

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

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

2:00 PM

SEPTEMBER 5, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planner Director; 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:

.....
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 CD5 District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). (This application was postponed at the August 1, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this site plan review to the October 3, 2017 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. 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 CD5 District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the August 1, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this site plan review to the October 3, 2017 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

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 lot 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.
3. 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'. (This application was postponed at the August 1, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering introduced David Calkins, representing the owner, and Derek Durbin, Attorney, were all there to represent to applicant. Mr. Weinrieb spoke to the application. Some design revisions have been made to the plan, including improvements to the Swett Avenue side. An additional survey in the intersection was performed all the way up to the project area. Swett Avenue was redesigned to improve the sightline and create a continuous 18-foot wide driveway. The grade could not be changed significantly on one side of the driveway, but the team was able to flatten out the hill. The road would now be designed now for a 15 mph roadway. The easement plan had a typo that has been corrected. The driveway has been extended 20 feet to allow for snow storage.

Mr. Roediger questioned what the addresses were going to be for the two houses. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it is blank on the plans because the street numbers are not assigned yet, but they will be Swett Avenue addresses.

Mr. Desfosses asked what was being done to mitigate the run off from the road extension. Mr. Weinrieb responded that most of the widening would result in the water going back toward where the treatment is already being planned for the house. There really is not an increase in runoff. Mr. Desfosses questioned if there would be curbing on both sides of the road. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the plan is to only provide curbing where it exists now. If more curbing is added, then it could create more of a runoff issue.

Mr. Pezzullo raised concern about not adding more curbing. Any roadway runoff needs to be contained or directed to the side swale. It appears that there are some swales at the high point, but it is unclear how the water will flow in the driveways. Mr. Weinrieb responded that there are a couple areas that have a little bit of a swale. The plan is to widen the road to 18 feet. If it is expanded more, then the project will be out of the right of way. This project would be bettering the road. Adding more curbing could create a hardship to an existing owner by directing it into an abutter's property. Mr.

Pezzullo suggested keeping the runoff in the roadway until the drainage at the end on McClintock Street. There are three drains in the intersection. If the runoff were kept in the pavement then directed to the drainage system, then the drainage system would need to be evaluated. Mr. Weinrieb commented that this would be a very small flow that will be increased. Mr. Pezzullo responded that this road way is basically acting as a driveway today, but tomorrow it will be an active road. What may not be problematic today could be tomorrow, so that's where this suggestion is coming from. All of the drainage in both directions should be addressed. Mr. Weinrieb commented that the high point hasn't changed, and it's a very small change in runoff. Mr. Pezzullo noted that the other side would all be additional pavement going to the offsite property partially owned by the city. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the drainage does not address the widening of the 18 feet on that side of the ridge. The road was changed from 14 feet to 18 feet of pavement. Mr. Desfosses asked if any mitigation has been done on the backside. Mr. Weinrieb responded that there is water that runs down this road today and by creating a crown and directing the runoff to treat it in a vegetated area should be sufficient. The applicants have worked very hard to stay out of the buffer to avoid needing a CUP. What has been done in the plans is above and beyond what's needed for treatment. Mr. Desfosses responded that because there are abutters downstream, they could be concerned about additional flows going into their properties. The plans need to show that steps taken ensure there would be no impact. The north side may be impossible to mitigate, but there is possibility to do more on the south side. Mr. Weinrieb commented that this is outlined in the drainage analysis. Mr. Desfosses responded that the plans need to show a zero net change. Mr. Pezzullo added that the rain gardens would need a deed restriction that outlined that the owner would need to maintain them, and cannot fill them in. Mr. Weinrieb Agreed, that was a given.

Mr. Desfosses reviewed the forced drain and is fine with it, but would like to add a caveat that there is no alternative. Mr. Weinrieb agreed.

Mr. Eby commented that the McClintock Street sign says to see detail in the plan, but did not see detail for the signage.

Mr. Cracknell questioned who was going to own lots 23 and 24 when this is done. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they are currently privately owned, and will continue to be tomorrow. Mr. Cracknell clarified that this was just a lot line adjustment is from old paper streets, and the project is to make lot 26 a little bigger. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Cracknell pointed out a correction needed to be made about the easement in the plan. Mr. Weinrieb agreed to make the update.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

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

1. E1 pump system must be used for each pump system.
2. Add note to plan regarding deed restriction that ensures private property owners will be responsible for maintaining storm water mitigation and drainage systems.
3. Finalize details of roadway drainage system and required improvements with DPW.
4. Include sign details (as referenced on Plan and Profile 1 of 2).
5. City Council approval shall be required to construct turn around on City property.
6. Add note to plan that the City shall have the right to place snow on the private half of the end of the turnaround area.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue** (previously 30 Maplewood Avenue), requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 5-story mixed-use building with a footprint of 17,410 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 53,245 ± s.f., including 22 dwelling units and 13,745 ± s.f. of retail use, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 2A and lies within Character District 4 (CD4), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the August 1, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this application to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on October 3, 2017, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Goodman Family Real Estate Trust, Owner**, and **Aroma Joe's Coffee, Applicant**, for property located at **1850 Woodbury Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Review for a 785 ± s.f. restaurant/take-out building and 195 ± s.f. attached patio, with drive thru service and a walk-up window, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 239 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Business (GB) District. (This application was postponed at the August 1, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this application to the next Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on October 3, 2017, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

F. The application of **Flintatta, LLC, Owner**, and **Unitarian-Universalist Church of Portsmouth, Applicant**, for property located at **73 Court Street**, requesting Site Plan Review to construct a 286 ± s.f. addition to provide a ramp and egress to and from the existing building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 19 and lies within the Character District 4-L1 (CD4-

L1), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the August 1, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon, Ambit Engineering, spoke to the application. This project is a minor addition to an existing building at 73 Court Street. The building does occupy a large percentage of the lot. There is a paved driveway on either side. The proposal is to put in an addition to the building that would encompass a stairway and an elevator. There is currently an outdoor stairway in the proposed area, but no elevator today. A ramp will be installed to allow for wheel chair access, and will be close to where the elevator would be put in. The addition is close to the property lines, but variances have been granted for the setbacks and the lack of parking. There is a landscape plan showing the plantings and the retaining wall with some grading. There is a detail of the porous section as well as the sidewalks and curbing. The project will close off one of the driveways, so there is detailing in the plans showing the curbing and sidewalk that will replace it. There has been additional work on site to locate sewer and drainage more exactly and the utility lines that run around the property. One of the issues that came up is that the construction of the addition is over some of the pipes. The church has engaged a structural engineer with Becker Engineers to outline where the addition would be built keeping these utilities in mind. The intent would be to sleeve the pipes through the area of the addition, so that the pipe could be replaced if needed by pulling it out through the sleeve. The step footing would allow the pipes to traverse through the footed area and only penetrate the wall.

Mr. Marsilia asked how close the addition would be to the property line on the west side. Mr. Chagnon responded that it would be a little over one foot. Mr. Marsilia commented that there would be exterior wall requirements. It would need to be fire resistant rated, and there cannot be unprotected openings on that wall.

Ms. Walker noted that elevation details are required for TAC and Planning Board.

Mr. Britz questioned how much of the pavers are porous. Mr. Chagnon responded that it would be everything in that area marked by a symbol in the plans. Mr. Britz clarified that the porous area would be all below the brick. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. The brick area would need to be solid.

Mr. Britz noted that the landscape plan doesn't show where the plants are going. It just names what they will be and points to a general area. Mr. Chagnon responded that it shows the shrub locations, but doesn't call out the individual locations. Mr. Britz requested this be specified further, so it's clear in the drawing. Mr. Chagnon agreed.

Mr. Cracknell requested clarification on the granite curbs. Mr. Chagnon responded that they would sit on the ground. Mr. Cracknell responded that a permit might be needed if they go into the right of way. Mr. Chagnon responded the first block could be moved back to be out of the right of way. Mr. Cracknell questioned if the surface to the left of the property line was pavement. Mr. Chagnon responded that area of the lot used to be in an easement and was used as a drive up. There is a retaining wall and pavement. The intent is to speak to the abutter to offer to landscape it. Right now it

would just be a saw cut. Mr. Cracknell noted that he hoped the applicants would be able to work with the abutter to change that entire section.

Ms. Walker noted that the applicants needed to provide all relevant zoning calculations for this district. Mr. Chagnon agreed this could be done.

Mr. Roediger questioned if the addition for better access to the space was in anticipation for a change of use. Mr. Chagnon responded that the church was going to be used for church and school events. It is a walk down from main sanctuary. It may be used for wedding receptions. Mr. Roediger commented that right now there isn't any protection in the building at all. This would be going from an office space to full-blown assembly area. There will need to be changes made.

Mr. Marsilia noted that based on the plans it looks like the applicants are all set on unprotected openings, but there was no information on the fire-resistant rating. That will need to be included.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the sleeves would be ok, but it will have to be worked out with the DPW and require a sewer easement. Is there already an easement on the drainage? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Pezzullo show a lateral to the sewer how would a sleeve accommodate that? Mr. Chagnon questioned if there was a distance the sleeve should be out of the building. Mr. Desfosses responded that it should be three feet. It may not be possible with drainage but it needs to be 6 inches minimum.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

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

1. Include detail on granite banding at driveway.
2. Confirm if any additional drainage may be required for non-paver portion of driveway.
3. Sleeve detail for sewer line must be approved by DPW.
4. Sewer and drain easement language needs to be approved by legal.
5. The existing sewer lateral should be 6" and moved outside the new foundation.
6. Note on zoning requirements should be updated.
7. Landscape plan should reflect planting list.
8. City license requested for seat block, as applicable.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Islington Commons, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **410, 420, and 430 Islington Street**, requesting Site Plan Review to remodel three existing buildings into 4 units (Building #1 with 1,490 ± s.f. footprint and 2,273± s.f. gross floor area, Building #2 with 1,130± s.f. footprint and 1,942± s.f. gross floor area, Building #3 with 2,048 ± s.f. footprint and 6,531 ± s.f. gross floor area); and construct 4 duplex buildings for 12 proposed units (Building #4 with 1,998± s.f. footprint and 4,109± s.f. gross floor area, Building #5 with 1,955 ± s.f. footprint and 4,063 ± s.f. gross floor area, Building #6 with 2,240 ± s.f. footprint and 4,900 ± s.f. gross floor area, Building #7 with 2,002 ± s.f. footprint and 4,549 ± s.f. gross floor area), with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 145 as Lots 34, 35 and 36 and lie within the Character District 4-L2 (CD4-L2) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon, Ambit Engineering, Rob Harberson from Market Square Architects, Robby Woodburn from Woodburn Landscape Architects, Doug LaRosa from Ambit Engineering, and Taylor McMaster, were there to represent Islington Commons LLC. Mr. Chagnon spoke to the application. There is an existing conditions plan that shows the plans on the site. Each lot has an existing building along the frontage. There is a merger form included in the application to merge three lots into one lot for the site plan. The offsite utility easement is in the process of being finalized. The easement would run along 909 State Street lot line to allow for utility hook ups. There is a demolition plan because some sections of the buildings, the pool area, pavement and some gravel will all be removed. The site layout plan shows the addition on the middle building and the building on the left. There will be a driveway between two of the buildings. There will be a sidewalk connection along Islington Street that would allow for pedestrian access to the street. There has been some zoning analysis done, which the applicants anticipate will need to add more detail to in the plan. The water, gas and electric will be coming from Islington Street. The sewer will be a gravity flow out to State Street. There is a grading and drainage plan included in the application. There is also a landscaping plan. There are some minor differences on this plan that will need to be adjusted. The elevations are included for all the buildings. They are all unique so that's why there is so much information. The comments from the work session have been addressed. The proposed numbering of the building would be to keep 410 the same then make the next building 412 and units in the back would be 413-428 then 430 and 432 would remain the same. Mr. Chagnon handed out an updated fire truck apparatus path. Something about water 3:00. There is adequate snow storage on the site. There is an open space color exhibit that outlines the areas that have been counted toward open space.

Ms. Walker questioned if the area along the outer left side of the site was five feet or more. Mr. Chagnon confirmed it was. Ms. Walker noted that before the Committee starts there have been comments given in the past that this project is trying to do a lot on the site. The comments are technical in nature, but also anticipating what would come up in the Planning Board meeting. This project is in front of the HDC right now as well, and this can't go to the Planning Board until it is approved by the HDC as well.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if all of the new units would have a walk out basement. Mr. Harris responded that all of the units have lower level walkouts. The existing buildings have walk outs in the front and

back. Mr. Marsilia clarified that all units would have a basement egress. Mr. Harris confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Walker noted a comment that came out of the work session by Mr. Roediger about the plan to sprinkle the buildings on Islington Street. Mr. Harberson responded that all the new buildings would be sprinkled. Mr. Roediger questioned if sprinkler installation would be carried out to the existing buildings as well. Mr. Harberson responded that it's something that is being discussed. Unit 430 already has it. The developers are still looking at this, but it is his understanding that they were going to be.

Ms. Walker questioned who the target demographic was for these units. Mr. McMaster responded that they will be condos and will have 3 bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms on average. Mr. Walker clarified that the prices will not be based on income goals just what the market can handle right now. Mr. McMaster confirmed that was correct. They will be listed based on the target market when they are ready. Ms. Walker questioned if the density was reflective of economic goals. Mr. McMaster responded that the density is reflective of what is allowed. It's really about what the site allows and what works. There is a lot more open space on this lot.

Mr. Cracknell commented that 275 Islington Street is a similar project, but all of the units are on the street and have enough parking. This project does not have enough parking even though it meets code. The biggest problem is not the number of the units, but the size and the footprints. It would be nice to see the turning templates for how people would even get in for some of these parking spots. Mr. McMaster responded that the turning radius for building 430 has been analyzed and a standard passenger vehicle can make that turn. Mr. Cracknell commented that the biggest concerns are the volume of the buildings and the displacement of planned area to fully service these buildings specifically with the parking. There is no visitor parking. Mr. Cracknell suggested that the second driveway be eliminated and it should be a private drive to accommodate parking and avoid confusion. The transition ramps for the raised sidewalk may need work. The two parking spaces behind 420 need some separation from 410. There are also details to work out with trash collection and snow removal.

Ms. Walker commented that a private waste removal contract will be engaged, but where are the trash cans going to be put out.

Mr. Marsilia pointed out an area where parking is not possible because the turning radius wouldn't work if they were.

Mr. Roediger noted that the lines fit for the turning radius, but once reality sets in there are doubts whether or not vehicles would be able to fit into the spot. Mr. Roediger noted that he could only support this if there is a deed restriction outlining that there is no parking at all outside the marked spaces. That space will be necessary for fire and ambulance. It will need to be clearly understood and memorialized that all parking needs to be in the unit spots and there is no visitor parking. It is good that the buildings are going to be sprinkled, but it's because of access issues. Mr. Chagnon responded that it's for access issues and would lessen the burden on the department because it suppresses 95% of fires that happen. Mr. Roediger responded that the sprinklers are designed for a 13R system. These are designed to get people out safely, but do not suppress the fire necessarily.

Mr. Chagnon responded to Mr. Cracknell's comments. This is a unique lot that is long and deep. There was some talk at the Planning Board and the team was asked to look at a design that would have

a turning area in the middle. This has been looked at a number of times, but the layout in the plans is better. The buildings on Islington Street cannot be touched. There are parking issues and the plans need to have better striping and signage included. There is parking on Islington Street, so that is the opportunity for visitor parking. The clientele that will be buying these would typically be buyers that will only have one car. The trash removal won't be street side, but it will be a private contract that does pick up. Unit owners would bring out the trash on pick up day. The turn around is designed in a way that made the most sense. It is a loop with designated parking spaces, and would work better for everyone.

Mr. Britz echoed the comments of Mr. Cracknell and Mr. Roediger. This site does not work for guest parking. It's such a tight margin. The deed restrictions and signage are a work around. The buildings are too big. The snow clearance will be really tight. This could be laid out better if there was more space.

Ms. Walker noted that the snow storage concerns were brought up in the last meeting, and it doesn't look like it's been addressed. Mr. Chagnon responded that the snow clearing would not be built up on the side of the road, and so it would not get exposed and turn into an ice dam. There is no concern about the ice.

Mr. Desfosses indicated there are utility conflicts that could happen on this project. There is also concern about all the traffic coming out of the residential driveway. All of the driveways have signs that prohibit street parking for sightlines, so this driveway would probably need that as well. This design does not work as a dual dead end. It would work better by getting rid of one buildings and making two driveways. The DPW has drainage and sewer concerns on State Street. The drain study right now does not address what happens to the runoff after it leaves the lot line. The proposal mainlines the water into the system, which would increase the flow to the system. The existing features plan needs to be updated. The gas line on the plans is dead. The sewer manholes on the plan need to meet DPW standards. The driveways need to be 10 feet wide so someone can get out of the car and still be standing on the driveway. The sidewalks that would be created on new streets need to meet standards. There is a high potential that visitors would still park where they aren't allowed.

Ms. Walker commented that she did not disagree that these condos could be sold to people who would only have one car. However, these are three bedroom condos and create the opportunity for bigger families to live there. This plan does not even accommodate shared parking.

Mr. Pezzullo agreed with most of the comments already said. A lot of the landscaping plans don't really accommodate the site design. It looks like a lot of the plants that are in the snow storage area or rain garden area are too big. There may be drainage and utility issues.

Ms. Walker questioned what the difference between the two different drainage analysis reports. Mr. Larosa noted that the applicants were asked to move some structures around for snow storage, so the elevations were updated.

Mr. Eby reiterated the concern about parking and roadways. The volume of traffic coming out of the street is not as much of a concern. There is concern about the pedestrian flow and the ramps.

Ms. Walker questioned what the purpose of the pavement treatment was just before the sidewalk. Mr. Chagnon responded it's a rumble strip at the end to slow down drainage and show that the pavement ends.

Mr. Cracknell completely agreed with Mr. Britz on the site plan. It is creating a management problem for the future condo association and the City. There has not been a response that has really tackled the issue of the tight parking and circulation. The applicants should take another pass to convince the Commission. If 12 units really is the magic number make sure that there is enough parking and space. This is a unique lot where houses are being put behind other houses with only the outlet out to Islington Street. It's an argument over adequate circulation and parking. To be viable this design has to come up with visitor parking.

PUBLIC HEARING

Cecilia Demarco, 39 Columbia Street, stated that she abuts the fence next to the back side of the lot, and expressed concern about the sunlight. No one has talked about how high the buildings will be. There are runoff concerns around the snow storage. Ms. Demarco had no problem with increased housing, but did have an issue with effects to the abutters on sunlight and snow storage.

Craig Sears abuts on the west side. No one has addressed whether there is a curb on that driveway.

Mr. Larosa responded that there is a curb along the entire west side that will direct all the water away from the abutters. Mr. Larosa also addressed Ms. Demarco's comments. The snow removal should not affect her lot. The buildings would be 35 feet high structures. The sunlight should not be negatively impacted. In fact, there could be increased sunlight.

Anthony Sarnie, 909 State Street, abuts the bottom of the lot, and appreciated the attention paid to runoff so far. All the State Street abutters are at the low point of the drainage. The runoff and drainage should be appropriately analyzed. When Mr. Sarnie first moved into the property the basement would have water issues. To remedy that the house was lifted 2 feet and a drainage system was added to maintain a dry basement. The concern is that this project would impact all of his drainage efforts negatively.

The Chair asked if anyone else was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one else rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone Site Plan Review to the October 3, 2017 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Borthwick Forest, LLC, and KS Borthwick, LLC, Owners, and Borthwick Forest, LLC, Applicant**, for property located **on proposed subdivision road to be created off Borthwick Avenue**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to increase the height of the proposed office building (footprint of 16,700 ± s.f.) from 3 stories to 4 stories (gross floor area of 66,800 ± s.f.), with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage, fire access drive and associated site improvements. (Original Site Review approval was granted by the Planning Board on

May 18, 2017). Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 241 as Lots 25 & 26 and Assessor Map 233 as Lots 112, 113, & 114 and lie within the Office Research (OR) and the Single Residence B (SRB) Districts.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney Robert Ciandella from Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella, along with Patrick Crimmins of Tighe & Bond, and Jason Plord, spoke to the application. The applicants are seeking a minor site plan amendment and have written a second letter after the work session to address the issues that came up after the session. The lighting issues have been addressed. The idea is that the Jackson Gray building would be a frame of reference for the new building.

Mr. Crimmins reviewed the changes in the site plan. The project was previously approved for a 50,000 square foot office building with 250 parking spaces. The new proposal is to add another floor to create a 66,000 square foot building with an additional 70 spaces. The client now has a customer who is looking to use this building, and that is the motivation for the additional floor. It will be the same footprint. The main visitor entry was moved and the entrance to the underground parking has also been moved on the plans. One entrance was eliminated. The gravel has been designed to accommodate the extra runoff. The TAC work session points were addressed in the letter. Small revisions were made, mostly for housekeeping. The revisions are labeled as such in the plans.

Mr. Plord noted that as discussed at the TAC work session the team has prepared a traffic study. The development is now planning for 66,000 square feet to accommodate medical office space. That changes the traffic study a little. It has been updated and submitted. In general it's a slight increase in traffic. The study looked at the Route 33 and Borthwick Ave intersection. There is about a ten minute time period that makes left hand turns hard. The applicants are working with DOT to increase the time of day left hand signal to accommodate this. The proposal is to have this implemented before winter, then come up with a timing plan. The internal intersection off of 33 is a T intersection with two stop signs and one free flow. It was previously proposed making that intersection an all way stop to reduce confusion. The proposal is to straighten out Borthwick Ave from Route 33. There is a bend in the road now. The team has come up with a fair share contribution of 8% and it would increase to 10% contribution to the overall by straightening that out. Ms. Walker questioned if there was a dollar amount that percentage equated to. Mr. Plord responded that including a sidewalk and straightening it would be less than 170,000 dollars. That's a rough estimate based on NH bid numbers. At the TAC work session it was also requested that the applicants reach out to Coast Bus. The team is working with Mike Williams Director of Operations at Coast. There is no problem putting up another stop on Borthwick Avenue, but there are discussions about potentially putting the stop on the subdivision road.

Mr. Marsilia commented that the applicants should be aware of code implications in adding an additional story. Egresses may need to be changed or added. The code review needs to be provided before this gets pushed to the Planning Board.

Mr. Roediger questioned what the new street will be called. Ms. Walker responded that is ultimately up to Planning. Mr. Roediger noted that the new road should not have Borthwick in the name.

Mr. Britz noted that the lighting is not a huge impact, but it's pretty obvious. Can this be shielded to only be directed to the parking. Mr. Plord responded that the applicants have asked the lighting designer about this and it has to do with the LED and the fixtures, but they could follow up. Mr. Britz commented that it would be nice to see what else could be done to reduce the impact. The information provided on the forest area and direction of the parking should not be an issue with the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Desfosses noted that it was talked about thickening up the binder course for the duration between when building goes up and the top goes on. Mr. Crimmins responded that was a stipulation of the approval, and was three inches of binding. Mr. Desfosses noted that right now it's showing two and a quarter. Mr. Crimmins commented that is not correct and the plans will be updated. Mr. Desfosses noted that it should be 3 inches fine binder

Mr. Eby questioned if the cul-de-sac changed at all since the original approval. Mr. Crimmins responded that it has not changed. Mr. Eby expressed concern looking at the plans that people may drive on the bike path. Mr. Crimmins responded the path will be gated. Mr. Eby would be looking for some pedestrian and bike path improvements.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Walker noted that Attorney Ciandella recommended this be a minor amendment. There are occasions where the Planning Director would approve minor amendments and the application would not go through TAC. This has gone through TAC, and so it should go through the Planning Board too.

Mr. Britz agreed with this.

Mr. Marsilia noted that if the site plan changed, then TAC should see that.

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

1. All conditions of original Planning Board approval to remain in effect.
2. Conduct a building code review to determine if the addition of the 5th story required any changes to egress or entrances that may affect the site plan.
3. Revise lighting plan to reduce lighting spillover at edge of paved parking surface new SW corner of lot.
4. Correct pavement cross section detail to provide 3" of fine binder with 3/8" of top course and add note that City shall approve the pavement mix design.
5. Off site traffic mitigation for Borthwick Avenue/Greenland Road intersection shall include consideration of improvements to bicycle and/or pedestrian connections.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Merton Alan Investments, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **30 Cate Street**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to add one unit to the end of each of the 8-unit buildings to create two 9-unit buildings, to re-align and add three units to the building at the southern corner of the lot, and to make the drive closest to Bartlett Street exit only, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage, and associated site improvements. (Original Site Review approval was granted by the Planning Board on February 16, 2017). Said property is shown on Assessors Map 165 as Lot 1 and lies within Character District 4-W (CD-4W).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe and Bond. and Robert Graham, representative for the owner, were both present. The project was previously approved for 26 town house units. The proposal is now for 31 units. The site plan has been adjusted appropriately. The utility and drainage design has not been changed. The connections were updated to accommodate the moved buildings. The plans show that fire trucks can get in and out of the property. There is now an exit only lane and do not enter signs have been added. An overlay has been included in the packet to show the old vs. the new. At the TAC work session there were a few comments. The plans have fixed the tip down ramps and added note 25 to reinforce trash removal. The test bits have been completed this morning and it's confirmed the water and sewer are exactly where the dig safe flags are. The site plan has been adjusted to accommodate those.

Mr. Eby noted that the tip down ramp that was adjusted but where is the landing area based on the new design. Mr. Crimmins responded that all of them have been adjusted. It's tough to see but it's a 6 foot tip down with a flush landing behind it.

Ms. Walker questioned what the mix of bed and size of units would be overall. Mr. Graham responded that they are expected to be three bedroom units. There is potential that some of the smaller units may be two bedrooms. They will range from 1400 to 1100 square feet. Ms. Walker questioned in research to meet the market demand how did parking play into it. The proposal has met code, but where will guest parking be. Mr. Graham responded that the plans show two parking spaces per unit and two guest parking spaces per unit. In this type of development this should be plenty of parking. More spots could be added, but it would be a trade off for trash and open space.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the open space is thin and narrow, and would prefer to just add parking there. It's so oddly shaped. The thicker open space should be left, but more parking should be added in the thin area.

Mr. Roediger commented that after looking at the turn radius, he is not sure there is space for that.

Ms. Walker noted that the suggestion of Mr. Desfosses about more parking would be a compromise that may not be worth it.

Mr. Britz commented on behalf of Mr. Cracknell about that the eight units on the south corner of the lot. Mr. Cracknell recommended to bring that down to seven units to give more room and expand the open space. Mr. Britz shares that concern and also noted his concerned about parking. Mr. Crimmins

commented that there was minimal change in open space between this design and the last. Mostly patios were eliminated to accommodate more units.

Ms. Walker noted that the Planning Board would probably ask about the density and the reasons for that, so the applicants would need to prepare for that. Mr. Crimmins questioned if there was a maximum for parking on the site. Only so many more spaces could be added. Ms. Walker responded that it's just a comment that will need to have some reasons behind why five more units are being added.

Ms. Walker commented that the site plan review is another layer to ensure the site is workable to make sure services aren't too impacted etc. In this case with no street parking, there is concern about where parking is going to go.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses move to recommend approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby with the following stipulations:

1. All conditions of original Planning Board approval to remain in effect.
2. Provide analysis of density and whether additional parking should be provided to accommodate guest parking.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **James A. Mulvey Revocable Living Trust, Robert J. Bossie Revocable Trust and Peter Brown Living Trust, Owners**, for property located at **150 Spaulding Turnpike**, requesting Site Plan Approval to create a truck sales outlet with vehicle display, vehicle storage, including 9.780 ± s.f. of pervious bituminous concrete pavement, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage, and associated site improvements.. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 236 as Lots 34, 35 & 36 and lie within the General Business (GB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz motioned to postpone Site Plan Review to the October 3, 2017 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:25 pm, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee