

## MINUTES

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

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

2:00 PM

JANUARY 2, 2018

**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; Patrick Howe, 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 December 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

#### SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon, Steve Kelm, Jen Ramsey, and Robbi Woodburn were present to speak to the application. The project is a proposed new building on the corner of Maplewood Ave and Deer St. The site will have underground parking accessed by a ramp on Deer St. and there will be six spaces on Bridge St. The project has numerous entrances on grade at the corner. Both Deer St. and Maplewood Ave slope away so ramps are included in the plans to keep it at grade. The underground parking is stacked and there is a variance approval for that. There is a generator room in the underground parking.

TAC Comments:

- All aspects of the site work shall be substantially complete prior to occupancy.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that whatever the normal procedure is would be fine.
- The applicant shall contribute to the cost for the replacement of the water main from the corner of Deer and Bridge up to the intersection of the mains in Maplewood Ave. The applicant will also be responsible for the services for the VFW, the proposed building and the cost of the hydrant.

- Mr. Chagnon noted that the applicants were willing to pay. However, they are not sure if this is something the applicant should be required to pay solely. The fair share may be split with the VFW.
- The applicant shall either construct or pay for the construction of a new sewer lateral for the VFW to connect from the building to the brick sewer main so that the AC sewer main can be removed for the water main project.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they are not sure if this is something the applicant should be required to pay solely.
- To verify that the new building's sewer connection is in the brick sewer and not the AC sewer, the sewer stub that is shown will most likely not be able to be used. A new connection to the main should be shown for both services.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded the brick sewer is fine.
- The line type on the plans for the old utilities (gas etc.) that are no longer in service on Deer and Bridge should either be removed or changed. The only gas main still in service is the one approx. 3' from the curb line and that main now goes into Maplewood the patch for the work is evident in the road.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the plan should have been updated to show the gas service. Mr. Desfosses responded that it is still showing wrong. Mr. Chagnon confirmed it would be updated.
- The applicant should verify that a 2" copper line is large enough for the planned uses of the building.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that the pipe would increase to a 4-inch pipe.
- The proposed gas service should not be located so close to the entrance of the garage. The gas company will require substantial bollards/protection in that location.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they worked with Unitil on the location of the service, but need to circle back to verify it still works.
- Inside the garage, the first row of stacked spaces should be much wider than shown, as it is directly adjacent to a wall. The end spaces should be at least 10' wide with the middle spaces all being the same width spaced out equally.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be fine.
- Tree species to be approved by Trees and Greenery.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they understand this. The applicants met with the City in the fall and the City Arborist requested they change a tree that was originally picked. That change has been made.
- The applicant will need a license for the silvacells they are showing.
  - Mr. Chagnon asked for clarification on this comment. Ms. Walker responded that the City typically requires a permit. Mr. Desfosses added that the City would need to maintain them.
- The conduit under the sidewalks is shown incorrectly. The street lights will require a 2" conduit run that is totally separate from the power going to the City's controller/VFW building. Provide 2 lighting pull boxes, one at each street corner.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this could be done.
- Show the proposed conduit plan for the building's power supply for comment.

- Mr. Chagnon responded that they have been in touch with the City on this design and the utility plan doesn't reflect the information put out to the City. The conduits will be run by the City. The location was moved after talking to Eversource. The new path will be reflected in the utility plan. Ms. Walker asked Mr. Desfosses if he would want a final review of change. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that he would.
- Brick pavers for the project shall be as manufactured by Pinehall 4"x8" the new std. Samples will need to be provided to and approved by the DPW.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be updated.
- All street curbing around the site shall be reset during the project.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be updated. Should a note be added to have the city review the suitability to the use? Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it should.
- Verify that all sidewalks can be built with no more than 2% and no less than 1% slope.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this was completed. It was a comment from previous TAC work session. Is there still an area that's missing? Mr. Desfosses responded that there was not anything missing.
- The cobble detail does show thermal finish but it does not specify thickness (should be at least 3" on top of 4" of asphalt). It also doesn't specify ashlar sides for a flat surface. Note should also indicate that if this is approved, it is the applicant's responsibility to keep this in good repair and repair within 90 days' notice of defect from the City.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the cobbles are a good feature and this would be updated.
- The applicant has changed the proposed lights in the City sidewalk. These shall be changed back to the City Standard fixture.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was not a problem. This was taken from the lighting plan from the lighting consultant. The issue was that the lighting consultant wanted to pick a fixture that would have the same lumi-throw.
- Shouldn't the tide flex valve in the drainage system be on the outlet pipe?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the location of the outlet pipe is on the property, so the property owners can be responsible for maintenance. Mr. Desfosses confirmed this was ok.
- The drain pipe that is 30' east of the garage is still labeled as an underdrain.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be updated.
- The applicant shall contribute to the City's storm water master plan study for this area. Confirm that there will be no groundwater discharge into the drainage system.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that there should not be any groundwater discharge into the system and the applicant will pay fair share of the master plan. Ms. Walker noted that the preference was to have that specified before it goes to Planning Board.
- No profile of the garage driveway shown. Has it changed since the previous submittal? Grade changes should be no more than 10% for a crest and 9% for a sag.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the profile was looked at. Mr. Chagnon handed out information to the applicants. The design with the auto turn was looked at and, it does work. Some vertical curves were introduced to show the grading and the spot grades weren't changed in the drawing. Mr. Eby responded that the comment was to make sure cars wouldn't bottom out etc. Mr. Chagnon responded that the ABI file could be

sent. Ms. Walker asked Mr. Eby if he needed more information to confirm the analysis. Mr. Eby confirmed that he did.

- Have groundwater elevations been monitored through at least one tidal cycle to determine if there are potential drainage impacts from tidal waters? It may be necessary to provide back flow preventers in catchbasins to prevent tidal storm water from entering site through catchbasins and other drainage structures.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the one preventer at the manhole would be sufficient. Mr. Chagnon was unsure if there are other catch basins now. No new ones will be added. Mr. Britz noted that he just wanted to make sure it's covered. They have a backflow preventer already, so it's good.
- Parallel parking spaces that you indicated were removed on the site plan should also be removed from the landscape plan and the easement plan.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this was fine.
- TAC will recommend to the PB that the applicant contribute to the cost of the replacement of the water main on Deer St.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this was fine.
- On sheet C6, your reference to the curbing references the reveal, not the width. TAC requests that any new curbing shall match existing or be 6" in width. I believe the standard reveal is 5", but DPW can confirm.
  - Mr. Desfosses noted that is true. Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be revised.
- The detail for the sewer line on sheet D5 still appears to reference encasing the sewer lines in concrete, please explain.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded this could be taken off but the intent was to present the state standards. Mr. Desfosses noted that a pressure pipe was required. It should be revised to show partial pipe. Mr. Chagnon responded that detail note would be removed.
- Is the process for eliminating groundwater intrusion for the foundation work that you reference in the cover letter reflected in a note or detail in the plan set?
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be added to the plan set.
- Additional bike racks should be added along the sidewalk closer to building entrances.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that two were put in. Is there a standard that needs to be met. Ms. Walker responded that it should be within 50 feet and two more should be added. Mr. Chagnon responded that was fine. Mr. Eby questioned if there is room to add some on Deer St. Ms. Ramsey responded that the retaining wall does set back, so people can park their bikes parallel to the wall. Ms. Walker added that they could help give some guidance on that. Mr. Eby noted that adding two more would be good.
- Any landscaping you show as part of this site plan approval (including off-site) will be required to be implemented as part of this site plan.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was all in the letter.
- Add boundary lines to plan legends, it is not easy to distinguish between easement lines and property lines, etc. On easement plan, cross hatching is useful for showing easement areas.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this was fine. The existing easements were hatched, but they all can be.
- Please provide more of an explanation of who the various easements benefit, e.g. the pedestrian easement from Deer St between VFW and future building. Who is that for?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the easement is for the public. There is an easement between the two buildings for access and maintenance for the owners. Ms. Walker

responded that any easements with public access should have some sort of draft for the Planning Board to see in the packet. A draft example can be provided if needed.

- On easement plan, does the area referenced in note 8 coincide with the 5' utility easement? Who is the access easement for?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that it does. The easement is for the respective owners.
- On easement plan, note 9, this should be determined prior to site plan approval.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was just a note on the subdivision plan so it can be taken out. Ms. Walker responded that would be preferred.
- On easement plan, note 10, reference this note on the plan at dumpster location.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded this was not a problem.
- On L-1, the Conditional Use Permit Qualifying Criteria should be moved to the site plan (with zoning requirements).
  - Mr. Chagnon responded this was not a problem.
- On site plan, add proposed total height of building to the zoning information.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that it's 44 feet 10 inches. It may not be there today, but it will be added.
- Note 7, please remove. Uses shown are not conceptual. If the use changes, then a site plan amendment or change of use approval will be required.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded this was not a problem.
- Note 8, add reference to condo docs which specify this.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that's about the use of the dumpster for 46 on the Maplewood property. The plan can reference where it shows the existing use.
- You included the inspection and maintenance plan for stormwater management. Where is this referenced in the plan set?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this reference would be added. Ms. Walker questioned if the Committee was comfortable with the inspection and maintenance plan. Mr. Pezzullo added that this is usually in the condo docs too. Ms. Walker responded that the site plan doc is where the City can enforce it. Mr. Chagnon responded that it should be on file with the City. Ms. Walker noted that it would be added as a stipulation.
- Statements required per Section 2.13.3 should be included on Site Plan and Easement Plan.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would want to talk about what sheets should be recorded. Probably one of the site plans. Ms. Walker noted that typically there is an overall site plan not separate for the first floor and second floor. The preference would be to give one overall for recording. Mr. Chagnon requested that be left as a condition and as a recordable plan is developed they can work with TAC.
- A note should be included on snow storage/removal.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was not a problem. Ms. Walker questioned what the plan was for snow removal. Mr. Chagnon responded that once it snows it would be removed offsite. Ms. Walker suggested the note say that snow should be moved offsite and will not be stored on city property.
- Existing/proposed open space should be included in plan set.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be added. Ms. Walker questioned if the summary of open space was provided? Mr. Chagnon responded that it was on C3 note 2. Ms. Walker responded that this comment has already been addressed.
- Indicate where Low Impact Development Design practices have been incorporated. Checklist references Sheet C-6, the Grading and Drainage Plan, without further explanation.

- Mr. Chagnon clarified that the checklist meant the submitted site plan checklist. Ms. Walker confirmed that was correct. Mr. Chagnon questioned if this should be added to the checklist. Ms. Walker responded that it should be and say where it's specifically addressed in the plan.
- Where does the exit beside the ramp from the garage discharge? It is not shown on the first floor. Does it discharge directly outside?
  - Ms. Ramsey responded that it goes to the open air parking structure. The ramp goes directly outside too. Mr. Howe noted that it doesn't line up with any of the doors. Will there be another door? Ms. Ramsey responded that the plans weren't updated in time, but there is a door there. Mr. Chagnon confirmed the plans would be updated.
- Neither of the exits from the basement mercantile space appear to discharge directly outside. One discharges into the street level garage accessed from Bridge St and the other leads up a ramp and then into the center stairwell. These exits do not appear to meet the remoteness criteria.
  - Ms. Ramsey responded that the stair to the back of the building discharges to a parking structure carport. One comes out just outside of that in between the easement area of the buildings. The remoteness calculations are included. Mr. Howe clarified that the remoteness has a ramp that goes up to the door on the mercantile space. Ms. Ramsey confirmed that was correct. Mr. Howe questioned if there would be a rail. Ms. Ramsey confirmed there would be. Mr. Howe commented that the remoteness on the rail should be measured. Ms. Ramsey confirmed that would be updated. Mr. Howe clarified that when the ramp is moved down it will be less remote to the mercantile. Ms. Ramsey confirmed that it will be less, but it will still be within the number. Ms. Walker questioned if Mr. Howe and Mr. Marsilia would want to verify that or if they comfortable with the updated plan? Mr. Howe responded he was comfortable. Are you considering discharge? Ms. Ramsey responded yes, it's an open-air structure surrounded by punched openings. Mr. Howe questioned if there was an egress on the middle corridor on the first floor. Ms. Ramsey confirmed there is a fire egress. A door to separate the lobby from the path of travel could be added.
- Where is the center stairwell enclosed on the first floor?
  - Mr. Howe commented that if the elevator were separated then it would be all set. Mr. Marsilia clarified that the accessibility to the mercantile is from that ramp. Ms. Ramsey confirmed that was correct. Mr. Marsilia noted that ADA details should be included.
- Clarify ownership/maintenance responsibility of drainage system in the parking area on Lot 1. Include note on plan regarding maintenance responsibility and maintenance requirements.
  - Mr. Chagnon clarified that would be the responsibility of lot 1 to maintain. It is on lot 1. This will be added to the notes.
- Why is proposed landscaping shown for 238 Deer St. (VFW) property. This landscaping might conflict with proposed use of VFW building.
  - Ms. Woodburn noted that the original site plan process showed some landscaping on the VFW property to provide better scenery and feel for the corridor area. The new VFW owners have been contacted to give a level of sign off. The goal is to dress it up for the good of the project, but it can be removed if needed. Ms. Walker clarified that the plan is showing improvements on a different property on this approved site plan so you will be responsible for maintaining it. Ms. Woodburn responded that it is included, but the VFW was not willing to do an easement because it could effect the property. Ms. Walker responded that the preference is that this be taken off. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it would be.



- Relocated hydrant is shown on private property (VFW).
  - Mr. Chagnon noted that the thought was it would be right at the property line. Mr. Desfosses clarified that it should be on the curb line. Not actually on it but near it. How much room is there between the steps and curb line? Mr. Chagnon responded 5 or 6 feet. Mr. Desfosses added that they just need to pick a good spot near the curb line. Is there parking for the VFW? Ms. Walker responded that it is being removed. Mr. Desfosses noted that the hydrant should be 6 inches behind the curb and shouldn't be in front of the steps.
- Proposed 6" drain pipe connected to roof drains are shown in City ROW. OCS #2 detail does not appear consistent with Grading & Drainage Plan (C6) and the modelling of unit in drainage report.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the model was done with all silva cell trunk lines being 6 inch in diameter. That is correct; the detail needs to be changed. Mr. Pezzullo noted that the roof drainage was going into the system. Is that all that's going in there? Mr. Chagnon responded that it would be roof drain only. Mr. Desfosses noted that the plan was showing it on the right of way. Mr. Chagnon responded that the intent was to try to get a source of water for those trees. The thought was to put the roof drain line to feed the silva cells then end in a catch basin. Mr. Desfosses noted that they just need a license on the pipe. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be done. Should the pipe be run the same setback or is it ok to run across? Mr. Desfosses responded that it was ok to run across. Mr. Pezzullo added that the license would just be for the part in the right of way.
- TAC left a zoning requirements comment.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that it's labeled as 3.5. Mr. Cracknell commented that it was advertised as 3.5. Ms. Walker requested that the applicants send an updated notice with four stories. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.
- TAC left a comment noting the applicant should conform to fire opening requirements.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that should have been included in the package. It shows the area of the building broken into segments with the allowable openings. An easement was added to the plan to make the 10 feet requirement. Ms. Walker clarified that the applicant was confident that everything is provided. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they were.
- TAC left a comment on parking calculations
  - Ms. Walker noted that this application is grandfathered into 2017.

Ms. Walker noted that there was one additional comment around the note indicating that the fire sprinkler system would be designed per the Inspections Department. Ms. Walker asked Mr. How if he was comfortable waiting to see the design? Mr. Howe responded that was fine. Is the garage to Deer St. going to be sprinkled? Ms. Ramsey confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if the basement parking space was heated. Ms. Ramsey responded that the basement would be tempered space, but the space at grade is open air. Mr. Desfosses noted that the water comes through the garage, so make sure the pipes are heated. A bypass meter should be added to the pipes in the basement.

Ms. Walker noted that the traffic generation report recommended a fair share contribution. This will be better defined. Because there were so many iterations, TAC will need to see an updated plan one more time. Then it can go to Planning Board.

Mr. Cracknell suggested they reconsider requiring landscaping on VFW pending agreement with VFW. Ms. Walker responded that the only catch is this is an application for one lot. The VFW would need to be included as a co-applicant. Ms. Woodburn responded that it's tough to say it would be done without knowing who the owner is. Mr. Chagnon questioned that if that landscaping was something the owner wanted to do would it trigger a site plan approval. Ms. Walker responded that the VFW owners could do it without a site plan approval. Mr. Cracknell noted that if it's not a requirement for this approval then it may or may not happen. Mr. Pezzullo noted that the new owners might need that land for other purposes based on potential uses of the property.

Mr. Pezzullo questioned who was responsible for the storm water management. Ms. Woodburn responded that it would probably be responsibility of new lot. Mr. Pezzullo responded that should be clarified.

## **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 postpone this Site Review to the next regularly schedule TAC meeting on January 30, 2018, seconded by Mr. Britz. 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 December 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this Site Review to the next regularly schedule TAC meeting on January 30, 2018, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

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 1,224 ± s.f. footprint and 2,273± s.f. gross floor area, Building #2 with 948± s.f. footprint and 1,942± s.f. gross floor area, Building #3 with 1,866 ± s.f. footprint and 5,950 ± s.f. gross floor area); and construct 3 duplex buildings and a single dwelling unit for 11 proposed units (Building



#4 with 1,085± s.f. footprint and 2,712± s.f. gross floor area, Building #5 with 1,625 ± s.f. footprint and 4,063 ± s.f. gross floor area, Building #6 with 1,750 ± s.f. footprint and 4,956 ± s.f. gross floor area, Building #7 with 1,780 ± s.f. footprint and 4,900± 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 December 5, 2017 TAC meeting.).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Doug Larosa with Ambit engineering Rob Harbeson from Market Square Architects and Robbi Woodburn from Woodburn and Company Landscape Architecture were there to speak to the application. The design has changed quite a bit. One change was made to allow emergency vehicles to come in turn around and exit. The plans have changed from 12 proposed units to 11. Three duplexes will be in the back and a single family in the front. Current zoning allows for 13 units on the property; this proposal is for 11 units. All of the drainage, landscaping and utilities have been reworked to provide spacing and adequate circulation.

- Provide the full drainage analysis for review.
  - Ms. Walker confirmed this was all set.
- Lighting conduit should be run into a pull box before entering transformer. Also provide meter socket and breaker assembly next to pull box.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that a lighting plan would be provided.
- No drain holes in hydrants, ever, not allowed by AWWA.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be revised.
- Permanent patches in City streets will match existing pavement thicknesses. Gravel will be reused to ensure consistency.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be noted on the plan.
- The applicant will need flagging, excavation, storm water, sewer and water connection permits.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that the notes would be added to the plan.
- Site layout much improved. However, 16 foot wide opening to parking areas behind #430 is very tight. Vehicles will need to make multipoint turns getting in and out of parking spaces for these units.
  - Mr. Larosa responded that the applicants would analyze this and show the vehicle turning radiuses. Ms. Walker clarified that each of those spaces are a parking space as well as access to a garage. It's a lot of maneuvering to get a car out of the garage. Mr. Larosa responded that in this design it's 30 feet from the proposed access way to the end and from the middle to each space is 30 feet. Cars can go around each other. Alternatively, they would have to pull out and around and back. Ms. Walker noted concern that some people will just park their car in the middle because it's more convenient. Mr. Larosa responded that the property should have a condo committee to handle those details. Ms. Walker confirmed that was ok.
- Minimum STOP sign size is 30", not 24".
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be revised.
- Street address sign should not be in sidewalk, should be on site.

- Mr. Larosa responded that this would show as an informational sign on the street. It is going to be put on the little space near 430 on the left hand side on the property. It should be visible from both sides of Islington. Ms. Walker questioned if it would be hung out on the right of way. Mr. Larosa responded that it would be on the post sticking out. The building is in the right of way now. It could be put on the other side of the street. Ms. Walker commented that the sign should be visible for fire safety. Mr. Howe added that it needs to be visible for vehicles coming from downtown. Mr. Larosa confirmed that the sign should be visible from 100 feet away.
- No snow storage area for site shown. Is it in the infiltration basin?
  - Mr. Larosa pointed out the snow storage on the plan. There is no curb on that part of the parking area. Mr. Britz questioned if there would be any storage in the middle. Mr. Larosa responded that there would not be because there's a filtration basin in the middle. There will be no snow storage on that.
- Site currently has significant number of mature trees. Important that landscaping plan be implemented and trees proposed are protected. Who will be responsible for maintenance of trees beyond 1 year guarantee? How can the applicant assure trees shown on the plan will reach maturity?
  - Mr. Larosa responded that there are two large maple trees on the site that will remain. The maintenance notes will be added to the landscaping plan. After the one year the condo association will have to maintain this. Ms. Walker added that this should be on the landscaping and site plan so it will be recorded.
- The voluntary lot merger will need to be completed prior to the site plan being recorded and site review agreement finalized.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be fine.
- More detail on your green statement would be appreciated. The site plan requirements indicate this should be a "detailed statement", not a cursory outline.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that the green building statement would be augmented.
- Add boundary lines to plan legends, it is not easy to distinguish between easement lines and property lines, etc. On easement plan, cross hatching is useful for showing easement areas.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed the plan legend would be updated to show boundary lines.
- Please remove notes 3, 5, 6, these aren't needed on the easement plan.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed the notes would be removed.
- Your landscaping and demolition plans note some existing trees along the boundary with 404 Islington St. It appears you are proposing to keep those trees. How are you planning to protect them during the demo and construction process?
  - Ms. Walker confirmed this was already addressed.
- Your site layout plan indicates a proposed address sign in the City's sidewalk. Were you proposing to locate this on the proposed utility pole? Any signage in the public right of way will require a license from the City Council and it is generally inconsistent with City policy to allow permanent private signage on public property particularly in densely inhabited areas like this. Please consider an alternative location on your property.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this was already addressed.
- How will the snow storage easement area be delineated to ensure existing and future owners of the property know where it is?
  - Ms. Walker further explained this comment is because snow storage is being provided for an abutting property owner. Mr. Larosa responded that it's apparent because of the lines. Ms. Walker noted it's a unique situation. Mr. Larosa responded that they would

consider this and get back to TAC. It would definitely be in the condo docs. Ms. Walker noted that the committee could consider if that would be fine or if more would be needed.

- Notes 3 through 5 on the site layout plan should be moved to the landscape plan.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be moved.
- Some utilities (e.g. catch basins) are shown on the site layout plan, but not all. At a minimum, please add the light pole locations to the site layout plan.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that this would be completed.
- Please remove the boundary iron rod locations from the site layout plan, these use the same symbol as the utility poles and are difficult to distinguish.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that this would be completed.
- Please provide a detail and add a legend item for the areas proposed to be “hatched”. It’s not clear whether these are paint only or pavement treatments as well.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that this would be completed. Ms. Walker questioned what the little crescent that is hatched on the plan was. Mr. Larosa responded that it’s accounting for a ladder truck swing. Ms. Woodburn added that it’s a reminder to her to not landscape there.
- On sheet C4, the reference to the underdrained filtration basin is mislabeled (W/D4 not found)
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be revised.
- Add snow storage areas to site layout plan.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be added.
- The location of the light shown on the landscaped island does not match the location on sheet C5.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that is correct. It was revised on C5 to illuminate the mailbox.
- The hatched area around the landscape island should be added to L-1.
  - Ms. Walker requested that a note be added on the landscape plan that clearance is being provided. Mr. Larosa questioned if that note should be on the site plan. Ms. Walker responded that it did not need to be. Ms. Woodburn added that they would be using Princeton elms that will be above the 16 feet. On the other side there will be sweet gum trees. Those trees have a thin head, so they will not be an issue.
- The underdrained filtration basin detail references ongoing maintenance. Please submit a maintenance plan and add a note referencing this on the site plan.
  - Mr. Larosa responded that in the drainage report there is a maintenance schedule at the end of it. Ms. Walker commented that should be referenced on the plan. Is it sufficient? Mr. Britz confirmed it was. Ms. Walker commented that this should be referenced on site plan and in the condo docs.
- How wide are the proposed garage openings?
  - Mr. Larosa responded that they are 9 feet wide on the back buildings and 8 feet wide on the other three buildings. Mr. Harbeson added that all of the garage bays are standard 12x24 and the openings are standard.
- Provide footprint and GFA of each building within the plan set. Supplemental spreadsheet is net floor area per the architect.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be done.
- Include the Historic District Overlay District in Note on zoning, Sheet C-1, Note 5.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be done.
- Add dimensional requirements to Note 6, Sheet C-1 or reference to Sheet C-2.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be done.

- Sheet L-1 or L-2 should have note required per Section 2.13.4.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be added.
- Are there updated architectural plans based on changes to the site plan?
  - Ms. Walker responded that this was provided, and they were all set.
- How will on-street parking on Islington St affect the turning template that was submitted?
  - Mr. Larosa responded that it wouldn't affect it at all. The turning template can be reworked so that the fire truck turns from the center of the street more. Mr. Howe clarified that there's no parking there. Mr. Larosa responded that it's not striped for parking. Mr. Eby commented there is parking there. Mr. Larosa confirmed that plans would be checked. It would still work.
- Is it still the plan to not allow parking on the access road and turnaround?
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that is still the plan. That can be added to the plans. Ms. Walker confirmed that it should be added to the plans. Mr. Larosa questioned if a no parking sign was needed. Ms. Walker responded that it was not.
- Provide information on the tree canopies that will be overhanging the access road (width, height). Will these impact access by emergency response apparatus?
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that this information would be put on the plan.
- Curbing around center island must be mountable.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that there was no curbing on the center aisle proposed. Ms. Walker confirmed they were all set.
- Will the buildings on Islington St be protected with a sprinkler system as the new buildings in the rear will be?
  - Mr. Harbeson responded that there was confusion about sprinklers. The existing building, number 430, has a sprinkler system and it will be re-worked. None of the other buildings have sprinklers and Mr. Harbeson believes that's to code. Mr. Howe clarified that none of the buildings will be sprinkled. Mr. Harbeson responded only 430 would. Mr. Howe responded that the overhangs of the rear and the front should be included on the plans.
- Show snow storage area(s) on the site plan.
  - Mr. Larosa noted that this comment was redundant.
- Install water main with polyethylene wrap and provide three brass wedges at joints.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that these notes would be added.
- Show individual shutoffs for fire services.
  - Mr. Larosa responded that this is shown in the detail. Should it be on the plan set as well? Mr. Pezzullo noted that there is no fire protection system. It is showing a line to each building. Mr. Larosa responded that the plans would be revised to take those off. Mr. Howe noted that initial discussions the applicants agreed that the buildings would be protected. Mr. Harbeson responded that it was brought it up as a means to address the lower point of the site. Now the whole site plan is reconfigured it was revisited. Mr. Howe highly recommended the applicants include fire protection.
- Evaluate potential conflict with proposed drain line crossing water main in State Street.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that this would be evaluated.
- Indicate that water, sewer and drain lines are "private".
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed the plan would be revised.
- Provide detail for proposed in-line sewer and drain manholes in State Street.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed the plan would be revised.

- Evaluate condition/capacity of sewer and drain line in State Street to accommodate proposed connections.
  - Joe Maletti from Ambit Engineering responded that the site's existing conditions are cut almost in half. One half flows to the southwest corner and the other half is contained in a natural depression. The project would be mimicking those conditions and cutting the flows in half. Mr. Desfosses requested to see the full drainage study. It needs to be looked at it for flow and volume and peak times. Mr. Larosa responded that the average residency is still 2.4 people per unit, which comes out to 1100 gallons per day. Mr. Desfosses confirmed he just needed to see the calculation.
- Provide Access Easement to City of Portsmouth for water line.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be noted on the plan and the condo docs. Ms. Walker clarified that this is separate from the condo docs. The Planning Department can provide a draft.
- Indicate on plan to be recorded that the owner/condo association is responsible for maintaining drainage system and reference the required "Maintenance Plan/Schedule".
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed this would be added.
- It appears that the proposed retaining wall along the eastern property line will result in "ponding" of stormwater on abutting property to the east. (see Grading & Drainage Plan, C4).
  - Mr. Larosa responded that the back of the retaining wall is crushed stone. The water should be able to infiltrate it. It's more or less decorative, so it can be removed if needed. The preference is to keep it. Mr. Pezzullo commented that the retaining wall should not be there. It has potential to trap water. Removing the wall would allow runoff to flow better. Mr. Desfosses added that the problem is that the grade is changing. Mr. Larosa confirmed that the area would be regarded.
- Driveway behind 420 Islington should be narrow like the others to support larger lawn.
  - Mr. Larosa confirmed that could be done. Ms. Woodburn questioned how wide it is now. Mr. Cracknell responded 24 feet and recommended reducing the sidewalk width. It doesn't need to be 5 feet. The landscaping and site plan don't match. Ms. Walker confirmed that the committee that they were ok with a 4 foot wide sidewalk. The committee members were ok with that width.

Mr. Desfosses commented that a tree would probably not live through the excavation of 410. Ms. Woodburn responded that the desire was to keep the living tree. If the tree does not survive then it would be replaced somewhere on the property.

Mr. Cracknell noted there were still concerns that unit owners will use the visitor parking spots. Mr. Harbeson responded that the intent is to bring the hedge all the way down to prevent that.

Mr. Pezzullo noted that the landscape plan might not match the filtration design for the center island. Is there any interference with that tree or the design? The limit of filtration system is unclear. Mr. Larosa responded that the limit is the whole island. The top is lawn. The tree would be in the area that will drain quickly. Ms. Woodburn added that the tree will have roots and will suck up the water. Is there concern about roots getting into the pipes? Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that was the concern. Mr. Larosa responded that those pipes would have socks on them. The roots could get in there and the whole filtration pond is permeable. The water should get to where it needs to whether there are roots or not.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the original drain site wasn't modeled correctly. The routing needs to be changed so that the endpoint of the pre and post conditions are on State St. Mr. Harbeson responded that the concern was understood, and it will be updated in the next round.

Mr. Britz pointed out that the parking site layout is listed as two. Is that because there is parking inside and outside? Mr. Larosa confirmed that was correct. Mr. Britz responded that it should be labeled as stacked parking on all of them not just one. Mr. Larosa confirmed that would be updated.

## **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 there was a number of things the need to be addressed and this application still has to go through the Historic District Commission. Ms. Walker's inclination was to postpone the application to the next meeting.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** Site Review to the next regularly schedule TAC meeting on January 30, 2018, seconded by Mr. Pezzullo. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Larosa noted that the HDC was waiting for TAC to sign off. Mr. Cracknell clarified that the HDC was waiting for TAC's comments not sign off.

.....

D. 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 748 ± s.f., and gross floor area of 1,216 ± 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. (This application was postponed at the December 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

The applicants were before TAC in October. The main concern then was that that the garage was not deep enough to have a good working garage. This has been revised and it is now open air parking. This application has been through the Historic District Commission and received approval. The architectural plans show how it looks from the street view. In the back of the parking area is a small trash enclosure.

- There was no explanation of what changed.
  - The applicant described above what had changed. It can be provided in writing.



- Add footprint/GFA of proposed addition to the plans/notes.
  - The applicant confirmed this would be added to the site plan.
- Show location plan with zoning boundaries on the cover.
  - The applicant confirmed this would be added to the cover sheet.
- Table format for CD dimensional requirements is preferred. Include existing and proposed requirements.
  - The applicant confirmed that they have all of that information and it would be included.
- Include a statement on measures to minimize impervious surfaces per Section 7.4.3.
  - The applicant confirmed that this would be added to the plan. There is currently a building there. It will be removed and pervious pavers will be put in.
- Include a calculation of the maximum effective impervious surface as a percentage of the site per Section 7.4.3.2.
  - The applicant responded that a full drainage study and summary was submitted in October. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that they don't need to see an updated analysis.
- Drainage summary only included in previous submission. Has the full study been submitted previously? Any changes with/without garage?
- Where is the loft accessed from? What is its' use? Is it a mezzanine? Wouldn't the loft constitute a 5<sup>th</sup> story and preclude the allowance of a single exit from the residential units per NFPA 101 - 2015 edition section 30.2.4.6?
  - The applicant responded that this was in an earlier plan. Originally there was a loft, but it has been removed.
- What are the addresses associated with the residential and mercantile uses?
  - The applicant responded that currently the whole site is 177 State Street. The residential units are accessed from the stair at the front, so they would have State Street addresses. The retail will be on Penhallow Street, so those will be Penhallow Street addresses. Mr. Howe questioned if that had been worked out with the City. The applicant responded that it had not yet.
- Proposed utilities need to be differentiated on the plans from existing utilities.
  - The applicant confirmed that additional information would be added to the legend.
- Penhallow Street infiltration detail appears to show that top of outlet structure is within the pervious paver crushed stone layer. Also is a cleanout provided for system. Engineer to evaluate.
  - The applicant confirmed that a clean out could be added and that detail would be clarified.
- Indicating HDC had suggested a variance.
- Need to clarify how porous pavement will integrate with brick sidewalk.
  - The applicant handed out information. The corner of the property has a small triangle of pavement. It makes sense to include that triangle in the pervious pavers, but they need to talk to the landowners.

Mr. Howe questioned if sprinklers would be added to the trash enclosure. The applicant responded that sprinkler calculations still needed to be prepared. Mr. Howe responded that it just needs to be accounted for. If it should be sprinkled then it should show on the plan. The applicant added that there would be a masonry wall on all three sides.

Mr. Eby commented that the applicant needs to be sure that the car can pull all the way into the spot and won't overhang onto the sidewalk. The applicant confirmed that a note could be added to the site plan.

## **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 questioned if the infiltration detail should be reviewed before this application goes to the Planning Board. Mr. Pezzullo confirmed that it should.

Ms. Walker confirmed that Mr. Howe was fine with the sprinkler plans coming in code review. Mr. Howe confirmed that was fine.

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

- Add additional information to the plans as noted by TAC including:
  - Include building addition footprint and gross floor area in plan notes.
  - Include a location plan with zoning boundaries on the cover sheet.
  - Provide table of character district dimensional requirements, including existing and proposed.
  - Include a statement on measures to minimize impervious surfaces per Section 7.4.3.
  - Proposed utilities need to be differentiated on the plans from existing utilities.
- Penhallow Street infiltration detail shall be reviewed and approved by DPW prior to Planning Board submission.
- Trash enclosure area shall be included in the sprinkler plan to be reviewed as part of the Building Permit approval.
- Add a note specifying that no vehicles shall protrude out of the parking space into sidewalk area.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Foundry Place, LLC and Deer Street Associates, Owners**, for property located at **165 Deer Street**, ("Lots 2, 3, 4 & 5), requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 5-story mixed use building (including a hotel, restaurant, and 1<sup>st</sup> floor parking garage) with a footprint of 22,073 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 104,020 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements to Lots 2, 3, 4 and 5. 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 December 5, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Walker noted that this application was pending two peer reviews, so it wouldn't move on that day.

Greg Mikolaities from August Consulting, Joseph Keefner from Geosight, Tracy Kozack from JSA and Bob White from GPI were present to speak to the application. The goal is to make progress on the project today. A matrix with the status of 32 of the TAC comments was submitted. The comments in green are completed. The comments in yellow are in progress and the applicants will talk about them today. The last set of plans had a paver driveway coming off Deer St. That has been revised to keep the brick sidewalk to make it clear it's a crosswalk. There was difference of opinion on this last time. There was a discussion about the non-vegetative screen around the transformer pad. There will be discussion on the storm water management and traffic pattern peer review. The gas company hasn't provided confirmation, but the applicants are confident it will be sufficient. They are just waiting to get the letter. There are some temporary improvements being done on lot 4 and some re-striping on lot 5. Geosight has re-done the application to reference all lots. This morning comments were received, and will be addressed.

- If the intent is still to have a brick driveway, the approach should be consistent with the earlier comment about 46 Maplewood regarding upkeep and 90 days' notice.
  - Mr. Mikolaities asked for clarification. Mr. Desfosses responded that it's the same comment that applied to both properties. The comment from 46 was proposing cobble crosswalk on their crosswalk across the street. It needs to be ADA compliant and the thickness should be 3 inches on 4 inches of asphalt. If this detail is approved it's the applicant's responsibility to keep in good condition. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed the applicants were fine with that.
- The applicant shall contribute a share of the cost of replacing the water main on Deer St to be consistent with the stipulation above. The applicant shall pay all costs relating to services stubs to be provided for lots 3 (if applicable), 4 and 5.
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this discussion is ongoing. The applicants will reach out to the Planning Department.
- Traffic impacts to be mitigated during this phase.
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this is the same as above. The applicants understand the fair share, and know that this is still open. Ms. Walker responded that typically the Planning Department decides what the fair share would be and then the applicants can decide if they want to contest it or not.
- Applicant understands that any utility work shown on the adjacent lots may need to be reworked if the approvals for those lots determine it and that the rework will be at the applicants own cost.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed that showing the utilities to lot 4 would hopefully prevent digging up lot 3 again.
- The 'drop off area' on Foundry Place needs to be removed. This area may require a fence.
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that there are two breaks in the landscape island on the plans. They are fine with enclosing that. The intent was to keep it open for snow. If the city

wants landscaping there then that's fine. Ms. Walker confirmed that it should be continuous landscaping. Mr. Keefner pointed out that the stairs were removed.

- PDMH1 should not be a doghouse manhole, it should get cut in or preferably tie CB into DMH 3541 instead.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed.
- Applicant needs to contribute to storm water study of the area.
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this was fine, however, more detail on this was needed.
- Applicant is showing Morin pavers still in some details
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed.
- All manhole shelves shall be constructed entirely of brick.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed.
- Loading zone in front of transformers is only passenger car size. Where will larger trucks load/unload? Where will trash pickup happen?
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this has to be a van space. This is a loading area for a van. There is turning templates for the trash on the site plan. There will be temporary wheel outs until lot 4 is complete. Waste management will pick up at the front on off hours. Ms. Walker responded that this has to be approved based on the knowledge that lot 4 may never happen. More detail on this trash plan is needed. Ms. Kozack pointed out where more detail was in the plan. Ms. Walker added that this needs to be added to the site plan not just the architectural plan. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed it would be updated.
- What are two remaining curb spaces on Foundry Place?
  - Mr. Mikolaities noted that this was a duplicate comment.
- Gateway Arch Sign? What is that?
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this would all come off the plans.
- What will be the wording on the entrance sign?
  - Mr. Mikolaities handed out a document. Ms. Kozack noted that the sign would have the name, logo and an arrow with valet parking. If it's at the 5-foot setback then drivers will see it too late. A variance is needed for this.
- Need traffic peer review comments.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed. A traffic memo would be submitted the next day.
- The proposed landscape maintenance agreement will need to be reviewed by DPW and the legal department. We will get comments back to you after we have completed our review.
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this has been submitted.
- Comment #10 on Table 1 references an open space requirement that 20% be pervious. Not sure what requirement you are referencing. Your calculations on sheet C3.5 appear to be correct, however.
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this is incorrect and it will be updated.
- You reiterate in Comment 14 that you are requesting the peer review process be expedited. We are happy to comply as realistically possible. However, you have not responded to the e-mail requesting your approval for the stormwater and drainage peer review scope and fee. The peer review cannot move forward until you approve.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed.
- Please update the sheet reference #s on the cover page.

Mr. Mikolaities confirmed this would be updated.

- Your zoning analysis on Sheet T.02T should reference the fact that this project is vested to the zoning in existence when you went before Planning Board for Design Review (indicate date of PB hearing).
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed.
- Your reference to the Incentive Overlay requirements is incorrect – the section is 10.5A46.10, not 10.5A47.10.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed.
- Your labeling of the Community Space on Sheet C3.4 is inconsistent with the labeling on the easement plan E1. On E1 you indicate the southern portion of Lot 2 was previously approved to benefit Lot 3, I believe this is supposed to say Lot 6. Please confirm.
  - Mr. Mikolaities confirmed this would be corrected.
- On E3, why is the preliminary sidewalk easement on Lot 4 shown? Is that being proposed as part of this approval? If so, those improvements should show on the site plans as well.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed this would be updated.
- Zoning boundaries should be shown per Section 2.5.4.3A(b).
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed this would be highlighted.
- Due to reduced fire department access to the building, enclosure pressurization of the stairwells will be required as well as an Emergency Command Center as outlined in NFPA 101 – 2015 edition section 11.8.6. Not all of the requirements listed in section 11.8.6.2 will apply.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed and confirmed that they would coordinate to ensure this is correct.
- Sprinklers will be required under vehicle lifts in the parking garage.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed a note would be added.
- Open space calc.
  - Mr. Mikolaities responded that this was a duplicate.
- TAC left a comment about community space.
  - Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that needed to be clarified, and ensure that it matched the site plans
- TAC left a comment about building height
  - Mr. Mikolaities confirmed a note would be added.
- TAC left a comment about the license agreement.
  - Mr. Mikolaities agreed.

Mr. Mikolaities addressed the outstanding items on the matrix:

The bricks have now gone away. Mr. Mikolaities requested direction on the removable screen from TAC. Is a variance needed? Ms. Kozack clarified that it's a metal grill that's 6 feet tall with steel rods backed by perforated sheet metal. The panels would be removable on the south side and east side for maintenance. Mr. Cracknell questioned if the chain link was required. Ms. Kozack responded that it is a request by the applicants. Mr. Keefner added that it would be buried in plantings. Ms. Walker commented that the standard is that it should be screened in landscaping. Ms. Walker expressed concern about the temporary nature, and requested the applicants take out the note stating it's removable. Mr. Cracknell questioned if the fence was going all the way up lots 4 and 5. Mr. Keefner confirmed that it was. Mr. Cracknell questioned if there was a detail for that. Mr. Keefner responded

that it was just in the planting plan. Ms. Walker requested the applicants provide more detail in the plan on that.

TAC made a comment about lot 2 surety. Mr. Mikolaities responded that they agree and know it needs to be done for the other lots too.

Mr. Mikolaities agreed with TAC's comments about the sprinklers.

Mr. Howe noted that the pressurized stairwell is referring to the air pressure. Ms. Kozack confirmed that was understood.

## **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 postpone this Site Review to the next regularly schedule TAC meeting on January 30, 2018, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

F. The application of **Happy Dreams, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **1 International Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 7,130  $\pm$  s.f., 3-story building expansion to the Residence Inn which will include 36 additional rooms and a 29 space reserve parking area to be constructed in the future, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 303 as Lots 4, 5, & 87 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District. (This application was postponed at the December 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. This application came to the 11/28 TAC work session. Mr. Crimmins addressed the comments from TAC.

- The rain garden area has a restrictive layer present from elevation 58-54 that is evident in the borings. The applicant needs to add a note that all the silty/clayey soils need to be removed in their entirety from the bottom of the rain garden until the sandy material is exposed. When that process is going on, an inspection should be called for with the Engineer and the City to determine if the underlying soil is appropriate for a rain garden use. If approved for use, the applicant shall continue building the rain garden as shown on the detail with the bottom stone course becoming thicker if necessary. This should be monitored to ensure the rain garden is infiltrating as proposed and the issue doesn't need to be revisited in the future.



- Mr. Crimmins agreed with this comment.
- The yard drain proposed near the northwest corner of the proposed parking lot shall be no closer than 3' from the fire main.
  - Mr. Crimmins noted this should be fine based on the plan, but a note can be added.
- A second Fire Department Connection feeding the buildings sprinkler and standpipes will be added as part of the addition. The FDCs will be interconnected so that pumping into either will supply all systems.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that the architect confirmed this.
- The hydrant that is out of service will be put into service or an additional hydrant added in the area to serve the second FDC.
  - Mr. Crimmins agreed with this comment.
- How will proposed addition be served by water, both domestic and fire protection.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that the intent is to serve it internally from the existing building. Mr. Pezzullo requested that a note be added on the plan. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be added.
- What is estimated water use for the proposed addition.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that it's a 70 gallon per day average per guest, and there is 1.5 guests per room. That is 3800 gallons per day total.
- Plans and drainage calculations include a "future" parking expansion with an unspecified timeframe for construction. Therefore, recommend that, at time of construction, an administrative review/approval be required to insure that the parking and associated drainage requirements at time of construction are complied with.
  - Mr. Crimmins agreed.

Mr. Pezzullo noted that the estimated water use should be on the site plan.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that an additional water and sewer permit would be required.

Mr. Marsilia clarified that it's a completely separate building. Mr. Crimmins responded that it's an extension with a future parking area.

## **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. Add a note to the landscape plan that all silty/clay soils need to be removed in their entirety from the bottom of the rain garden until sandy material is exposed. An inspection is required including the Engineer and the City to determine if the underlying soil is appropriate for rain garden use.
2. Add note to plan that yard drain near NW corner shall be no closer than 3' from the fire main.
3. A second Fire Dept. connection to the buildings sprinkler and standpipes shall be added.

4. The hydrant shown as out of service shall be put into service or an additional hydrant added in the area to serve the second Fire Dept. connection.
5. Add note on how the proposed addition will be served by water, both domestic and fire protection.
6. Estimated water usage calculations shall be noted on site plan.
7. Additional Water/Sewer permit shall be required.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

G. The application of **Ethel V. Ross Trust, Owner, and Joseph Caldarola, Applicant**, for property located at **142 Mill Pond Way**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 2-story, three unit townhouse with a footprint of  $5,560 \pm$  s.f. and a gross floor area of  $18,514 \pm$  s.f. , with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 140 as Lot 20 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (This application was postponed at the December 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Calderola and Jack McTigue were present to speak to the application.

- Re-draw the utilities as shown in the attached sketch.
  - Mr McTigue confirmed this would be done. Mr. Calderola added that they don't need a 500-gallon tank.
- Verify that drainage works as intended after construction downstream of the property. The applicant may need to do some wetland reshaping around the abutters driveway to ensure that everything drains as intended.
  - Mr. McTigue responded that the calculations were done for a 25-year storm. It did increase the flow but it's not a huge flow. Mr. Desfosses noted that the neighbors were there last month saying the runoff floods the driveway, so depending on where the runoff is redirected reshaping may be needed. Mr. McTigue responded that the outlet was moved a little bit further from the wetland. A level spreader was put in so runoff will continue down the property. Mr. Britz pointed out that the property has no berm. Mr. Mctigue responded that they had no problem adding a berm. Mr. Desfosses added that it's a post construction monitoring comment. Mr. McTigue confirmed this would be added as a note to the drainage plan.
- Grading plan appears to allow runoff from driveway for Unit 3 to travel directly to small wetland. While some of this area's drainage makes its way to rain garden there appears to be some that is not being treated or slowed significantly before entering existing wetland area. Request grading be adjusted to berm or flatten lawn outside of driveway so drainage is at least slowed and filtered by lawn area before entering wetland.
  - Mr. McTigue confirmed a berm would be added. Mr. Britz added that it doesn't need to be much. Mr. McTigue noted that they did put in the level spreader too.
- Include a Green Building Statement per Section 2.5.3.1A.

- Mr. McTigue confirmed this would be provided.
- Footprint and GFA should be included per Section 2.5.3.1B.
  - Mr. McTigue confirmed this would be added to the site plan.
- Missing engineers stamp and wetland scientist stamp per Sections 2.5.4.1D and 2.5.4.1E.
  - Mr. McTigue confirmed this would be added.
- The statement required per Section 2.5.4.2E should be added to the plans.
  - Mr. McTigue confirmed this would be added to the site plan.
- Indicate where Low Impact Development Design practices have been incorporated per Section 7.1.
  - Mr. McTigue confirmed this would be added to the drainage plan.
- Include a statement on measures to minimize impervious surfaces per Section 7.4.3.
  - Mr. McTigue confirmed this would be added.
- Include a calculation of the maximum effective impervious surface as a percentage of the site per Section 7.4.3.2.
  - Mr. McTigue noted that there was something that talked about the open space, but it can be clarified further.
- How will the propane tank be protected from vehicles?
  - Mr. McTigue noted that 3 foot-sized boulders would be added in front of it, so cars won't drive over it. Mr. Howe questioned if the tank was underground. Mr. Calderola confirmed it was.
- Rain Garden #1 appears to be "in rock" per test pit data.
  - Mr. McTigue responded that it is weather-fractured rock and it was dug down to elevation below 6 feet. Mr. Pezzullo requested clarification on the infiltration rate. Mr. McTigue responded that they dug down into the rock and put sand on top of it to do the infiltration rate. Mr. Pezzullo responded that as long as it meets the state standard it was fine. Mr. McTigue confirmed that it does meet the state standards.
- Provide separation distance of SHWT from bottom of rain garden #2.
  - Mr. McTigue responded that this would show on the details.
- Provide cleanouts at change in direction of sewer service pipe and proposed drain pipe from rain garden #1.
  - Mr. McTigue agreed.
- Concern about snow storage adequate and the turn around area seemed shallow. Mr. Cracknell just want to confirm it would work. Mr. Calderola confirmed it would, and noted they have a turning template on this. Mr. Eby confirmed that it looked fine to him.

## 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. Add additional information to the plans as noted by TAC including:

- A.) Sketch for utilities shall be reviewed and approved by DPW prior to Planning Board submission.
- B.) Grading plan should be updated to revise direction of runoff from driveway for Unit 3 to travel directly to small wetland. Grading should be adjusted to berm or flatten lawn outside of driveway so drainage is slowed and filtered by lawn area before entering wetland. A post-construction drainage analysis shall be required to confirm if any changes are required.
- C.) Include a Green Building Statement per Section 2.5.3.1A.  
Footprint and GFA should be included per Section 2.5.3.1B.  
Add engineers stamp and wetland scientist stamp per Sections 2.5.4.1D and 2.5.4.1E.
- D.) The statement required per Section 2.5.4.2E should be added to the plans. Indicate where Low Impact Development Design practices have been incorporated per Section 7.1.
- E.) 7.4.3 Include a statement on measures to minimize impervious surfaces per Section.
- F.) Include a calculation of the maximum effective impervious surface as a percentage of the site per Section 7.4.3.2.
- G.) Add boulders to plans as proposed to protect propane tank from vehicles. H.) Raingarden #1 should meet separation requirement for state standards. I.) Provide separation distance of SHWT from bottom of rain garden #2 on details. J.) Provide cleanouts at change in direction of sewer service pipe and proposed drain pipe from rain garden #1.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Desfosses confirmed that the comments are minimal enough to review internally. Ms. Walker added that the 500-gallon and sketch of utilities should be reviewed by the DPW prior to the Planning Board.

Mr. Calderola commented that the six parking spaces in front of the buildings are shown as brick and pavement. They may end up being a more decorative masonry. Ms. Walker responded that if it's changed then it might need an administrative approval. Mr. Desfosses responded that the applicants could add a note that says the driveway surface is to be determined.

.....

H. The application of **Wentworth-Douglass Hospital, Applicant**, for property located at **56, 73 and 121 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction a 2-story, 25,000 ± s.f. medical office building and a 3-story, 60,000 ± s.f., medical office building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 303 as Lots 4, 5, & 87 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District. (This application was postponed at the December 5, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this Site Review to the next regularly schedule TAC meeting on January 30, 2018, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

## II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **National Propane LP, Owner, and Unitil Corporation, Applicant**, for property located at **1166 Greenland Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval for installation of a launch and retrieval/maintenance facility along the regional gas main that runs along Greenland Road, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 280 as Lot 2 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

### SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Rob Sorely and Bob Schumer from Unitil were present to speak to the application. The project is for a launch and retrieval facility. It's for the maintenance of a gas line. This application has been through a TAC workshop. This facility is in the location it's proposed in because this is where the main changes from an 8 inch to a 10-inch pipe. The pig gets sent down the line and the applicants wanted to put this facility at that point. The location can be moved a little to one side or another, but the goal is to not change the location too much. The original plan was to put the facility on a knoll; however, there is a septic system already there. It cannot be relocated. There is wetland impact. This application went before the Conservation Commission. It got approval with a couple conditions. The application has been through the Zoning Board of Appeals as well. The applicants have submitted to DES for wetland approval. This has also submitted to Greenland, NH Conservation Commission as well.

- Force main shall be at least 3' from fence
  - Mr. Sorely responded that they have looked at the NFPA codes, and nothing seems to cover the pipes. There is a federal code that is a general statement saying the pipe shall be protected.
- Guardrail needs to be extended to protect this from errant cars.
  - Mr. Sorely responded that the Right of way line is at 28 feet, so this is out of the clear zone. A guardrail was added to the current plan. It was requested to look at it for the south side, so it's been added there as well. The preference would be to have it adjacent to the facility.
- Guardrail should be carried around to protect the southwest side of the enclosure.
  - Mr. Sorely responded that square boxes were added to add a decorative iron fence that has protective features at the top and there will be a 2x2 stone column every three panels. Then there will be black mesh on the other side to further screen the facility.

Mr. Sorely noted that the Conservation Commission asked that the impacted upland vegetation be replaced. That has been included on the plans. They requested that the outfall location be cleaned up in that area and native species be put in to assist with water quality treatment. The applicants will strip out all the exotic plants and will replant with native plants.

Mr. Britz questioned what the applicants will be planting in the wetland area? Mr. Sorely responded that it is a mixture of rodesia, dogwood and blueberry.

Ms. Walker noted that a few changes were indicated that weren't on the plans today, so it will need to be updated for the Planning Board.

Mr. Howe questioned how long the guardrail was that will protect the side toward Greenland. Mr. Sorely responded that it will go about 24 feet. Mr. Howe noted that the preference would be to go as far as they could with the guardrail and not hug it so close to the fence line. Mr. Sorley responded that the goal was to not be in the DOT right of way. Mr. Howe clarified how to skew it out to avoid that. Mr. Sorely confirmed that would be fine.

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

- 1. A detail should be included in the plan set for the decorative fencing with granite columns proposed.
- 2. Additional guardrail should be added as directed by TAC and should be carried around to protect the southwest side of the enclosure.
- 3. Force main shall be at least 3' from fence.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Cracknell moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:00 pm, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee