

MINUTES

SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

2:00 PM

OCTOBER 31, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planner Director; Peter Stith, Principal Planner; Jillian Harris, Planner I; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department. Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT:

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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 October 3, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering was present on behalf of the applicant. He introduced his team and reviewed the topics from the July workshop and the resulting changes to the plan. He noted that the Committee asked him to separate the 30 Maplewood Avenue site from the 46-64 Maplewood Avenue site, which they did, but there was some crossover. He noted the following changes:

- Certain plantings weren't labeled and were not in the schedule but they were separated out;
- Drainage on the adjacent site that was previously approved needed to be built to accommodate the building;
- Fire department concerns about ventilation and pedestrian egresses in the parking garage were indicated by Notes 5, 6 and 7 on the plan;
- There was a concern about the elevator sump pump, so there was a note about future design;
- The elevator pit design would be done so that they would know where to attach the appropriate pumps;

- A second location was added for grease traps, as shown on the utilities plan;
- Dewatering and capacity of the drainage system would handle any dewatering from the garage, and they would submit a drainage connection permit and detail it into the permit;
- The design was revised, which he would address later;
- A jog was removed in the retaining wall along Deer Street;
- A view was changed to show a drainage collection more clearly;
- The traffic light mast arm was relocated to ensure there was proper 7-ft clearance for the proposed tree (Mr. Desfosses said they had to be careful excavating around it and couldn't put any underground system there);
- The standard tip down was revised to the cast iron domes;
- The detail for the cobblestone was revised to show a thermal finish cobble set in concrete so that it would provide a surface that wouldn't move and would be flat cobbles with no edge;
- Due to the concern about vehicles exiting and pedestrians traveling down the street, they added a note on the drawing about a system of warnings, including an audible warning system during daytime hours and a flashing system;
- Trash disposal at 46 Maplewood would use the existing dumpster. Exhibit A, Withdrawn Land, indicated that the applicant would control the property. When the 46 Maplewood Avenue property was withdrawn from 30 Maplewood Avenue, there was an easement for the use of the proposed dumpster on the condition that the withdrawn land pay its share of the pro rata cost of the use;
- Bike racks were shown on the landscaping plan in two locations;
- Pedestrian egress from the building would include a central stairway corridor with access to Deer Street for the upper floors and direct street access for the lower floor. The basement would have two means of egress;
- The sprinkler room was relocated to the middle of the north side of the building to give it more headroom, as indicated on Sheet C4.

Mr. Chagnon said they added notes to the plan pertaining to garage ventilation requirements and protective openings. Ms. Walker said she wanted to ensure that the garage egress, the ventilation design, and the protective openings would be done as part of the review process. She asked Mr. Marsilio for his comments, noting that they would not wait for the construction plans. Mr. Marsilio said that the two stairways in the garage did not meet the requirements for remoteness and might have to change. He said he expected to see the stairway on the grading plan extend into the garage, so that would have to be discussed with the designer. He said the travel distance would be an issue and that he needed a table for the unprotected openings and a note indicating that the means of egress would comply with IBC. Mr. Chagnon said it would be on the building plan.

Mr. Roediger said the door needed to be moved to one of the sides on the relocated sprinkler room. He said they had to use life safety code 101 for the egress. He said they still had questions about the landscaping plan, like the tree to the northeast on the Maplewood Avenue side of the ramp. He said that the tree might get into potential sightlines as it matured, which could be a potential issue for someone egressing the garage. Ms. Woodburn said the tree canopy would be trimmed to 6 feet in height. She said the only issue might be the tree guard, but one could see through it.

Mr. Marsilio asked about the electricity room location. Mr. Chagnon said it wasn't labeled, and he showed its location on the diagram. Mr. Marsilio said the door could not open into a parking spot because it would block access.

Mr. Chagnon said they would have to provide permits for the sewer and drain connections and that they moved the fire hydrant back. He noted that the Committee wanted a new fire hydrant, which he said was acceptable. He said there was a new water main that would be placed on Deer Street and that the applicant would contribute to the cost.

Mr. Chagnon said the cobblestone apron and underdrains were confusing because the underdrain didn't tie into the floor drain. He said the basement area for the kitchen wasn't storage space; he was told that it would be backup space for a potential restaurant. Mr. Pezzullo recommended that the area be called a storage area instead of a restaurant. Mr. Chagnon said he could change the labeling on the plan to clarify that it was a storage space and not a proposed restaurant space.

Mr. Chagnon said that, for the sidewalk detail, he used a 10th inch per foot, or one percent. He said the sidewalks were all one percent sloped from the curb up. Mr. Desfosses said it was an important item because there were many different doorways on a road that had variable height. He said the detail should say 'minimum slope, 8th inch per foot', and 'maximum foot, quarter-inch per slope'. He said that any more than that would not meet ADA code. He recommended that the doorways be checked because of the road's grade. He said it was unclear to them whether the intent was to leave the existing curbing at the same height and to have a uniform curb go all the way around the building. He said he didn't know if cross-sections had to be done on the sidewalk at all the critical spots but that it could become a critical issue. He advised having a good handle on it before the contractors said the buildings were 3 inches too low or too high. Mr. Chagnon said there was a note indicating a 6" curb reveal and that they would leave it as such. It was further discussed. Mr. Desfosses said he was more concerned about areas where there weren't retaining walls and the road sloped away. Mr. Chagnon said he thought 3% was the maximum. Mr. Desfosses clarified that it was 2% per the ADA code.

Mr. Desfosses pointed out that the landscape plan was correct in showing the limits of the brick sidewalks, but the applicant's plans didn't match the landscape plan. He said the area in front of the VFW would be excavated and that the conduit, light poles, and hydrants should be shown. Ms. Walker said the applicant was asked to separate out the improvements for each lot. Mr. Desfosses said it had to be shown somewhere that the whole block was getting done. Mr. Chagnon said they would submit it as an amendment to the 30 Maplewood Avenue site plan. Mr. Desfosses said they needed a more holistic plan that showed everything. It was further discussed. Ms. Walker said she wanted to know what was attached to 46 Maplewood and what was attached to 30 Maplewood. She said an amendment could be done as part of the 30 Maplewood Avenue project and that they might do an administrative approval. She told Mr. Chagnon to figure out what he wanted to do and to let her know. Ms. Woodburn pointed out that the request was to use something that was already approved in the City, which they had done.

Mr. Chagnon asked how the Committee wanted them to check the garage ramp. Mr. Eby said he was concerned that cars would come up and bottom out on the top of the ramp or come down and scrape at the end of the ramp. Mr. Chagnon said they based the design off architectural standard values. He said they would do a site distance study.

Mr. Chagnon asked about the maximum number of parking spaces relating to the Downtown Overlay District. He read from Section 10.112.50, noting that the maximum number of parking facilities would not apply to buildings in use within the Downtown Overlay District. He also referred to comments about the green building components and said they were operating under a design review approval from December 2013. Ms. Walker said the green building requirements may have been in there since the last revision to the site plan. Mr. Chagnon verified that it was a requirement that they had to provide a statement for.

Mr. Chagnon said they submitted a lighting plan previously that wasn't in the plan but would submit another one.

Mr. Roediger noted that the project construction terminated on the eastern side of the pedestrian walkway going from Deer Street to the back side of 30 Maplewood Avenue. Mr. Chagnon clarified that the walkway went through the garage level of the building. Mr. Roediger said it was confusing. He referred to the Deer Street rendering and asked whether everything to the right of the garage entrance and the walkway was set back. Mr. Chagnon agreed, saying that it was behind the VFW building. Mr. Roediger said it didn't make sense because it looked like the face was even with the garage. Jennifer Ramsey was present and said that if the VFW building was in the foreground, the third floor would be seen, but that the building's back ell wrapped behind the VFW. Mr. Chagnon asked about side views. Ms. Ramsey said one would have to look at the pedestrian thoroughway, which was a pedestrian way between Phase 1 and 2. She said the building curled around, the pedestrian passageway came into view, and the remaining portion of the building was the rest of the garage.

Ms. Walker said the Committee wanted a third-party review of the drainage before it went before the Planning Board. She said they would work with the applicant through the DPW and the Planning Department would facilitate it.

Mr. Desfosses said they were very worried about the groundwater because it went under multiple buildings and he didn't know what kind of fills were under the building or whether the passageways would be open to allow groundwater to get under the building and cause a need for aggressive dewatering. He explained it further. He said he didn't know what would happen until the hole was excavated and felt that the building should be constructed as a dry basement without underdrains. He further discussed it. He said he didn't know the implications of introducing groundwater near the building and thought it could cause an incident. He noted that the building was very low in the street and near the low spot of the utilities and that it had to be factored into the foundation design.

Ms. Walker asked if Mr. Desfosses wanted the applicant to do another revision prior to having a peer review or whether they should have a peer review done of the current design. Mr. Desfosses said they needed a peer review of the foundation design to ensure that any dewatering was extremely limiting. Ms. Walker suggested a scoping meeting before doing the peer review. She said that DPW could recommend who could do the review. Mr. Chagnon said the previous design had a gravity drain but the current design had a pump. Mr. Desfosses said they needed a handle on what was being pumped and how things were isolated. Ms. Walker reiterated the need for consistency between the site plan and the landscaping plan and that the projects still needed to be separated.

Mr. Eby asked about the truncated domes and where the crosswalks converted. He said they were shown further west on the plan than they needed to be. Mr. Marsilio asked what the depth was to the bottom of the footings below grades and how deep the cutters would be. Mr. Chagnon said the floor of the basement was at 5+. Mr. Marsilio asked whether there had to be some detail showing how the excavation would be supported relating to the public access. Ms. Walker said it should be highlighted before the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Marsilio said there was a deep cut that couldn't be benched. Mr. Chagnon said the final detail might go with construction and not have to be worked out before site plan approval. Mr. Desfosses said the applicant would need a license from the City Council. Ms. Walker said she wanted to flag any licensing issues before the project went before the Planning Board.

Ms. Walker said the Committee preferred asphalt for the driveway. Mr. Desfosses said the granite pavers were fine, but the plan indicated cobblestone, which wasn't appropriate. He suggested that it be changed and that a detail be added to it, stating that it would be thermal with a flat finish. He said they would support it as long as the asphalt pavement was still there.

The applicant asked what the Committee was looking for as a minimum clearance between pipes and how it would be evaluated. Mr. Desfosses said it would depend on the age of the structure and whether there was reinforcement. He suggested a foot of concrete between pipes and said that the bulkhead could be brick and mortar.

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. Roediger moved to **postpone** the application until the December 5, 2017 TAC meeting. Mr. Eby seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

.....

B. 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 October 3, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the application to the December 5 2017 TAC meeting.*

.....

C. 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 \pm s.f. footprint and 2,273 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #2 with 1,130 \pm s.f. footprint and 1,942 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #3 with 2,048 \pm s.f. footprint and 6,531 \pm s.f. gross floor area); and construct 4 duplex buildings for 12 proposed units (Building #4 with 1,998 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,109 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #5 with 1,955 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,063 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #6 with 2,240 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,900 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #7 with 2,002 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,549 \pm 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. (This application was postponed at the October 3, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Doug LaRosa of Ambit Engineering was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He introduced the developer Eamonn Healy, Attorney Derek Durbin, the designer Rob Harbeson, and the landscaper Robbie Woodburn.

Mr. Healy said that they met previously with Ms. Walker and Mr. Cracknell to review the comments and subsequently made the suggested changes. Mr. LaRosa stated that one of the big items was the vehicle turning movement. He said they presented three exhibits, and a significant one was the fire truck turning radius. He said they used a specific program to input the required features and designed the turning movement so that the fire truck could enter and exhibit the site. He said they did the same with a passenger vehicle and showed that it could enter and exit at 430 Islington Street. He said that 410 Islington Street was a tight turn, so they terminated the driveway between 410 and 420. They showed that a passenger vehicle could enter and exit the garage.

Mr. LaRosa said they added two guest parking spaces between Buildings 1 and 2 and that, even though they weren't 10 feet wide, they were adjacent to a 5-ft walkway, so they felt that it allowed for greater usability of the two spaces. He said they also designed each driveway to be a minimum of 10 feet wide for the drivers who entered into the lower floor of each duplex. He said there was a proposed parking layout for the future Islington Street design but felt that one space would probably have to be abandoned to the left of the drive, which allowed for the two new spaces in front of where the existing driveway was being blocked off. He said it would benefit the City and add additional parking on Islington Street.

Mr. LaRosa discussed site lighting, saying they wanted to do a dark-sky compliant small post in front of two of the units and one on the drive. He noted that they weren't on the site plan but would be addressed. He said the crosswalk was granite edging and a change in material. He said Mr. Cracknell suggested that they incorporate it into the plan. He said all the surfaces would be ADA-compliant. He said they would provide a detail for granite or concrete pavers.

Mr. LaRosa discussed the drainage study. He said that the water flow drained into two catch basins on Union Street and that of flow went from east to west out to the site. He said their site drained into one specific location at the corner and that it was all raised. He said it wasn't accurate that the flow went directly across their property as previously indicated. He pointed out that the site collected the stormwater and infiltrated it in an infiltration structure along the back and that the only other possible outlet was at the corner of 895 State Street. He said they would be happy to meet with the City or an outside reviewer to review it. He said they proposed standard engineering practices such as porous pavers and raingardens but that they required maintenance. He said their inspection report included a list of items that the owner had to comply with.

He asked Ms. Walker what the standard practice was for City review of site plans with drainage that required maintenance. Ms. Walker said they usually required that it be submitted to the City as a recordable document or noted in the site plan indicating that it was in the condominium document that maintenance would be the responsibility of the condo owners. She said they also asked that a report be submitted to the City confirming that the maintenance was being done. Mr. LaRosa asked whether he could use those practices in his drainage calculations. Mr. Marsilio said he thought the standard might be more than what Mr. LaRosa had indicated, as far as pervious pavers or surfaces. He said the NH Stormwater Center Design Guidelines indicated that the test pitting, infiltration rates, volume of stone, and type of storm that could be handled would have to comply, which he said had not been demonstrated. Mr. LaRosa said they would comply with those requirements. He noted that three test pits were dug on the site and that the infiltration rate was less than the infill rate that was previously accepted. He said the soil was accepted by the State and asked whether the Committee would accept an infiltration test to verify the infill rates. Ms. Desfosses said they did their own independent study of the site. Mr. LaRosa said they could hire H. W. Cole to do the infill rates. Mr. Desfosses said that it would be part of the independent study. Ms. Walker said they wanted a third-party review because they didn't feel just the City and applicant input were adequate for the site.

Ms. Walker clarified that the Planning Department was happy to meet with any applicant to review projects and acknowledged that, even though the applicant met with them, the Planning Department still felt that the project was too dense for the site, which was reflected in the comments about the traffic interior circulation, the stormwater management, and the accommodation for the practicality of the site for parking for the users. Mr. LaRosa asked what would be acceptable for guest parking. Ms. Walker said they were looking to Mr. LaRosa to make the case, and they didn't feel that Mr. LaRosa justified it enough to be adequate. She referred to the distance from the street and the way people would utilize the site, noting that it would be more like a neighborhood street due to its design and that people would be more likely to park on the street instead of on a spot in front of the unit. She said she wasn't sure that it made sense to have guest parking right next to each of the units versus a common area where multiple people could access it. Mr. Healy said they had two additional guest parking spots on the plan but that they were too busy. He said Mr. Cracknell had agreed and appreciated that the front entrance between 410 and 420 was closed off to create a few parking spaces. Ms. Walker said she still felt that the spots near the units would not get utilized and that people would likely park in the travel way, raising safety and access issues.

Mr. Eby discussed the turning movements. He said the vehicle making the turn around the retaining wall didn't seem physically possible as shown on the diagram. Mr. LaRosa said it was a software issue

and that they would provide a new exhibit. He also offered to submit a video clip. Mr. Harbeson said the fence was 42 inches and made of black metal, and could be seen through. Mr. Eby said the only way to get out of the garage was to completely back out and to make sure that the fence had a clear sightline because people would be backing out into the travel way. Mr. Harbeson said that was why they had the black railing, and that the fence would stop at the point where the elevation was lower. Mr. Eby said it seemed like a tight area. Mr. Eby said a fire truck would have to back out. It was further discussed. Mr. Eby said it might work in a non-emergency situation but the site was too dense. Ms. Walker noted that the applicant was maxing out the sight for everything and if it got any narrower, they wouldn't have wiggle room for open space. She said there weren't a lot of options in terms of widening the accessway. Mr. Roediger brought up the snow plowing issue. Mr. LaRosa said the snow would be removed from the site. Mr. Roediger said things could work against it because they wouldn't have control of when or where the snow would be plowed.

Mr. Marsilio asked for clarification for the sprinkler system. Mr. Harbeson said that 410 Islington Street would have a sprinkler system but that 420 and 430 would not because nothing required them to be sprinklered. He noted that 410 was close to the property line. Mr. Marsilio asked whether Unit 4 would be within 3 feet of the property line. Mr. Harbeson said that all the building would be six feet off the property line. Mr. LaRosa said that Unit 4 needed to be looked at further. Mr. Harbeson said they were thinking of going to a different sprinkler system, NFPA 13 instead of NFPA 13R.

Mr. Eby asked about the driveways. Mr. LaRosa said each driveway was ten feet wide. Mr. Eby said it looked like nine feet on Units 1 through 4. Mr. LaRosa said each had a border around it but that he would verify it.

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

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the application to the December 5 2017 TAC meeting.*

.....

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 \pm 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. (This application was postponed at the October 3, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

*Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** the application to the December 5, 2017 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

.....

E. The application of **Pamela Thatcher, Owner**, and **Charlie Seefried, Applicant**, for property located at **180 Middle Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 3-story four unit residential building with a footprint of $2,606 \pm$ s.f. and gross floor area of $9,348 \pm$ s.f., and a proposed 2-story one unit residential carriage house with a footprint of $959 \pm$ s.f. and gross floor area of $1,918 \pm$ s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 127 as Lot 8 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) District and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the October 3, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

The consultant Peter Weeks was present to speak to the petition on behalf of the applicant. He introduced the project engineer Alex Ross and the owner/applicant Charlie Seefried.

Mr. Weeks addressed the Committee's previous comments. He said the existing sidewalk on Middle Street got no narrower and that there would be no reduction on the sidewalk from where it currently was. He said Mr. Ross would review the sightlines and make sure that the last 8-ft section of fence would be changed so that the slats would have 4 inches of space between them. He said the 3-point turn at the two parking spaces were fine. He said that the water service on the property would be indicated on the final plans. He said the underground utilities would be taken care of. He said they would add the fact that the architect would certify 2.13.4 per site plan review.

Mr. Weeks said he met with the Planning Department and worked out the landscaping details. He asked the Committee to recommend to the Planning Board approval for the project with any stipulations necessary.

Mr. Roediger asked who Mr. Weeks dealt with at the Fire Department. Mr. Weeks said he spoke to Eric Eby. Mr. Roediger said he wasn't so sure that just taking four slats out of a fence would provide the necessary level of sightline. He said there was 16 inches of visibility at the end of the fence and wasn't sure that it would be enough. Mr. Weeks asked if it could go the length of a car. It was further discussed. Mr. Roediger said he wasn't sure whether four openings or inches in the final three feet of fence would achieve the results they wanted. Mr. Ross said they looked at several possibilities on site and thought opening the slats would be sufficient. He said it was shown as 3 feet but could be opened up to 6 feet and that they could drop the fence. Ms. Walker said she was fine with that. Mr. Ross said the HDC was in favor of not touching the fence so that the least disturbance would be made. Mr. Eby said he wanted to see the slats increase at least 6 feet back to provide more visibility. Mr. Weeks said they could present both alternatives to the HDC. Ms. Walker said it would be the decision of the Planning Board, who could state their preference would be the lowering, and then the HDC could

weigh in. Otherwise, she said they could be open to the second option or pulling the fence back a few feet and sliding the post back a few feet for sight distance.

Mr. Pezzullo asked about the parking spaces and the turns. Mr. Weeks said there could be a 4-point turn, and it was further discussed. Mr. Ross pointed out that there were parking spaces #1 and #8 to consider, and that they were tight spots. He said they wanted to avoid a huge paved parking lot and that the two parking spots required a 3-point turn.

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. Eby moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board with the following stipulations:*

- 1) The sidewalk along Middle Street shall be no narrower than it is today.
- 2) Add the water service on the property.
- 3) Fix the typo for the line marked OGU on the Grading, Drainage & Utility Plan.
- 4) Add a note to the plans or details indicating that when planting trees, the metal cage shall be removed entirely and the top 2/3 of the burlap shall be removed.
- 5) The Landscape Architect of record shall witness and approve the planting method and depth.
- 6) Change the base for the cobblestone pavers to be gravel instead of stone.
- 7) Add required notes to Landscaping Plan per Section 2.13.4 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
- 8) The fence along the northeasterly property line shall be lowered to no more than 3' in height for a distance of 6' back from the front property line.

*Mr. Roediger seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

.....

F. The application of **Bluestone Properties of Rye, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **135 Congress Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct an addition to the rear of the existing building, with a footprint of 1,424 \pm s.f. and gross floor area of 2,943 \pm s.f., for restaurant expansion and function space, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 5 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the October 3, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the application to the December 5 2017 TAC meeting.*

.....

G. The application of **Roman Catholic Bishop of Manchester, Owner, and Stonegate NH Construction, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **2075 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of two 3-story, 24-unit residential buildings, both with a footprint of $14,640 \pm$ s.f. and gross floor area of $58,495 \pm$ s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 268 as Lot 7 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the October 3, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition. He said they did an Existing Conditions plan of the site and identified a small 20-s.f. wetland system on the property. He said they wouldn't work anywhere near it and that it didn't fall into the CUP criteria. He reviewed the plan, noting that Pheasant Lane was a private roadway and half owned by the church, so the pavement ran halfway down the roadway. He said there was an easement for the subdivisions and a small wetland system that went into a culvert. He said the survey noted all invert information for the sewer and drainage structures on the site. Regarding the demolition, he said they would honor the existing tree line along the south and east sides of the site and would try to maintain the specimen tree at the front of the property. He said that everything else would be raised. He said the two-way access into the site would be lined up opposite West Road, which would allow for a better configuration, and that they would get rid of the two uncontrolled access points onto the roadway. He discussed the Corridor Plan for DOT, saying that there could be a raised median along that road and perhaps a future signal and a four-way control. He said they were working with DOT for the permitting. He noted that the traffic study was forwarded to Ms. Walker and to DOT. He said the two buildings would have 24 units each, with parking underneath. He discussed the access and exterior parking, noting that they added four external spaces and two internal spaces for each building, as suggested by the Planning Department. He said they didn't need parking zoning because they had excess parking. Ms. Walker said there would be a proposal to move the lot from that zoning area.

Mr. Weinrieb said it would be to their advantage to provide more parking to make it more marketable to the residents and visitors. He said the fire access would be a gated access with swing gates and a solid wood fence. He said a wood fence would be set back by the existing tree line to enhance the visual buffer between Pheasant Lane and the development. He said there would be a boulder retaining wall that wouldn't cut into the existing buffer area.

Mr. Weinrieb said they filed for DOT and AOT permits in September and were expecting comments from AOT. He noted that AOT changed their runoff computations for the 17 coastal communities and that they had to have a 15% increase in all the storms analyzed. He said they received comments from DOT and were waiting for the traffic study. He discussed the grading plan and said they had treatment devices, peer stormwater management, and raingardens. He said they were reducing the runoff volume on the site and reducing about 26,000 square feet of impervious and that everything coming off the site would go to the rear of the site and then into the wetlands on the other side. He discussed the utilities, noting that they would connect to the sewer manhole and replace a sewer line, which meant minimum

slope figures. He said a series of drainage structures would collect stormwater and go into the raingardens. He said natural gas would come from Lafayette Road and power would come from the utility pole underground. They would build up the building to allow the driveway to go under the building and provide access for both buildings. He said it was easier to regrade around the buildings without a retaining wall but that they would build a retaining wall on one side and install a tree well line. He said another retaining wall would avoid grading onto the easement from the phone company. He discussed the landscape plan and lighting plans.

He said they submitted a drainage study to DPW on September 27 and assumed that a summary would be adequate for the initial submission. Ms. Walker said she didn't think DPW was aware of where it was on the site plan process and said that three copies would have to be submitted as part of the site plan package.

Mr. Weinrieb asked for clarification on the sidewalk and the DOT 12-ft easement. He said DOT had a bike lane, panel, and a sidewalk in the right-of-way. Ms. Walker said it was the 2011 plan and that the 2014 City Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan had a shared plan which was different than what DPW proposed. She said the Ten-Year Plan hadn't gone to preliminary design and modifications were likely to happen. She said TAC's comments were based on their communication to the State and what was in the capital improvement plan. She said she didn't think DOT would use the entire 12 feet but didn't know for sure. Mr. Weinrieb said there would be challenges because they wanted to maintain the trees in the area, they had a stormwater management device and an existing sign, all of which forced them back into that 12-ft easement. He said he preferred that the bike path be close to the intersection. Ms. Walker verified that Mr. Weinrieb was proposing to keep it in that 12-ft easement and that NH DOT move forward with their project. She said the sidewalk would no longer exist in that case, and there wouldn't be a sidewalk in front of the development, which would be detrimental. She said the easement was for the widening of Route One and that they didn't want it to end up not being part of the project. It was further discussed. Ms. Walker said they could buy themselves a little room out of the proposed cross-section by combining the sidewalk and the bike lane, but they'd want to see a buffer between the shared path. She asked if the reason it bended was to protect the trees. Mr. Weinrieb agreed and said they could pull some of it back but would have a more severe slope in front of the building and would have to relocate the sign. It was discussed further. Mr. Weinrieb said they could plant 3-4 new trees and preserve one particular mature tree.

Ms. Walker asked whether there was a catch basin on the road. Mr. Weinrieb said it was offset from the road and had the utility pole next to it. Ms. Walker said they would work with him on the design. Mr. Weinrieb said they would work with DOT on the pitch of the roadway in the right-of-way. He said he wasn't sure what the issue with the sewer was but would ensure that it was tested to comply with standards and that the work in the right-of-way was monitored by the City. He said they would clean up the easement and property lines and provide a better legend in their plans.

Ms. Walker said they no longer required landscape plans to be recorded, so they would ensure that the landscape plan was referenced on the site plan.

Mr. Weinrieb said it made sense to have the crosswalk on the location opposite West Road because it was a busy road. Ms. Walker said they typically didn't require crosswalks at driveways. Mr. Weinrieb

said the driveway was over 40 feet and that he wanted the crosswalk. He said the condo association would maintain it.

Mr. Weinrieb said he would provide details on the fence and boulder wall. He noted that they had interior bikes on racks for the residents and that they had their own storage bins. He said he was thinking of adding a two-bike rack for each building for guests. He said they would add the interior dimensions of the parking spaces and would re-label the building identification. Ms. Walker asked that Mr. Weinrieb clarify what side the front elevation was on.

They discussed what material the emergency egress would be. Mr. Marsilio said it had to be a hard surface.

Mr. Weinrieb said the existing vegetation would remain. Ms. Walker asked him to explain what the existing consisted of. Mr. Weinrieb said they would provide more identification on the outdoor lighting on the site plan.

Mr. Marsilio said a backup generator was needed for the HVAC system on the enclosed garages and should be shown on the plan. Mr. Roediger asked for a detail of the gate. Mr. Weinrieb said it would swing in and that he would provide a detail.

Mr. Roediger asked about adding a fire hydrant to the right of the sidewalk, which wasn't on the plan. Mr. Weinrieb said he would add it.

Mr. Pezzullo asked whether there was any dewatering on the project and whether there were any large sumps or trench drains. Mr. Weinrieb said there would be a trench drain in the middle but it was a closed system. He said they would add a note. He said it would overflow into the raingarden and that there was a catch basin at the low point of the wall that could be connected. It was further discussed.

Ms. Walker said the current zoning discussed the importance of Islington Street buildings fronting on the street. She said the Planning Board had an issue with the orientation of the buildings and thought they were kind of an island in the middle of the site. Mr. Weinrieb said that if they went in any other direction, they would have much longer buildings and would have to come off Hoover or Pleasant Streets. He said the driveway's location was necessary because they were opposite West Road. He said it was driven in part by the parking garage design.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ryan Fitz of 56 Pheasant Lane said he was an abutter and that all the residents of Pheasant Lane, the condo association, the Woodlands area, and Elwyn Park were in favor of the project because it would maintain the residential nature of the community.

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

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the application to the December 5 2017 TAC meeting.*

Ms. Harris stated that Peter Britz of the Planning Department said the raingardens should use a small river stone rather than bark mulch as the filter media.

.....

H. The application of **Seacoast Development Group, LLC, Owner**, for property located along **Rockingham Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into three lots as follows:

1. Proposed lot #1 having an area of 38,466 ± s.f. (0.883 acres) and 119.76’ of continuous street frontage on Rockingham Avenue.
2. Proposed lot #2 having an area of 15,874 ± s.f. (0.364 acres) and 128.56’ of continuous street frontage on Rockingham Avenue.
3. Proposed lot #3 having an area of 19,044 ± s.f. (0.437 acres) and 305.34’ of continuous street frontage on Rockingham Avenue.

Said property is shown on Assessors Map 235 as Lot 2 and is located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District where the minimum lot area is 15,000 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage is 100’. (This application was postponed indefinitely at the May 2, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the application to the December 5 2017 TAC meeting.*

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Robert J. Fabbriatore Irrevocable Trust, Owner**, for property located at **177 State Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 2-story addition to a mixed use building, with a footprint of 360 ± s.f., and gross floor area of 661 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 44 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **postpone** the application to the December 5 2017 TAC meeting.*

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to **adjourn** the meeting at 4:40 p.m.*

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee