

MINUTES

SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

2:00 PM

FEBRUARY 27, 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; Carl Roediger, Fire Department. Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT: n/a

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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 January 30, 2018 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering and Marty Goodman, applicant, were present to speak to the application. The zoning for this project has changed between the last meeting and this meeting. The applicants have worked out the fire suppression issues. Mr. Weinrieb addressed the TAC comments.

- Exit driveway should be just one lane, not two, for safety. If two lanes, the vehicle waiting to turn left would block the visibility of the vehicle turning right, and with no shoulder to creep out into, would present potential crash situation with southbound through traffic on Woodbury.
 - Mr. Weinrieb agreed. It was no issue to make that change. At the last meeting the plans had a single lane and TAC asked them to see if one or two lanes were required based on the traffic report. The report came back inconclusive, and so they could do either. Based on the TAC feedback they added two lanes. Mr. Eby responded that the traffic analysis shows one lane would be fine.
- Crosswalk cannot lead to parking lot. It must lead to a walkway or be eliminated.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that TAC suggested the crosswalk to enable people to walk from the mattress store to the walk up window. It was added to the plans, but it can be

removed if TAC does not want it. Ms. Walker noted that this TAC comment did not disagree that a crosswalk would be nice, but right now this is not consistent with the crosswalk standards. It would be better to eliminate it than have it go into a parking lot.

- The applicant needs to show an appropriate SMH detail, label the asbestos pipe correctly and put instructions on the plan on how to deal with the pipe. The DPW will likely want to witness the installation of the manhole.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that he would like to work with the DPW on what they want to see specifically for that detail. Mr. Desfosses responded that was fine. Mr. Pezzullo agreed.
- The applicant needs to capture more of the parking lot flow into the catch basin system in order to do a better job with pretreatment.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded this site currently has no storm water management. This application has been through the Conservation Commission and it does have their endorsement. There is no opportunity to add a catch basin in the loading dock area because of the grades. Better treatment will be achieved if it is an open flow that goes through a treatment area and then to the rain garden. The only area that would not be getting double treatment is the loading dock area. If that is not acceptable, then they would be open to guidance on the matter. Mr. Pezzullo agreed with Mr. Weinrieb about the loading dock area. A sediment floor bay could be added on the easement area and on the other side. That's a possibility. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the original design had a larger treatment area and TAC told them to get the treatment out of the easement area. This plan is meeting the goal except for that one loading dock area. This is a developed area so the applicants did what they could.
 - Mr. Pezzullo commented that the larger storm water basin could be expanded toward the dumpster area. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the Conservation Commission asked them to make it separate to make a pre-treatment area. Mr. Pezzullo noted that a sediment floor bay could be put in where the smaller pond is and the bigger area could be expanded toward the dumpster. It would require some grading, but the sediment floor bay would catch sediment and clean it. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the larger one could not be much larger because of the slopes in that area. Mr. Pezzullo strongly recommended that the applicants look at this more. A curb may be needed for some of the drive through area to direct the flow to the low point. The loading dock area would be hard to treat and it's a smaller area. It is fine. Mr. Weinrieb noted that this is achievable, but it's contrary to the UNH and other runoff disbursement practices. Concentrating the runoff will cause more erosion. Mr. Pezzullo noted that pretreatment is required, so it should be included.
 - Ms. Walker asked Mr. Britz if the Conservation Commission would have an issue with changes. Mr. Britz responded that it did not sound like it would be a huge change. It would be basically in the same area with plantings. Unless it changes dramatically, then it will be similar from a landscape perspective. Ms. Walker noted that they would stipulate the applicants would work with DPW on this.
- The driveway should be modified to allow only one car out at a time.
- DPW will need an easement for the water main.

- Mr. Weinrieb noted that they did more research on this and it may not be the actual City main. It might be the water service coming into the building. Mr. Desfosses responded that he would talk with the applicants about this offline. They can look at what was there before. If that is a City main, then they will need an easement.
- Mr. Weinrieb noted that he would do more research on the seasonal high water table. Mr. Pezzullo responded that if that line is not an 8-inch line, then they might need to do more for this. Also, the filter media mix does not match the requirements. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it was a modified mix because of the location of the site. Mr. Pezzullo noted that it's close, but was not sure why it was changed. This would change the maintenance requirements.
- Mr. Weinrieb noted that they did not add the 15% because this project is not under AOT. They followed the extreme flow precipitation tables from Cornell. AOT requires 15% over the Cornell study. Mr. Pezzullo thought the new requirement was to use the Cornell study with the 15%. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the City regulation point to the state requirements. If the City wants the project to follow that 15%, then it needs to be a standard change. Ms. Walker agreed the project should follow the state standard until a change is made. Unless a project needs an AOT permit anyway then it would need the 15%. Mr. Desfosses commented that AOT looks at very big sites. This site is very small. Mr. Pezzullo requested the applicants update the table in the report. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that he would.
- Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that they would provide detail for the storm water manhole. Mr. Desfosses noted that they should give it an overlay to keep it in good condition.
- The sidewalk along Woodbury should be resurfaced in kind across the entire frontage.
- The layout shown on sheet C-2 shows the 14 x 14 patio on the east side of the building with the overall structure being rectangular. The layout depicted on sheet A1.0 shows the patio in a different configuration. Which is correct?
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that the patio design on the plans was correct. The other was a prototype. That would be corrected. Mr. Roediger questioned why it would still be in the package? Mr. Weinrieb responded that it could be removed. Ms. Walker noted that the patio and the detail should match. It should be consistent.
- The 2 "Black Tupelo" trees (Ns on plan) depicted on sheet L-1 appear to encroach on driveways and parking when mature. Consider smaller plantings?
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they talked to the landscape architect. Eventually those trees will be much higher. The preference would be to stay with those trees. Mr. Roediger expressed concern about trying to keep the trees out of the roadway. If they could be pruned to be kept out of the roadway, then they are fine.
- On sheet C-2, SITE NOTES CONTINUED, Note 21 should read: Existing building (Mattress Store) shall have a fire suppressions installed within two years of Planning Board Approval for the Aroma Joe's building.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they have been working with the Fire Department to get a fire suppression system. Mr. Roediger clarified that note 21 would be changed. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that it would be changed.

Ms. Walker clarified that the dumpster location has to be 10-feet from the property line. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they would be putting the dumpster right near the other dumpster. Ms. Walker noted that a variance would be needed for 10 feet and waiver would be needed if it could not be 20 feet.

Mr. Britz noted that a seed mix could be added for the outfall for storm water pond 1 on the drainage and grading plan. Mr. Weinrieb 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

Ms. Walker noted that they have a list of stipulations and the applicants need to work with the DPW before moving forward to Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Roediger, with the following stipulations (unless otherwise noted, all changes listed shall be included on the revised plans submitted to Planning Board for approval):

1. Exit driveway shall be just one lane.
2. Crosswalk that leads to parking lot shall be eliminated.
3. The applicant shall coordinate with DPW to show an appropriate sewer manhole (SMH) detail, label the asbestos pipe correctly and put instructions on the plan on how to deal with the pipe. It shall be noted that DPW will witness the installation of the manhole.
4. The applicant shall review ability of expanding stormwater pond #1 to accommodate more pre-treatment of the stormwater run-off from the parking area. DPW shall review and approve the stormwater design as revised.
5. The applicant shall confirm the owner and adequacy of sizing of the water main and whether an easement for the water main is required.
6. The applicant shall provide seasonal high water table (SHWT) in locations of proposed ponds.
7. The applicant shall provide a detail for each pond including any overflow/discharge structures. Indicate separation from SHWT.
8. Pipe slopes and inverts shall be shown for all pipes.
9. Applicant shall update the filter media mix to match NH Stormwater requirements.
10. The maintenance requirements for proposed ponds shall indicate minimum twice annual inspection.
11. The rainfall intensities shown in the Stormwater Modeling Summary Table in the drainage report shall match hydroCAD analysis.
12. The applicant shall provide a detail for proposed new SMH connection to the existing sewer.
13. The plans shall be updated to show that the sidewalk along Woodbury Avenue shall be resurfaced in kind across the entire frontage.
14. The layout shown on sheet C-2 shows the 14 x 14 patio on the east side of the building with the overall structure being rectangular. The layout depicted on sheet A1.0 shall match this configuration.

15. The two “Black Tupelo” trees (Ns on plan) depicted on sheet L-1 appear to encroach on driveways and parking when mature. Notes shall include maintenance requirements for trimming.
16. On sheet C-2, SITE NOTES CONTINUED, Note 21 shall read: “Existing building (Mattress Store) shall have a fire suppressions installed within two years of Planning Board Approval for the Aroma Joe’s building.”
17. The applicant shall note the dumpster location distance from the property line, revise the location should it be less than 10 ft. and note the requirement for a waiver if it is determined to be less than 20 ft.
18. In addition to planting Seed Mix A in Stormwater Ponds 1 and 2, Seed Mix A shall be planted in the area of the outfall of Stormwater Pond 1 from the rip rap outlet up to the edge of wetland.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. 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 \pm 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 \pm 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 \pm 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 October 31, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Colwell from MSC and Jim Bouzianis, the property owner, spoke to the application. Mr. Colwell noted that this is a three-lot subdivision on Rockingham Ave. There is a bike path to the south, Woodbury Ave. is to the east, and the Turnpike is to the west. The applicants attended a work session on October 27, 2018 and the comments from that session have been addressed. There was a delay due to a question about the sound level. There was a question if there should be a sound barrier between the lot and I-95. It was determined that a barrier was not needed. The sound study concluded there was very little sound increase.

- Homes should be constructed with sound deadening materials to insulate them from highway noise.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed.
- Rockingham Ave carries a lot of traffic to the Turnpike. Residents on this street have complained of speeding vehicles. The new residents of these homes will likely have the same complaints. The applicant should consider providing a permanent radar speed feedback sign on the westbound side of the roadway heading towards the turnpike.

- Mr. Colwell spoke with the applicant about this prior to the meeting. A speed limit sign may be necessary, but we don't feel that it is the applicant's responsibility to add it. This is an enforcement issue, and the applicant doesn't want to provide sign.
- The 6" water line will not be allowed. Show individual services for all lots.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed the water services would be separated. The plans would be updated.
- The drainage easements along the road need to continue across lot 1 along the road then adjacent and parallel to the LAROW line 20' wide and needs to include the wetland and wetland buffer areas of lot 1. In addition to the drainage easement, we may need flowage rights to the wet portion of Lot 1 for future stormwater infrastructure.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed that the easement should extend to the wetland. However is there a need to include the buffer area? Can someone clarify this? Mr. Desfosses noted that the reason for the request is for storm water separation from Woodbury Ave. Mr. Colwell noted there could be a swale down to the wetland. Mr. Desfosses responded that in the future the City would put in drainage down the street. It would help the City to include the buffer area to make it available for a future project for storm water treatment.
 - Mr. Britz noted they should consider putting the easement on the buffer area to prevent future building. Mr. Cracknell commented that building would be allowed with a CUP in the buffer. Mr. Britz responded that was why the buffer should be in the easement.
 - Mr. Cracknell questioned if the whole buffer area was needed for the drainage. Mr. Desfosses responded that he was not sure. That's why the whole buffer area was requested for the easement and the City is relaxing the request for an overlay. Mr. Colwell expressed concern that most of the lot would be encumbered by a drainage easement. If it could be limited to the buffer area and the wetland that would be helpful. Mr. Britz noted that it would be better if it could be out of the buffer. Mr. Pezzullo was not sure that was possible. Mr. Cracknell commented that the house is right on the buffer.
 - Mr. Britz suggested adding a drainage system that started at the driveway and to help think about the shape of the easement. Ms. Walker noted that the easement could be for drainage and conservation. Mr. Desfosses commented that it's better if the drainage area is bigger to make it more natural. Mr. Pezzullo commented that the swale in the backyards would not be needed for municipal reasons once this drainage was built.
 - Mr. Bouzianis clarified that the City was looking for an easement on the westerly side in the wetlands area and the buffer area. Ms. Walker responded there were two proposals. One is for drainage and one is for conservation to prevent building in the buffer. Mr. Desfosses noted that the drainage would be a closed underground pipe going into a head wall then into a basin that would have an outfall into the wetland. Mr. Bouzianis clarified that there was no way to locate general the limits of that ahead of time. Mr. Desfosses responded that without the engineering he would not be able to know the limits. Mr. Bouzianis noted that he did not have a problem with it as long as it did not limit the use of the lot for day-to-day use. Mr. Desfosses commented that depending on how big it needs to be it could just be a rolling hill. Mr. Bouzianis questioned if that would result in tree clearing. Mr. Desfosses confirmed it would. Mr. Colwell commented that the drainage easement design is still to be determined. Mr.

Cracknell noted that there should be a clear limit, so a buyer will know what they are buying. Ms. Walker noted that they would work on the language so that they don't have to commit now, and it could be worked out later.

- The City will not require an overlay of Rockingham, however all utility trenches need to be guaranteed against settling for a period of 2 years from the date of the final utility trench.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed that would be done by the contractor.
- The proposed underground electric and communications lines shall be located on the lots and not in the drainage easement.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed. They will be moved onto the lot. Mr. Bouzianis questioned if two feet was enough. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it was.
- The individual homeowners will be required to maintain the drainage swale behind the houses for perpetuity.
 - Mr. Colwell noted that Mr. Desfosses explained that at some point the municipal runoff won't go into the swale, but the swale will take runoff from the hill. Mr. Bouzianis questioned if that would be covered in the deed restriction. Mr. Colwell confirmed it needed to be added.

Mr. Colwell agreed to the TAC comment that each house should have a separate water connection.

Mr. Colwell agreed to the TAC comment about the sewer size.

Mr. Colwell responded to the TAC comment about the rain garden. He did not feel that test pits were needed. Mr. Desfosses agreed that the soil is good.

Mr. Colwell confirmed that the flow from the existing catch basin has been evaluated. The flow coming out of that is almost negligible and was incorporated into the drainage analysis.

Mr. Colwell confirmed that they would remove comment "to be removed" about the foundation on sheet 2.

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 they would need to work out the drainage easement.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the applicant said they weren't responsible for speed signs and he agreed with that.

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

1. A note shall be added that future homes should be constructed with sound deafening materials to insulate them from highway noise.
2. The 6" water line shall be updated or removed to match City requirements and individual water services shall be provided for all lots.
3. A drainage easement and no-build restriction within the 100' wetland buffer shall be provided on proposed Lot 1 for future City stormwater management infrastructure (to be built by the City). The easement location shall be coordinated with the Planning Department and DPW prior to Planning Board review.
4. All utility trenches on Rockingham Avenue shall be guaranteed against settling for a period of 2 years from the date of the final utility trench.
5. The proposed underground electric and communications lines shall be located on the lots and outside of the proposed drainage easement area.
6. Documentation shall be provided that deed restrictions have been updated to outline that individual homeowners shall be required to maintain the drainage swale behind the houses for perpetuity.
7. Sewer laterals shall be 6" in diameter.
8. Removal of the existing foundation shall require a wetland conditional use approval. The foundation shall remain on the plan unless the applicant intends to apply for a wetlands conditional use permit prior to subdivision approval.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Clipper Traders, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street**, **Portsmouth Lumber and Hardware, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street**, and **Boston and Maine Corporation, Owner**, for railroad property located between **Bartlett Street and Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Subdivision Approval to consolidate and subdivide five lots and a portion of another into 5 lots, a right-of-way, and a remainder of one lot as follows:

- (1) Proposed Lot #1 having an area of 20,678 \pm s.f. (0.4747 \pm acres) and 143.44' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.
- (2) Proposed Lot #2 having an area of 53,137 \pm s.f. (1.2198 \pm acres) and 83.20' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street and 385.64' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (3) Proposed Lot #3 having an area of 104,320 \pm s.f. (2.3949 \pm acres) and 816.61' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (4) Proposed Lot #4 having an area of 63,825 \pm s.f. (1.4652 \pm acres) and 487' \pm of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (5) Proposed Lot #5 having an area of 177,643 \pm s.f. (4.0781 \pm acres) and 297.73' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (6) Proposed Right-of-Way having an area of 63,866 \pm s.f. (1.4662 \pm acres).
- (7) Map 164 Lot 4 reducing in area from 13 \pm acres to 4.7 \pm acres and having 75' \pm of continuous street frontage on Maplewood Avenue, and decreasing intermittent street frontage of 234' \pm on Bartlett Street to 105' \pm of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.

Said properties are shown on Assessors Map 157 as Lots 1 & 2 and Assessors Map 164 as Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and are located within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W), Office Research (OR) and Transportation Corridor (TC) Zoning Districts.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** to the April 3, 2018 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Portsmouth West End Development, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **145 Brewery Lane**, requesting Site Plan Review for a 92 unit, 4-story apartment building with a footprint of 18,430 \pm s.f. and gross floor area of 92,150 \pm s.f., consisting of parking on the lower level and 23 dwelling units on each of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th levels, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 154 as Lot 2 and lies within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Doug Larosa and John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering and Eric Chinburg from Chinburg Builders spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon noted that the project is going to take advantage of some of the bonuses allowed. They will be creating 20% open space on the lot, which will allow a larger footprint and a higher building. The site currently has three buildings. One is a former DPW building that will be torn down. A large pile of dirt will be removed as part of the project as well. There will be a drive access from the end of Jewel Court and Chevrolet Ave. There will be a speed bump in the middle to slow speed down. There will be some sidewalk access points to the building. A sidewalk will come down the drive and connect to part of the community space. Mr. Chagnon passed out a rendering of the view looking toward the building. The rendering showed parking spots and round stones that formed a circular sidewalk element. It also showed an open gathering space with a stairway up to the first floor. The south and west side are at a higher-grade elevation of 20-23. The open space is at an elevation of 17.5. There are balconies to give the building nice modulation. On the first floor level along the north side of the building and the south side there are patios. Those are detailed in the landscape plans. Parking is achieved off of the cut through drive. There will be parking coming along the existing buildings. There are entrance and exit points to the lower part of the building.

- With the high number of pedestrians expected to be generated by the new residential units, the applicant needs to provide better pedestrian facilities and connectivity to the surrounding neighborhood, including but not limited to sidewalks along Jewell Court, Albany Street, Chevrolet Ave and Brewery Lane.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that those were good goals, but he thought they had established connectivity in the design. The sidewalk was brought all the way around to connect to a sidewalk that exists on 125 Brewery Lane. Mr. Desfosses commented that the sidewalk goes nowhere. Mr. Chagnon responded that it goes all the way to Cass Street. It's interrupted by four parking spaces, but it goes all the way. Ms. Walker questioned if it was on City property. Mr. Chagnon was not sure. It has been tough with Plaza 800.

On the previous approval there was a connection made on the west end across the street. If they build a set of stairs then the sidewalk could connect to the sidewalk on Plaza 800, which extends to Islington Street. That connects to the Hannaford. Plaza 800 is agreeable to that connection. Chevrolet Ave. is not public, so that would require the landowner to agree and easements would be needed. They are not in a position to do that. Ms. Walker noted that they would have to follow up with comments on that.

- The applicant will need to develop a sidewalk down Brewery and Albany Streets to Cass St.
- The applicant will need to develop a sidewalk on Jewell Ct to Islington St.
- The applicant will need to develop a sidewalk down Chevrolet Ave.
- The applicant is showing insufficient amounts of parking for this intensive a development. The maximum number of spaces allowed by ordinance should be provided.
- Juliet, The 12' concrete sidewalk being shown is maybe too wide. 8' width is probably sufficient.
- What is the groundwater elevation? Will the site as proposed need dewatering?
 - Mr. Chagnon replied that the elevation is at 13. If there were more specific comments about that then they would be interested in hearing them. They are working with the DPW on this. The developer is willing to allow the City access to the site.
- No metal wire should be placed in sidewalks on public land.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed it could be changed to fiber.
- 3rd Party inspection for all on site utility work.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was not a problem
- The plans should show a clear open space layer that includes the proposed community space areas (including the SF for each area)
 - Mr. Chagnon provided a better exhibit at the TAC meeting. It had a table on the right with the green space calculations. Mr. Cracknell commented that the exhibit was helpful. Ms. Walker noted that they needed to use terms that are in the ordinance. Mr. Cracknell responded that green space should be changed to open space. The four main areas that make up the open space are the natural park on the left, two pocket parks and a square in front of the building. A wide pedestrian sidewalk counts as open space. Mr. Cracknell recommended getting rid of the four parking spaces to widen the sidewalk to 12 feet. The parking spaces can be relocated. Ms. Walker noted that community space needed to be deeded to the city of Portsmouth. Right now the applicants are proposing a pocket park that would be deeded to city of Portsmouth. Mr. Chagnon confirmed it was in the middle of the development. Would a pedestrian easement satisfy the easement requirement? Ms. Walker confirmed it would. Mr. Cracknell commented that it looked like there was an out parcel that has parking and the green space is not even five feet wide. What would screen the abutting parking from the new parking? Mr. Chagnon responded that the owner wanted a fence, and that is detailed in the plans. Mr. Cracknell confirmed that was fine. The only other thing to consider is that walkways can count as open space. One landscaped island is open space but the one on the other end is nothing. Look at the landscaped islands that could be open space. Just be consistent. Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- The entrance spacing should be shown for all buildings.
 - Mr. Cracknell clarified that every door for the public needs an arrow for where it is. Mr. Chagnon asked if Mr. Cracknell was ok with the doors on the other building. Mr. Cracknell responded that it would be nice to know where they are.

- The site plan should be changed to remove the outbuilding table as there isn't an accessory or outbuilding in the project. I think we can treat the rear building as another principal building and assume the setback requirements have been met along the public street using the existing buildings on Brewery Lane. Otherwise, the new building would need to be no more than 15 feet off of the Plaza 800 driveway if we treat that as a secondary frontage.
 - Mr. Cracknell clarified that all the other streets are private, and so the frontage is only on Brewery Lane. The frontage requirements need to be met there. Ms. Walker noted that they still need to determine if they are private streets or if they can count as frontage. The City needs to determine the status of the streets.
- The open space figures seem inconsistent between the table and the notes.
- The parking requirements should be fully detailed.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that notes about the parking had been included. Ms. Walker clarified that they should be put on the summary. Mr. Chagnon agreed that it would be updated.
- Public access easements should be clearly shown for all infrastructure and community space areas.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed. Ms. Walker clarified that anything easement related could be on there. It just should not be confusing. Mr. Pezzullo suggested they differentiate the existing easements from the proposed.
- I would suggest removal of the 5 parking spaces along Brewery Lane as they prevent a sidewalk connection and the vehicles overhang into the street.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed. Mr. Larosa noted that 12 feet is required for 4 stories. Mr. Cracknell noted that it's on the same property. This goes back to the question of where is the frontage for the lot. Brewery Lane definitely is frontage.
- How does present design comply with NFPA 1 - Fire Code, Section 18.2.3.2.1 concerning FD access to the building?
 - Mr. Roediger noted that a 12-foot wide driveway was not access to the building. Ms. Walker commented that they did talk about this last time. Mr. Roediger noted that a 12-foot wide path is a stretch to be able to get within 50 feet of the door. It doesn't comply with the code. Mr. Larosa explained the fire exhibit and showed how to access the sprinkler room. Mr. Roediger responded that it did not address access to the building. The only door not protected by greenery is that one door. We need to be able to get within 50 feet of the door. Mr. Larosa asked what an acceptable width would be. Mr. Chinburg asked if it could be 14 feet wide. Mr. Roediger responded that he would like to see the road wider, and that would be a huge help. Mr. Chinburg confirmed they could add a note in the plan to keep it plowed to its full width in the winter. Mr. Roediger confirmed that would be fine.
- The landscape plan should include the required statements per Section 2.13.4 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be added.
- The checklist submitted references the supplementary information for information pertaining to where dark sky friendly measures have been implemented. The applicant should clarify where it is addressed in the supplemental info.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that was correct. It was left off in the sheets. They will be coming. Mr. Walker confirmed that was fine.

Mr. Chagnon responded to the TAC comment about building a sewer connection to the sewer main. The plan is showing two different sewer connections. They would like to connect in two locations. Mr. Desfosses noted that it wasn't clear where they were. Mr. Chagnon noted that they would label it better. Mr. Pezzullo noted that it looked like they wanted to use the existing sewer. Mr. Larosa responded that they wanted the opportunity to connect in two locations; the front and back. The velocity calculations will be run. Mr. Pezzullo commented that it wasn't clear what it served. The calculations need to show that the pipes are properly sized. Mr. Larosa confirmed that he would clarify the detail.

TAC made a comment about labeling the proposed utility and water connections. They are not labeled or sized. Mr. Larosa responded that one was for fire and one was for domestic. Mr. Desfosses noted that they require a bypass to be set up for the water meter so one can be taken out at a time. Mr. Pezzullo added that would be part of the application for the water permit.

TAC made a comment about the water and infiltration basins. Mr. Larosa responded that there are two infiltration basins coming off the parking lot. The one to the east will need a membrane to the water. The other one will only have a membrane if it needs to. Mr. Desfosses noted that the City is aware of the pollution in the ground. Mr. Larosa commented that the pollutant plumes do flow to the west and will have an impervious line. They will look at the east one, and will do several test pits there. Mr. Pezzullo clarified that the filtration basins would be further defined. Mr. Larosa confirmed they would and there will be a filtration basin that will be grass with landscaping around it.

TAC made a comment requesting the applicants to provide a design detail for the proposed water quality unit. Mr. Larosa confirmed they would do that and they have been in touch with AOT on this.

Mr. Pezzullo raised a question about the rainfall level. Mr. Chagnon agreed that it needed to be revised. Mr. Larosa confirmed they would add 15%.

TAC made a comment about outlet 3 on sheet C7. Mr. Larosa responded that was another filtration structure and detail would be added.

TAC made a comment about the contour and direction of the flows for storm water runoff. Mr. Larosa confirmed they would add arrows to the plans to show the directional flows.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that he did not see how the units were modeled. They weren't part of the drainage analysis. Mr. Larosa confirmed the models weren't in the analysis, but it would be updated. They will slow down the runoff. Mr. Pezzullo noted that the offsite runoff from Plaza 800 and Chevrolet Ave. weren't mentioned in the study, but should be addressed. Mr. Larosa responded that water is collected along Chevrolet Ave. at a low point and along Plaza 800 at a low point. It will go directly into a pipe and down to Jewel Court. Mr. Larosa confirmed it would be modeled. Mr. Pezzullo clarified that it did not need to be in the model, but should be addressed in the calculations. Mr. Larosa confirmed it would be addressed.

Ms. Walker noted that they would follow up on the sidewalk discussion. The City staff will recommend what to do for sidewalk connections. The goal is to make sure the site is walk able within the site and offsite. Ms. Walker asked for clarification on the parking. Mr. Chinburg responded that he has done a number of projects with shared parking and this is a sufficient amount.

Mr. Marsilia questioned where the generator was on the plan. Mr. Larosa pointed out the gas generator, and confirmed that they would label it.

Mr. Chinburg commented on the sidewalk discussion. The residents are all going to want to go to Islington Street. They won't want to go to the private streets. There is good connection to Islington Street and the City should take that flow into consideration. Ms. Walker confirmed that the applicant would have time to respond to whatever was recommended.

PUBLIC HEARING

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering represented the Griffin family from Plaza 800. They are in general support of the project. They do have some issues, but they will be working offline with the developer on them. Eric Weinrieb spoke as a private citizen as well and expressed his support for the project.

Tamara Markovsky from 30 Aldrich Court is a direct abutter to the project. This was the first abutter's notice they have gotten, but it sounded like the project is far into the process. It is a nice looking building and the design on Chevrolet Ave. is good. Ms. Markovsky expressed concern about the scale and size of the building. The article in the Portsmouth Herald said that the building would be 82-units but it's 92 units. There are traffic concerns for Chevrolet Ave. Right now it's 30 mph, which is already too fast. This project could increase the volume up to 150 cars. The community space and natural park areas are confusing on the plan. Part of it looks into Ms. Markovsky's yard. Mr. Britz confirmed that part would remain as is. People will be able to access it, but it won't be changing. Ms. Markovsky supported the wide sidewalks and would love to have that with the park and the lighting. That is appreciated. These plans were difficult to find online. Ms. Walker noted that if this application doesn't move forward to Planning Board today, then another abutter notice won't get sent out. Feel free to call the Planning Department if you are having trouble finding plans and we can assist.

Debi Pekowsky from 121 Aldrich Court expressed some concerns for the project. Ms. Pekowsky's house is at the lowest point on Aldrich Court. The means it will be lower than the building, which years ago was only going to be two stories high. Now it is four stories with 92 units that can look down into her yard. What will be done to mitigate the fishbowl effect? Mr. Cracknell asked how tall the buffer trees were? Ms. Pekowsky responded that they were 30 feet or so. Ms. Walker noted that this was a good concern, but TAC could not respond to everything that day. Ms. Pekowsky questioned how this project got to 4 stories? Mr. Cracknell responded that there was a community meeting years ago when they rezoned the West End. They looked at all sorts of urban design issues and went through six months of City Council meetings before the code was adopted. It took a year and a half to adopt this code. Four stories are allowed within the code. This building was allowed in the prior code as well. A buffer line was incorporated in the plan. There is 200 feet from the back of your lot to the site as part of the code.

Dave Markovsky from 30 Aldrich Court was in general in support of the building and appreciated the quality and aesthetic. Mr. Markovsky's concern was traffic on Chevrolet Ave. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic. People walk in the street right now and more traffic would discourage people to walk as much as they do now.

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 asked Mr. Eby about the additional traffic analysis. Mr. Eby responded that the project generated 50 trips at peak hour. Generally 100 trips at peak hour is what triggers a traffic study. Ms. Walker clarified that Mr. Eby felt that he had enough information to make a City recommendation. Mr. Eby confirmed that he did.

Mr. Cracknell moved to **postpone** to the April 3, 2018 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Britz moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:00 pm, seconded by Mr. Pezzullo. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee