

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

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

2:00 PM

JULY 5, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Transportation Planner; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector; Carl Roediger, Fire Department.

MEMBERS ABSENT: N/A

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **165 Deer Street**, ("Lot 3"), requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an existing building and the construction of a 5-story mixed use building (including a residential units, hotel, restaurant, retail sales and a 1st floor parking garage) with a footprint of 22,073 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 99,307 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17 and lies within the within the CD5 District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). ((This application was postponed at the May 30, 2017 TAC Meeting))

Mr. Britz moved to postpone to the August 1, 2017 Technical Advisory Committee, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **181 Hill Street**, ("Lot 6"), requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an existing building and the construction of a 5-story mixed use building (including residential units, a retail bank, office use, retail sales and a two level parking garage) with a footprint of 17,973 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 81,498 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17-2 and lies within the within the CD5 District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the May 30, 2017 TAC Meeting)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Ms. Tracy Kozak, JSA Inc and Mr. Michael Penny, GZA GeoEnvironmental provided a brief overview of updates made to the project since their last TAC meeting presentation. Lot 3 is

delayed to finalize the design. Lot 6 is ready with comments incorporated from the April TAC meeting. The goal is to create a new enclave neighborhood that is welcoming. This project will provide a connection between neighborhoods and hopefully a viable place for a parking garage. The goal is to align the timing of the design work as close to the city's timeline as possible. The design of this packet was in line with the city's design based on when it was submitted.

The following are the highlights from Mr. Michael Penny's presentation of the changes made since the April TAC meeting:

- Cover sheets identify new sheets that have been added.
 - The Foundry place garage will have 31 spaces for primarily residential use.
 - Hill St. garage will have 16 spaces 14 for the Hanover group and 2 for residents
 - Remaining for residents will be in the garage.
- Sheet C3
 - Narrowed the Hill St. garage entrance
 - Decided to not change the radius because there is potential for turning around cars or future connections.
 - There will be two driveways from Foundry and Hill St. Meeting to see if two driveways are necessary, and if a waiver is required.
 - Minor changes to signage traffic control etc.
 - There will be 3 parking spaces on Hill St. open to public.
- Sheet C4 - curbing and drainage
 - Slope grating easement between lot 6
 - Retaining wall on west side of lot 6 between 7-4 feet high
 - Increased the width of the sidewalk, and storm water detention sidewalk
 - Parking garage partially below ground water on one side and above on another. Decided to go on a sub slab drainage system and was conservative to add a pump system to pump up into city storm drain.
- Sheet 5.1
 - Describes offsite electrical improvements
 - Working with Eversource to build a new transformer behind last chance garage. They will be able to offer overhead power coming down for some existing buildings.
 - DSA is still in the process of negotiating deals with providers so could change locations. Hope that they will be finalize before planning board meeting.
- Landscaping
 - Added a new list of plant species that will be chosen for the project.
 - Vegetation on the sidewalks is important to the project but understand that maintenance will be needed.
 - DSA working with the city on a maintenance plan.
- Ventilation of the garage.
 - Only foundry place garage will require ventilation, and will connect to a generator on the roof so it will still work if there is a power outage.

PUBLIC HEARING

The chair opened the public hearing. Seeing no one rise; the chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Walker ran through the comments from the discussion with the presenters in the April TAC meeting to make sure all have been or will be addressed. Any comment without additional information beneath it is an agreed upon fix that did not require more explanation. The comments and results are as follows:

1. 3 parking spaces are to be provided on the exterior of the building on the Hill Street side of the site. As these will be on private property, the City cannot and will not be enforcing the time limit proposed for the spaces.
2. Item 27 on page 6 of the June 16 GeoInsight letter states that the 31 parking spaces in the garage are for the retail space patrons. Is this correct? Wouldn't they be for the residential tenants? How would public parking be monitored and enforced to keep this from becoming a free parking lot for the public?
 1. Mr. Eby commented that they are looking for more clarification on this.
3. The private portion of Hill Street is still being shown as over 24 feet wide. This is excessive for this area and should be narrowed to 20', which will allow the curb to be better aligned with the parking spaces on the abutting property to the west. Furthermore, this will enable the sidewalk to be widened at this location and additional space for landscaping.
 1. Mr. Roediger commented that this road does not have to be 24 feet but cannot be less than 20 feet.
4. The scale bar on Sheet C3.0 is incorrect.
5. There is no need for the proposed W11-Y13 sign on Foundry Place. There is adequate sight distance for vehicles leaving the garage for speeds of up to 15 mph, which should not be exceeded in the short distance from the roundabout.
6. A crosswalk across the garage driveway is not needed and should be removed.
7. Why is the center line on the garage driveway not in the center of the driveway?
8. The corner radius on the west side of the garage driveway can be reduced to shorten the pedestrian crossing distance. Encroachment is not a concern with the low traffic volumes that will be present on the road at this location.
 1. Ms. Walker asked for clarification on this. Mr. Michael Penny clarified that this would provide a turn around option for cars that miss the garage entrance. It could also be beneficial if the road is ever expanded to connect to Rock St. Mr. Eby and Ms. Walker agreed that this is a lot of overbuilding for unknown future projects. The committee is still going to ask for the corner radius to be reduced or shortened.
9. Construction staging and parking is shown on the Hill Street side of the parcel on top of the silt sock. Shouldn't it be moved away from the silt sock?
10. STOP signs should all be 30 inch, not 36 inches.
11. It doesn't appear that the parking easement for lot 14 is shown on sheet E4.
12. On the construction sequencing sheets, the traffic control barrier as shown on sheet SQNC.3 for lot 4 will prohibit the use of the row of parking spaces next to the bank. The barrier must be moved towards Lot 3 to keep the use of those spaces.

1. Mr. Eby commented that they will need to keep the bank traffic flowing. Mr. Michael Penny replied that this could be addressed in their Lot 3 presentation as well.
13. On sheets SQNC.4 through 6 the traffic flow arrows on Lot 4 show traffic traveling over the parking spaces towards an existing sidewalk. Are the parking spaces being removed, along with the sidewalk, to create a new driveway.
 1. Mr. Michael Penny commented that there would be 2 lanes of traffic coming through. There may be impact to parking but it will depend.
14. The plan proposes reconstruction of the road on the applicant's side of 'Hill' St and a 1" overlay of the other side. This is unacceptable as the applicant's side will need to be dug up for utility connections. The applicant should reconstruct full width of the road from the end of the street up to the Heinneman parking lot. Therefore, detail 5 on Sheet C7.0 will not be used as they will use detail 4 instead.
 1. Ms. Walker clarified with Mr. Desfosses if he was looking for a full road reconstruction. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that is what he is looking for. Mr. Michael Penny responded that this was not originally accounted for because this was planned for in a separate project. Mr. Desfosses responded that they will need to account for this road reconstruction in their project, and if a future project does go through it can supersede their plan. They cannot count on the future project to take care of the road. Mr. Michael Penny agreed that they will account for the construction in their plans and construct the road in their project if the separate future project does not go through.
15. We are investigating whether the existing sanitary sewer in Hill St can be truncated back to the City portion of the street. We think the only services on the pipe are the ones the applicant is abandoning, and therefore this section can be removed. We will have more to report on this but the applicant may be required to construct a new manhole at the end of the sewer just upstream of the last service line.
 1. Mr. Desfosses commented there should not be a sewer line on private property that is doing nothing, and would prefer that a manhole be put on it. They applicants will need to confirm where all the services go.
16. The hydrant connection as shown is improper. A tapping sleeve will not be used because the end of the main sweeps into the existing hydrant. Applicant will need to cut all the existing fittings off the existing main and construct a main extension.
17. The City's information seems to indicate that Heinneman's sewer goes underneath the Last Chance garage. This may require that the new electric and communication lines will have to be located around any new sewer laterals for these two buildings that will probably need to be constructed by the City during the installation of the new 48" sewer.
18. The sewer connections for this building that are being installed in Foundry Place need to be coordinated as the plans show that the lines don't match up.
19. The power and communication lines for 319, 329 and 339 Hanover will come from pole 23/16S on Hanover St and not from a relocated pole on Hill St. The City will also need pull boxes for all systems located off the back right corner of 319 in order to serve the other buildings that are lower down Hill St once the poles go away. It is the City's intent to remove all overhead lines on Hill St and using that proposed pole will hinder our efforts.

1. Mr. Michael Penny commented that it is their understanding that Eversource cannot run power that far. Mr. Desfosses commented that a new pole will not be allowed, so they will need to work together on a solution.
20. Applicant will need to confirm with Eversource, Fairpoint and Comcast that the manholes shown on sheet SE2.3 are adequate for their needs.
21. City requires two separate Fire Department Connections (FDC) for the building. One to be installed on the Foundry Place side of the building between the entrance to the parking garage and the transformer pad. The second FDC will be installed on the Hill St. side of the building between the garage entrance and the entry sidewalk. Both FDCs will be interconnected. Developer can utilize the traditional Siamese connection or a "flat plate" style connection.
22. Knox® key switches shall be installed adjacent to each garage door to allow for Fire Department operation.
23. Knox® key boxes shall be installed at both the Hill St. and Foundry Place entrances for building access.
24. Grand master keying shall be required. One key shall operate every lockset installed in the building.
25. Planning Department is confirming that the façade modulation requirements are satisfied. As currently proposed, this only works if Hill Street is the assumed frontage for the lot. In contrast, if its Foundry Place, then the applicant will have an issue as sections of the building appear to exceed the 80 foot maximum length requirement.
 1. Ms. Tracy Kozak confirmed that Foundry Place side of the building meets the façade requirements. Mr. Cracknell requested to see the building height fully laid out. Mr. Roediger commented that the building looks like it has two fronts and requested that they look at this again to ensure that the plans meet the frontage requirement. If Hill St. is the front of the building then it will require a 14-foot sidewalk. If they removed the 3 parking spaces on Hill St. the sidewalks could be expanded to 14 feet. Ms. Tracy Kozak responded that Foundry Place would be the front of the building because that is the public street. Hill St. will be private entrance for residents. Mr. Cracknell agreed with Mr. Roediger that this should be looked at again to ensure all the requirements are met.
26. The building height measurements and calculations should be confirmed as the plans are within 2 inches of exceeding the maximums. Same for any rooftop appurtenances.
27. The façade glazing figures should be confirmed as they're also very near the minimums.
28. If Hill Street is used as the primary frontage then the façade type would be a forecourt building which is not permitted in the CD5.
29. In using the Incentive Overlay District provisions the building may be 10 feet / 1 story taller. This also requires a minimum sidewalk width of 14 feet for this project so the sidewalk along Hill Street is too narrow and needs to be widened.
30. In the geotechnical report addressing Groundwater Management it states that the lower elevation of the garage will be 7.6' which is below the groundwater on the south portion of the site and above the groundwater on the north portion of the site. The report goes on to say there will be between 6 and 50 gallons per minute of flow of groundwater pumped from the building. This means our stormwater system is always going to have a groundwater component from this building along with the stormwater

that this development will be putting in the system. Staff would like the applicant to demonstrate that our stormwater system can handle the continuous groundwater flow.

1. Mr. Britz expressed concern about how the ground water will flow and how it will affect abutting properties. Mr. Michael Penny replied that the cross-section of the building is 7 feet below grade on one side, and 6 feet below grade on the other. Theoretically the water will slide through the Foundry Garage into the pond. Conservatively, the plan includes adding a pump to account for excessive water. Mr. Britz commented that the pond can get very high and asked if there is an option to contain water on site. Mr. Michael Penny replied that they did not model for that on the storm water model, but they will have water-monitoring wells on site during construction and the water quality can be tested from that too. Mr. Pezzullo requested to keep the option open for the city to do a peer review of that report for both temporary construction and potentially permanent too.
31. The open space calculations should not include areas that are over the underground garage as that technically isn't a pervious surface. For instance the courtyard entrance walkway coming from hill is being counted as open space and is over a garage. Also the landscape area on the west side of the building appears to be over the foundation, please clarify.
32. The stormwater detention detail is not shown.
33. Under Sustainable Strategies -- we would like to see how the building construction can be designed to meet LEED in all the systems not just in terms of Indoor Air Quality.
 1. Ms. Tracy Kozak commented that they took a deeper dive into this for energy savings and reducing the carbon footprint. They will have an energy model available and can include it in the planning board submission.
34. There is an significant lack of landscaping on the Hill Street side of the building.
35. The proposed community space on the Foundry Place side next to 191 is primarily occupied by the transformer and therefore cannot be counted as community space.
 1. The committee requested that this item be revisited.
36. Fix the label on the legend on the Open Space plan as it refers to community space.
37. How will the landscaping strip on the side of the building next to #191 be maintained and will irrigation be required?
38. On-street bike racks should be added along the portion of the building planned for retail use.
39. See Site Plan Review regs for required language for Site Plan and Landscaping Plan notes.
40. The permanent foundation drain force main tie-in to the City's drainage system requires a storm drain connection permit. In addition to the permit application fee, a capacity use surcharge fee will be required. The surcharge fee is determined on a case by case basis. Fee is related to the amount of discharge, the sump pump system design, and the capacity of the drainage system. The applicant will need to submit a detailed sump pump system design for our review and approval.
41. The construction groundwater dewatering discharge requires a temporary construction dewatering discharge permit.

42. Note that the groundwater might need to be sampled/tested for both the temporary and permanent connection to the City's drainage system to determine if any treatment is required prior to discharge.
43. Where does the area drain in the walkway to the building from Hill Street connect?
44. Stormwater runoff from the east side of the building is being directed to flow onto the abutting property. The construction and grading easement on the abutting property might not allow for the flowage of stormwater runoff. Also, the flowpath of this runoff appears to direct water into the public street. Runoff might need to be contained and directed into the site stormwater system.
 1. Mr. Pezzullo questioned if this was the right easement; a flowage easement may be needed if water is being directed onto another property. Mr. Michael Penny pointed out that the water would be flowing as it does today. Mr. Pezzullo responded that if they are directing water onto the street then the water may have to be contained on site.
45. Provide details for the proposed underground stormwater detention system.

Mr. Marsilia pointed out that the east and west elevations have unprotected openings. It looks like they're over what they are allowed 5-10 feet from property line. Ideally before the planning board the applicants should have a table that addresses those.

Mr. Desfosses questioned what the requirement for community open space was, and when it will be developed. Mr. Cracknell clarified that the open space is required because they want to build a taller building. The timeline of the development of the community space will be established with the planning board.

Mr. Cracknell noted that if the Foundry Place side of the building is the front façade, the applicants need to verify the building height for zoning, verify modulation 100 or less, Mr. Cracknell recommended the presenters add building type to the plan.

Mr. Cracknell suggested the presenters reconsider the planter and plant trees instead because the planter eliminates potential for future outdoor seating.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if the plan includes the right amount of community space. The requirement is that the space needs to be predominately forest with at least 50% of the community space being porous. The community space should not be in the area where the transformer is. The applicants should work with Eversource to move the transformer back a little if possible. Mr. Cracknell also suggested they widen the sidewalk on Hill St. then could be included in community space.

Ms. Walker requested clarification for the street parking on Hill St. Mr. Michael Penny responded that the parking is not required to the plan, but it would be an added benefit. They are required to do 14 spaces and have put them in the garage already. The Hill St. parking would just provide more options because parking is at a premium. Mr. Roediger added that if there is parking on both sides of the street, then 20 feet is too narrow he would want the road to be 22 feet at least.

Mr. Britz asked for clarification around the extent of building foundation. Mr. Michael Penny clarified that just the footings would be sticking out not the walls. Mr. Britz agreed that would be ok.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone to the August 1, 2017 Technical Advisory Committee meeting Seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Summit Land Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **160 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a two-story manufacturing and office building with a footprint of 85,500 s.f., including 190 parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 313 as Lot 2, and lies within the Pease Airport, Business, Commercial (ABC) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Sean Tobey, Hoyle Tanner, Mr. William Davidson, Hoyle Tanner and Mr. Michael Mates, Pease Development Authority spoke to this application.

Mr. Sean Tobey offered a brief overview of the plan. The project is for an office that will be used for a Canada based company that is expanding to Portsmouth. This will be adding 150 new jobs to the city area. The existing site is just less than 8.4 acres. This is one of the last few remaining sites on Pease that can accommodate this kind of building. The building will be providing 140 parking spaces with two loading docks. At TAC's request they have widened the sidewalks and doubled the size of bike rack. The plan outlines the construction will happen in two phases, and fire suppression will be incorporated into the second phase. The Café will not feature a full kitchen and there will be no industrial waste as part of manufacturing. The utilities will run down the main driveway and hookup to the existing lines on corporate drive. This project will not be LEED certified, but everything will be designed to reduce energy as much as possible.

PUBLIC HEARING

The chair opened the public hearing. Seeing no one rise; the chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Walker commented that the plan did not add trees on the driveway entrance and to be careful to not have the landscaping block the fire department connection. Mr. Sean Tobey responded

that the trees will be incorporated into the plan, and they can push the bushes back to accommodate the fire department connection.

Mr. Desfosses questioned how the sewer would be abandoned. Mr. Sean Tobey replied that they would cut the caps at the property line and remove anything within the parcel. Mr. Pezzullo noted that the main should be capped as well.

Mr. Desfosses requested clarification on the nature of the outfall pond and that water flow. Mr. Sean Tobey responded that there are two drainage pipes currently and they plan to match the two outfalls that currently exist. Mr. Desfosses questioned why the new pipes will be so much bigger. Mr. Sean Tobey responded that it is because the two that exist today are undersized.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there will be riprapping all the way down to the street channel. Mr. Sean Tobey replied that the riprapping will not go all the way to the street channel. Mr. Desfosses questioned how will down stream be protected from getting eroded without riprapping all the way down. Mr. Sean Tobey replied that riprap has been sized based on the standard outfall by the time the water reaches the end of the riprapping it should be mostly dissipated.

Mr. Desfosses asked for clarification on why the existing end walls and outlet pipes were not being removed. Mr. Sean Tobey replied that they are in the buffer so were not in the plans to remove. Mr. Desfosses noted that he would prefer they all be removed as part of this project. Mr. Britz noted that this would be fine, and could be incorporated in their conditional use permit application. Mr. Sean Tobey agreed.

Mr. Desfosses noted that it is required to put in inverted manholes for the drain manholes. Mr. Sean Tobey agreed to add this into the plan.

Mr. Pezzullo requested clarification on quantity of water use, and noted that the plan stated there would be no industrial wastewater discharge. Mr. Sean Tobey confirmed this. Mr. Pezzullo requested more detail on how this will work. Mr. Sean Tobey did not have more detail at the time but will get the detail incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the city is planning to reconstruct Corporate Drive this year. The project is in design now and will hopefully be under construction summer of 2018. Mr. Sean Tobey responded that they were unaware of this project. They hope to have building done June 2018, so should the projects should not overlap.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if it has been confirmed with Fairpoint that there is actually a telephone line in the manhole. Mr. Sean Tobey responded that this has not been confirmed, but it will be investigated before this plan is brought to planning board.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if it has been confirmed that there is no duck bank running along Corporate Drive in that location. Mr. Sean Tobey responded that this has not been confirmed, but it will be investigated before this is brought to planning board.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if it has been confirmed with Eversource how they would get power. Mr. Sean Tobey responded that this has not been confirmed, but it will be investigated before this is brought to planning board. Mr. Desfosses noted that the plan should include the underground electric coming off a pole.

Mr. Desfosses requested that the presenters report back to the committee on the utility connections after investigation.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if a new traffic light will be needed at the new driveway. Mr. Michael Mates responded that nothing has been identified for lighting with this project yet, but it will probably be required to put in one if not two new bases for future lighting. A handful of new lights have been put in recently, the closest new light is at Rye Street and Corporate Drive near the Waste Water Treatment Plant. Mr. Desfosses noted that the power supply and transformer location would need to be thought out for this. Mr. Michael Mates requested that this be added as a stipulation to ensure this is planned properly.

Mr. Roediger noted that a full radio strength test would be needed after phase two of the project is completed. Mr. Sean Tobey agreed and noted that it will be added to the plan.

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval of the matter to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Roediger, with the following stipulations:

1. Applicant work with the ADA on street lighting
2. Install the utility connection prior to the city street construction.
3. Inverted manholes are added to the plan.
4. Outfalls get removed in the wetland buffer if the conservation commission agrees.
5. Full radio strength test is added to the plan.

The board votes unanimously. This application will be brought forward to the planning board.

.....
B. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and 19 Rye Street, LLC, c/o Two International Group, Applicant**, for property located at **19 Rye Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a two-story office building with a footprint of 14,859 s.f., including 146 parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 305 as Lot 4, and lies within the Pease Airport, Business, Commercial (ABC) District

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Sean Tobey, Hoyle Tanner, Mr. William Davidson, Hoyle Tanner and Mr. Michael Mates, Pease Development Authority spoke to this application.

Mr. Sean Tobey provided an overview of the application. The construction of a new two-story office building at 19 Rye Street for health services. The building will have 150 parking spaces mostly located at the rear of the building with sidewalk connectivity and a bike rack. The project maintains 51% open space. The drainage is not treated today, so the plans include treatment and have incorporated drainage maintenance in the plans. The sewer will connect to 15 Rye Street as

it does today. The other utility connections will be set up where the connections to the old building are today. Landscaping has been added to create a strong buffer from the street to the parking lot. Pre-TAC meeting comments have been incorporated to the plan.

PUBLIC HEARING

The chair opened the public hearing. Seeing no one rise; the chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses commented on that the drain manhole would need to be an inverted manhole for this project as well. Mr. Sean Tobey agreed.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the pole adjacent to manhole 5 looks offline to him. He requested the applicants to push it back so it does not impede on to the sidewalk.

Mr. Desfosses asked for clarification on the lighting in the right of way for this project. Mr. Michael Mates Confirmed the ADA is not requiring it.

Mr. Roediger commented that a radio strength test would be needed for this project. Mr. Sean Tobey agreed.

Ms. Walker clarified that the butterfly bush the applicants removed at the committee's request needed to be replaced with another plant. Mr. Sean Tobey confirmed that they did replace it.

Ms. Walker proposed breaking up the property with more landscaping. Mr. Sean Tobey responded that they would have to bring everything up 8-10 feet. There's an existing 4-foot berm. They want to keep existing trees and keep the buffer from the street. Mr. Cracknell agreed with Ms. Walker and noted that they could include the comments without making major impacts.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if the berm was also going to be used as snow storage. Mr. Sean Tobey confirmed that yes, if they have a loader they can drop on top of the berm.

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval of the matter to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell, with the following stipulations:

1. The manhole drain gets updated to be inverted manholes.
2. The telephone supply pole is moved back so that it is not impeding on the sidewalk.
3. Radio strength test is included in the plans.
4. More landscaping is added.
5. The landscape island is a minimum of 8 feet.

The board votes unanimously. This application will be brought forward to the planning board.

.....
C. The application of **409 Franklin Pierce Highway, LLC, Owner**, for four vacant lots located off **Woodworth Avenue and Swett Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to consolidate and reconfigure lots lines to create two lots as follows:

1. Assessors Map 243, Lot 25 consisting of 8,492 s.f. being merged and eliminated;
2. Assessors Map 243, Lot 26 increasing from 10,181 s.f. to 14, 411 s.f. with 0' of continuous street frontage.
3. Assessors Map 243, Lot 27 increasing from 10,615 s.f. to 27,681 s.f. with 0' of continuous street frontage.
4. Assessors Map 243, Lot 28 consisting of 12,804 s.f. being merged and eliminated.

A variance was granted on April 25, 2017 by the Board of Adjustment to allow 0' of continuous street frontage. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 243 as Lots 25, 26, 27, and 28 and lie within the Single Residence B (SRB) District where the minimum lot area is 15,000 s.f. and the minimum continuous street frontage is 100'.

Mr. Roediger moved to postpone to this application, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Merton Alan Investments, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **30 Cate Street**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to remove the 10 foot wide walkthroughs in the center of the two 8-unit buildings and move the units together; to provide a 20 foot wide separation between the 6-unit building to create two 3-unit buildings; and the revision of grading and utilities to accommodate the new building locations. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 165 as Lot 1 and lie within Character District 4-W (CD-4W).

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Patrick Crimmins, Tighe and bond, gave a brief overview of the project. They will be removing the islands to push units closer together. This will result in using an existing manhole because the utilities can be closer together. The 6 units along the west property line will be separated to two three-unit buildings to accommodate a driveway easement. The project is getting close to construction and just looking for approval.

Mr. Cracknell requested the applicant consider adding another tree on the corner to round off the park, and he requested that the dividers use cobblestone or granite block. Mr. Cracknell noted that the 15-foot easement gap could accommodate an elm tree out toward the end to provide more shade.

Mr. Cracknell requested that a patio or pergola be added for the units that have been separated to be more consistent with the other units' layouts.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the sidewalk for the first two units appears to be a private walkway for one unit owner. If the sidewalk was moved closer to the garage it would appear to be more of a community walkway.

Mr. Desfosses noted that sewer manhole 4 already has 3 penetrations in the manhole. Mr. Desfosses requested that the applicant confirm what side the water main is on for that manhole. If the water main manhole relocation is needed then it's on the applicant to execute.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the catch basin on the property is not included on the plan, but should be removed for this.

PUBLIC HEARING

- The chair opened the public hearing.
- Mike Teele of 767 Islington Street, raised concern over the pedestrian crossing on the railroad tracks. The properties bear a liability issue for people walking through there, and there are potentially legal issues. Mr. Teele suggested that for the safety of the property owners the plan should prevent intrusion from that side. Mr. Teele suggest that the property should be properly fenced from the western side to the rail road tracks.
- The chair saw no one else from the public rise. The chair closed public hearing

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval of the matter to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Marsilia, with the following stipulations:

- Sewer manhole 4 is very close to water main. If the water main is actually in the way then it will be the applicant's responsibility to move the water main.
- The catch basin should be abandoned properly and the land should be grated off, so water doesn't pool there.
- An additional Zelkova tree will be planted along Bartlett St.
- Applicant will use a flush mounted block.
- Applicant will pull back the sidewalk.
- Applicant will add an American elm at the 15-foot divider.
- Applicant will modify landscaping within the gap to encourage active use for the two units. Applicants should add a patio or pergola there to be consistent with the other units.

The board votes unanimously. This application will be brought forward to the planning board.

.....

E. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **165 Deer Street**, ("Lots 2 & 3), requesting Site Plan Approval for creation of a temporary parking lot having 73 standard parking spaces and 3 handicap accessible parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lots 17 and 17-1 and lies within the within the CD5 District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD).

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. John Chagnon, Ambit Engineering and Mr. Maxwell Rogers Deer St. Associates, gave a brief overview of the project. This Plan came to the workshop and received a lot of comments focusing on the use of the property. The intent is to create a temporary parking lot to be used for 2 years, and then the site will be re-developed. The lot will be used for leased spaces for workers. There is an operations plan put together to show that it's a private leased parking lot and will be towed on violation.

Ms. Walker pointed out that this is contingent on zoning board approval, and is not sure ZBA can grant temporary use. Ms. Walker also raised the concern around what would happen if the lot was never re-developed. It was noted that a permanent lot would be held to different standards.

Mr. Eby pointed out that the plan shows 5 spaces on right that have signage saying bank customer parking only. Mr. Eby questioned if those were part of the lot and if so, how will this be monitored?

Mr. Chagnon replied that this will be handled like any other parking lot those will be labeled bank parking only. The spaces will be managed like any other bank lot in town.

Mr. Maxwell Rogers pointed out that the bank spots are mislabeled on the plans. Everything in the lot will be signed the same way and the bank will have its own separate entrance for their spaces.

Mr. Britz clarified that the plan is not proposing any new paving. Mr. John Chagnon confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Britz asked where the storm water flows. Mr. John Chagnon replied that the storm water flow would be the same as it is today. There may be an opportunity to push a row up to include some planters. Mr. Desfosses pointed out that the line on railroad could be pushed back a foot or so to make room to add crushed rock. This would provide a place for the water to filter to.

Mr. Desfosses pointed out a parking space labeled on sheet C2 would not be able to open a door to a car if put into the lot. Mr. John Chagnon acknowledged this and will remove it from the plan.

Mr. Desfosses asked if yellow pain could be used in lots. Mr. Eby confirmed that yellow paint could be used.

Ms. Walker questioned what the proposed timeframe of operation would be for the temporary lot. Mr. Maxwell Rogers responded that the lot would be operational for 14-18 months. Lot 2 may be used sooner than that for lay down for construction and within that two-year period the lot would be redeveloped.

Mr. Eby pointed out that if lot 2 becomes unusable because of construction equipment then lot 3 would not be operational.

Mr. Pezzullo pointed out that the standard regulations don't speak to a temporary lot. Standard regulations would normally bring this to a site review. Mr. Pezzullo questioned what the temporary office park sign what will that be used for. Mr. Maxwell Rogers replied that the signage is for a temporary construction office. The office will be used for construction for this lot. Ms. Walker verified that they have a permit for this. Mr. Maxwell Rogers confirmed that yes they do have a permit.

Mr. Marsilia proposed that approval should be given for 2 years and then they would have to come back to get longer approval for the temporary lot or present their proposed development. Ms. Walker agreed it should be time specific approval and suggested the timeframe for approval be 14 months.

Mr. Desfosses noted that at one end of the lot there could only be 6 spaces not 7 because of the fence.

Mr. Maxwell Rogers commented that the water usage for the lot is not changing. There will be the same amount of rainwater as there is today. Mr. Pezzullo noted that if this were going to be permanent lot then, then there would need to be a site review. The project would have to meet the standards and requirements for the regulations. Mr. Pezzullo suggested the applicants make some improvements to the water flow as part of their plan.

Mr. Eby suggested that they move a handicap space to put it closer to the entrance near the other two designated handicap spots.

Mr. Desfosses clarified that any pavement outside the fence area should be removed as part of this project. The pavement should be cut along the fence and removed up to the property line.

Mr. Eby asked the presenters to define daytime for the parking limitations. Mr. Maxwell Rogers replied that the parking lot would be open only for business working hours. 8 am – 5 pm. Ms. Walker requested that the hours be added to the plan.

PUBLIC HEARING

The chair opened the public hearing. Seeing no one rise; the chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

The board recommended that this be postponed so the presenters can come back with some more enhancements.

Mr. Desfosses also suggested that this plan go to the zoning board before they come back to TAC.

Mr. Desfosses motioned to table this request, Seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
F. The application of **Dennett Homestead Condominium Association, Owner**, for property located at **73 Prospect Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of a portion of one residential building and the construction of two additions. The side addition will be 24' x 24' and the rear addition will be 20'8" x 24'. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 143 as Lot 28 and lie within the General Residence A (GRA) District.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this application indefinitely Seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cracknell moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:41 pm, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee