff feels like they will need one. P. Britz asked

about trash would be delivered and circulated through the site. Mr. Benson mentioned that they were still working on this but they imagined that a trash truck or the staff will collect trash from each building. Package delivery will be delivered to a central location within the community building and delivery vans will have designated parking nearby. Mr. Hayes mentioned that they are evaluating a potential partnership with a trash valet system which would be localized to each building.

[42:09] P. Britz asked if the intention of the solar canopy was to reduce noise. Mr. Benson responded that they are continuing to study the covered parking (two sided facing the west and south) and how it could help with the acoustics.

[42:59] E. Eby asked about the parking spaces on the main street, the head-in parking and parallel parking. He wanted to know if they intended to flip those as the current configuration constrains which direction cars need to come from to park. Mr. Aceto noted that they considered this configuration to reduce headlights into the windows on buildings.

[44:33] Chairman Stith noted that the applicants would need a wetland third party review, a traffic third party and stormwater third party analysis.

PUBLIC HEARING

[45:13] Chairman Stith opened the public comment.

[45:35] Liz Bratter of 159 McDonough Street came to speak. Ms. Bratter voiced her concern about the sound barriers, the need for more signs and not circles, the narrow roadway that currently exists on the way to Motel 6, the proximity of the dog park to wetlands and storm drains, the proximity of buildings to the wetlands, and the height of the proposed light poles.

[53:07] Chairman Stith closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

[53:22] Chairman Stith noted that he would entertain a motion to postpone.

[53:26] D. Desfosses made a motion to postpone. Z. Cronin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

[53:45] Z. Cronin made a motion to adjourn. D. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate E. Homet
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee