

MINUTES

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

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

2:00 PM

OCTOBER 30, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department and Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT: n/a

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of minutes from the October 2, 2018 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Desfosses moved to approve the minutes from the October 2, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. OLD 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 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 20,667 ± s.f. (0.4747 ± acres) and 143.44' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.

- (2) Proposed Lot #2 having an area of 51,952 ± s.f. (1.1927 ± acres) and 80.91' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street and 386.88' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (3) Proposed Lot #3 having an area of 102,003± s.f. (2.3417 ± acres) and 809.23' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (4) Proposed Lot #4 having an area of 61,781 ± s.f. (1.4183 ± acres) and 481'± of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (5) Proposed Lot #5 having an area of 177,435 ± s.f. (4.0733 ± acres) and 297.42' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (6) Proposed Right-of-Way having an area of 69,621 ± s.f. (1.5983 ± acres).
- (7) Map 164 Lot 4 reducing in area from 13 ± acres to 4.7 ± acres and having 75'± of continuous street frontage on Maplewood Avenue, and decreasing intermittent street frontage of 234'± on Bartlett Street to 105'± 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) and Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) Zoning Districts. (This application was postponed at the October 2, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Ms. Walker clarified that this application review was for preliminary and final subdivision approval, and it would be corrected in the advertised posting.

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering, Attorney Time Phoenix, Steve Pernaw from Pernaw Traffic Consulting, Ed Hayes, Dan Pinciara, and Doug Maletti from Ambit Engineering were present to speak to the application.

TAC Comments:

- The angle parking spaces along the roadway are an improvement over existing conditions with the current traffic volumes. If future development is proposed on the lots on the roadway, the placement and orientation of these spaces may need to be revisited.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed with this comment.
- Lot 5 should have an accessible ADA parking space identified.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed and confirmed the correction would be made. Mr. Chagnon noted that the parking and the snow storage were going to be swapped on the plan. It made more sense operationally and this would make the ADA spot closer to the building.

- The access easement across Lot 2 could result in more traffic from Lots 2 and 3 using that secondary driveway onto Bartlett Street. It would be preferable to have the Lot 2 and Lot 3 traffic using the subdivision roadway to access Bartlett Street. With that in mind, the access easement should be only on Lot 3, not Lot 2.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would make that change on the plan.
- The street name sign detail on Sheet D2 should be updated to current MUTCD standards, with only the first letter capitalized.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that would be updated.
- Water lines may need to be updated based on results of Capacity Analysis, which applicant is currently modeling in coordination with the City's consultant. ○ Mr. Chagnon agreed that should be incorporated.
- Please confirm the gas line does not need to be upsized, it should be relocated under the roadway.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that there was a preliminary meeting with Unitil. They agreed that it would most likely require coordinating the existing services into the main. The size of the main won't be determined until the services for Lot 5 go in.
- Please confirm that no trees need to be cut or trimmed in order for the electricity to be drawn from the Dover St area. Also, confirm that the lines in the neighborhood are of sufficient capacity and height as is. ○ Mr. Chagnon confirmed that Eversource had been on site and the plan is to maintain a connection on Dover St. by looping the utilities. They will coordinate with Eversource to determine whether or not that pole needs to be replaced. Mr. Chagnon expected a letter from Eversource before the application went to the Planning Board. Ms. Walker asked if Mr. Desfosses was fine with that response. Mr. Desfosses responded that it depended on what the outcome was. DPW needs to know about all of the impacts before it is moved. Ms. Walker noted that they would definitely need the letter. Mr. Chagnon responded that if they need to raise the pole 10 feet, then they might need a pole replacement. Mr. Desfosses noted that they probably would not have an issue with that. Mr. Chagnon made a note to talk with Eversource about how far back they have to go to make the connections.
- The plans are still not complete regarding the plans for Lot 1, Lot 2 Lot 3 etc. Each of those sheets should be showing individual connections for sewer, water, gas, drainage, power, communications and access for each lot. ○ Mr. Chagnon responded that he marked up the existing conditions plans with all the connections they knew about. There are some unknown services to Lot 1, but all of the remaining services are located. Mr. Chagnon requested clarification on the question. Mr. Desfosses responded that on Lot 1 there should be an access easement across Lot 2. It should be shown. Each Lot needs to be able to stand-alone with access to all utilities. Mr. Chagnon handed out the marked up plans. There is gas coming into Lot 1 currently. Mr. Chagnon did not know the location for the water. That still needed to be identified. Mr. Hayes confirmed there was water in the building. The sewer is not shown, but a sewer main crosses the Lot.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the water should come off the City Street and not be tied into another building. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be shown. There is water on Bartlett St., so it could be shown for future use. Mr. Desfosses noted that if that was the plan, then it should be noted on the plan to understand all the implications to the City. Mr. Chagnon commented that there is a catch basin that would be available in the right of way. Mr. Desfosses responded that should be noted on the plan. Mr. Chagnon noted that electric and telecomm is on the lot already too. Mr. Desfosses questioned if the utilities were on the Lot.

Mr. Chagnon responded that a utility pole crossed Lot 2. There is a pole on Lot 1. Mr. Desfosses clarified that no easements were required. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct.

- Mr. Chagnon noted that Lot 2 has gas connected to the main in the back. Water is connected to the main on the backside and the sewer runs through the lot. The electric and telecomm are in the corner now. The drainage was redone with a catch basin system that ties into the street.
- Mr. Chagnon noted that Lot 3 has water coming in the back of the building off of Bartlett across Lot 2. Mr. Desfosses questioned if the easement was shown. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it was. Ms. Walker noted that it was a sewer easement. Mr. Chagnon responded that they could put in an easement on that Lot and then they would be putting in a new main. Mr. Desfosses commented that the easement should be there and it can be abandoned when the main is installed. Mr. Chagnon noted that the sewer connects to the City main in the back, and the gas comes from the line that crosses Lot 1. They will add an easement. The drains are all there right now. Lot 3 has drainage available. ○ Mr. Desfosses questioned who would have ownership of the new road. Mr. Phoenix responded that they would all own it. Mr. Desfosses questioned if the Lot 3 easement would cross the road. Mr. Phoenix commented that they should outline the ownership. ○ Mr. Chagnon noted that Lot 4 had an existing gas service that will be in the right of way. The water comes from across Lot 5, so a water easement will be there. Mr. Desfosses noted that was only as long as that main remains in service. Mr. Chagnon commented that the sewer crossed Lot 3 and an easement was proposed. The Lot has direct drainage to the North Mill Pond. Telecomm and power comes from the right of way and feed into the back. There is also a power connection that comes from the front.
- Mr. Chagnon noted that the plan proposes to give utility companies an easement for the poles. There is an existing overhead easement, but not in the area the poles are in. The plan proposes to update the easement. It's a note on the existing easement plan. Mr. Chagnon pointed out the access easement to the Lot. Ms. Walker noted that anything that has to be relocated or will remain should show on the proposed plan. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.

- Mr. Desfosses questioned if the easement across Lot 3 went across the right of way. Mr. Phoenix confirmed that it did. Mr. Chagnon noted that Lot 5 has a water line that crosses the Lot. It does not have gas. They would have access to the utilities in the road. The sewer still needs to be located. There is no formal drainage on that Lot. Mr. Desfosses noted that they were showing the new water main on the plan, but services are going to the edge of the right of way. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. Mr. Desfosses questioned if there would be an overhead extension. Mr. Chagnon responded that the proposed service would be coming from the pole and then go underground. It is likely a new pole would be needed. They would run the conduit and leave the ropes so the infrastructure would be installed under the road. The design and location of the equipment would be subject to the Lot 5 development plan. They have to go overhead across railroad. That will remain then tied into the underground.
- Ms. Walker clarified that there would be no drainage work on Lot 5 until the future site plan, and questioned where the Lot drained to now. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. Some of the runoff goes to a low spot on the Lot and the rest goes to the pond. There are a few other hollows on the Lot. The cul-de-sac will be elevated, so the runoff will drain into the middle.
- Ms. Walker questioned if Mr. Desfosses was comfortable with this utility identification and the discussion on how they would be addressed. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that he was. Ms. Walker noted that it would need to be reviewed and approved by DPW before it went to the Planning Board. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was fine. Mr. Desfosses noted that each Lot should all stand on their own.
- Mr. Roediger had concerns about the waterline from Dover St. Mr. Desfosses noted that they would do a water study and will determine what needs to be installed. If water has to be looped, then it is highly likely that the water line will need to be replaced. Mr. Roediger was still

uncomfortable with a plan that is designed with new water line stopping at Lot 5. They have no idea about capacity requirements. Ms. Walker responded that one of the conditions of the approval would be that it needed to go through a capacity analysis with the understanding of the type of plan that they are creating. Mr. Chagnon added that there would be some flow assigned to Lot 5. Mr. Roediger noted that there should be a lot of flow assigned to the Lot given the projections. Ms. Walker noted that the purpose of this plan was to acquire the land to subdivide. The subdivision needs to be approved and TAC needs to be comfortable that it meets all the regulations. There will be lots of conditions with the approval because before anything is constructed TAC needs to know the road and utilities can handle it. One condition is that nothing will be constructed until that is known. The water capacity results would be reviewed with the Fire Department. Mr. Roediger noted that the pipe size should be noted as TBD. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that

would be updated. ○ Mr. Desfosses questioned if there was easement across the railroad. Mr. Chagnon noted that it was shown, but it will probably be a license by the time they negotiate with PanAm. There is no easement it is only a license. Mr. Chagnon anticipated that it would be private. Mr. Desfosses noted that it would most certainly be a private line, but the proper things would need to be negotiated. Mr. Chagnon agreed.

- A blanket water access easement shall be provided across the entire area for Leak detection and valve maintenance.
 - Mr. Desfosses noted that the only one not showing was access for Lot 1. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.
- The sewer easement needs to continue across the proposed cul-de-sac area continuously. The sewer easement should be separate and consistent with the sewer line and not be confused with the roadway. ○ Mr. Desfosses noted that it needed to follow the water system, so that if there are systematic leaks they can find the leaks and repair them. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated. They were planning to give the City a blanket easement in the road also.
- The location of the proposed sidewalk along the subdivision road should be buildable as shown, including relocating of any utilities. ○ Ms. Walker commented that if they were relocating poles, then it needed to be notated on the plan. Mr. Chagnon responded that the existing edge of pavement stopped at the sidewalk, so they should not need to move any poles.
- Where parking spaces are located along existing buildings, add breaks in the landscaping or other mechanisms to improve pedestrian connections to building entrances.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that there were no building connections along the Ricci buildings except for a dock door. The other ones were covered. Mr. Cracknell noted that the parking was separated from the building with landscaping on Lot 2. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would add a sidewalk or cut through.
- As the applicant does not anticipate recording the final plat prior to construction of the road and utilities, the final subdivision approval shall require a subdivision bond adequate for the completion of these improvements. ○ Mr. Chagnon agreed and noted the information would be obtained prior to Planning Board. Ms. Walker commented that would be helpful, but it does not have to be there for the Board.
- As the applicant is seeking this subdivision approval as a condition of final acquisition of the property from PanAm, a condition of final approval of the subdivision by the Planning Board shall be that the transfer of ownership from PanAm to the applicant shall occur within 2 months of the approval of the subdivision by the Planning Board.
 - Mr. Phoenix questioned what the reasoning for the comment was. Ms. Walker responded that the public was very interested on what was going to happen on the property. If the subdivision is approved and then the land is not transferred PanAm could sell it to someone else. Mr. Phoenix

anticipated it will close before getting all the permits, but it may not. They may need more time. Ms. Walker responded that it was fine if that window needed to be longer. Mr. Phoenix confirmed that he would work it out with the Planning Staff.

- Final design and construction of the road and utility improvements shall be subject to wetland conditional use permit approval and all applicable state and federal permits.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was fine.

Mr. Chagnon noted that there were some comments in the third party peer review for the traffic analysis. That has all been signed off on except for the proposed parking along the road. That was up to TAC. The sight distance profiles were subject to review by TAC. Mr. Chagnon submitted the sight distance plans based on the new centerline position. Mr. Eby responded that it looked fine to him. Ms. Walker noted that depending on the future use of Lot 5, this would likely be revisited. Mr. Chagnon noted that they looked at the Lot 4 sight distance with a proposed speed limit of 10 mph. 20 mph would require 115 feet and that is easily obtained although landscaping will have to be maintained at a low height. Ms. Walker questioned if that should be a condition of approval. Mr. Eby confirmed it should.

Ms. Walker noted that there were some comments submitted from Elizabeth Bratter, and Ms. Walker addressed them. Ms. Walker noted that they understand the soil is a concern. It came up in the zoning meeting. TAC was not considering a site plan for this property today. It's a subdivision application. It does not give approval for future use. This will likely come up again with the site development application. Each lot needs to show how it will be serviced for drainage. This also will be revisited when it comes back for future development. There was confusion because in the supplemental materials it showed buildings. What is there now has gotten prior relief. They will revisit sound levels at the site plan review. All of the other comments are worth thinking about and some have already been incorporated. The parking serves the existing businesses and changing them right now does not make sense. It can be revisited.

Mr. Desfosses requested clarification about the drainage under the road. DPW will approve the final plan for the road. Mr. Chagnon responded that they have been in discussion about the treatment regime required to obtain approval from AOT.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone else 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 Site Plan approval**, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following stipulations:

Conditions to be completed prior to Planning Board submission

All of these revisions shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department and Public Works Department prior to final submission to Planning Board. The Planning Department shall manage the review process by staff.

1. Lot 5 shall have an accessible ADA parking space identified.
2. The proposed access easements to benefit Lot 3 across Lots 1 and 2 shall be eliminated. Access to Lot 3 shall be via the proposed subdivision road only.
3. The street name sign detail on Sheet D2 shall be updated to current MUTCD standards, with only the first letter capitalized.
4. Applicant shall provide a letter from Eversource confirming how electricity service will be provided and the potential extent of impacts to the surrounding neighborhood in order to extend service. These impacts shall be known prior to subdivision approval.
5. The plans shall be updated to show existing and proposed utilities servicing each lot. The plans should also identify where cross easements may be required to provide service connections that run across multiple lots. Services shown shall include sewer, gas, water, storm drainage, power, communications and access. A new water main shall be provided under the proposed road and a note shall be added to the plans that service lines for Lots 4 and 5 shall be relocated to the new line once operational. A note shall be added to the plan that water line sizing shall be based on the outcome of the Water Capacity Analysis.
6. The sewer easement shall be revised to continue across the proposed cul-de-sac area continuously. The sewer easement shall be shown independent of the roadway and shall follow the sewer line for its entirety.
7. The applicant shall verify that the location of the proposed sidewalk along the subdivision road is buildable as shown. Any required relocating of utilities shall be noted and provided for.
8. Where parking spaces are located along existing buildings on Lot 2, the plans shall be revised to add breaks in the landscaping or other mechanisms to improve pedestrian connections to existing building entrances.
9. The subdivision plan for Lot 4 shall include a note verifying that landscaping shall be maintained to provide adequate line of sight from the driveway.
10. Working with the Planning Department, the applicant shall agree to specified time frames for the transfer of ownership and completion of proposed improvements to be incorporated into conditions subsequent as described below.
11. Easements that are to be relocated or to remain shall be documented on the proposed easement plan

- 12. Easement plans shall be updated to include provision of a water access easement and road access easement to benefit City. Draft deeds shall be submitted for Planning Board review.

Conditions Precedent (to be completed prior to the recording of the subdivision)

- 1. As the applicant does not anticipate recording the final plat prior to construction of the road and utilities, the final subdivision approval shall require a subdivision bond adequate for the completion of these improvements. All improvements shall be completed within the specified time frame agreed upon prior to Planning Board approval.

Conditions Subsequent (to be completed after recording of the subdivision)

- 1. If future development is proposed on the lots on the roadway, the placement and orientation of the angled parking spaces along the roadway may need to be adjusted. This will be reviewed during the Site Plan Review approval process.
- 2. The applicant shall coordinate with the City’s consultant to complete a Water Capacity Analysis using the City’s capacity modeling and shall modify the water service design as required. The private water line that currently feeds lots 4 and 5 shall be either replaced or abandoned depending on the outcome of the Study. All modifications shall be reviewed and approved by the DPW.
- 3. Any future development of Lot 5 may require modifications and relocation of the gas line. Any modifications shall be reviewed and approved by the City through the Site Plan Review process.
- 4. As the applicant is seeking this subdivision approval as a condition of final acquisition of the property from PanAm, a condition of final approval of the subdivision by the Planning Board shall be that the transfer of ownership from PanAm to the applicant shall occur within the specified time frame agreed upon prior to Planning Board approval.
- 5. Final design and construction of the road and utility improvements shall be subject to wetland conditional use permit approval and all applicable state and federal permits.
- 6. Proposed easements to the City shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Legal Departments prior to final adoption by the City Council.
- 7. Final road design and materials shall be reviewed and approved by the DPW prior to construction. Any modifications to the design that result in a revised layout from that approved by Planning Board shall require amended subdivision approval.
- 8. Applicant shall provide documentation of ownership rights and responsibilities for the private road to be constructed.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

,

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Islamic Society of the Seacoast Area, Owner**, for property located at **686 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 2-story building for religious assembly with a footprint of 3,880 s.f. and Gross Floor Area of 5,333 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 220 as Lot 90 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Doug LaRosa from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. Mr. LaRosa passed out an updated plan to address the TAC comments. This is a proposed site plan for the Portsmouth Masjid on Maplewood Ave. It is located right next to the highway under the bridge where Maplewood Ave. is being reconstructed. The site is currently being used as

a construction storage site. It is a 1.04-acre lot. There is some significant topography on the site. This project received a special exception to allow a place of worship in the SRB Zone and variance to allow a lot on 47 feet of frontage. There is a residence that is rented at the entrance of the property, so they will be mindful of that. The site has a utility easement across the back. They are working with Eversource to allow a compatible parking area under the easement. The proposed use is a 3,880 square foot mosque with 60 parking spaces. The parking calculation was based on a 240-attendee facility. It is designed to have a 24-foot wide driveway to the first parking area. That area is intended to have a one way in and one way out flow. The next parking area is in the rear of the lot and part of it is in the utility easement. A fire truck can drive up turn around and come back down. The last time the project was here the building was centered in the site. They will come back with a revised design to show the fire truck movements. The site has quite a bit of topography, so there is a retaining wall on the east and west side. Originally the dumpster was in the back, but it was moved to the intersection for easy pick up. The building is constructed in two levels. The lower parking lot can enter the building through the basement level. Adding an elevator in the corner is currently under discussion. The first floor will be the main prayer level. The second floor will also be a prayer level. It was a challenging drainage design. There will be filtration basins on the site. This is at the very top of the watershed. Some water goes to the back and the rest goes toward Maplewood Ave. The light level calculations are included. It is not in a very sensitive area. They do meet the light level calculation requirements for the site. A landscape plan was provided. It includes screening for the residential property. It is set back from the intersection for good site distance. There will be river birches along the retaining wall. They are not a great visually for all seasons and will not be a great sound barrier. However, they can handle wet roots. There will be nothing under the power lines. The parking lot has appropriate landscaping in the islands and dumpster area.

Ms. Walker clarified that their proposed capacity for parking was 240 people and questioned if that was that the total building occupancy or the total for the assembly area. Mr. LaRosa responded that it depended on how the building will be used. The two main prayer hall areas have a maximum capacity of 200 people. The basement takes more than that, but it would never be used for prayer services. Two activities will not be going on at the same time. Ms. Walker was clarifying because the parking calculations are based on the assembly area. They may need less parking.

Mr. Marsilia met with the architect a couple weeks ago and has not seen what he asked for incorporated in the plans. One was occupant load. Mr. LaRosa noted that is was in the revised packet. Mr. Roediger noted that the maximum occupancy is 240 people for parking. It is 708 people for code. Ms. Walker commented that they needed to clarify from the zoning perspective to make sure they are using the same occupancy. Mr. Roediger agreed they needed to make sure they were talking about the same thing. Ms. Walker questioned if 240 was just what they were hoping for or what the plan shows there is capacity for. A CUP may be required. Parking should match the anticipated use. If you can legally fit 780 people, then it could be an issue. A parking CUP would be needed.

TAC Comments:

- The 14 foot wide driveway into the parking area nearest Maplewood Ave is too narrow for 2-way traffic. It should either be widened to 16 feet or be one-way flow.
 - Mr. LaRosa anticipated that as a one way flow. They will add directional arrows to the plan.
- The handicap access aisles should have NO PARKING signs at the front of the space.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be added.
- The proximity of I-95 will cause the site to be affected by noise from the highway. Sound deadening construction techniques should be incorporated into the building design.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be discussed with the architect.
- The driveway should have a 50-foot segment of double yellow center line at its intersection with Maplewood Ave, to help separate entering and exiting traffic. ○ Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be added.
- A sidewalk along the site driveway should be provided to connect to the sidewalk on Maplewood Ave.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that there were a few ways to do it. They should be able to accommodate pedestrian traffic up and down. It's a 24 feet wide driveway. A sidewalk could be installed along one side, but it would encroach on the landscaped areas. Mr. Britz suggested a path through the landscaping. Mr. LaRosa responded that was a good idea.
- The Location Sign detail on Sheet D5 is missing the 'S' in Masjid.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that was fine.
- Yard fire hydrant should be added to the landscaped island on north side of building. Existing distance to the front door from the closest hydrant on Maplewood Ave is approximately 500'. Proposed fire service water line to be upgraded from 4" to 8" from Maplewood to the new hydrant. New hydrant to conform to Portsmouth Water Dept. standards.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be added. Mr. Roediger clarified that it needed to be a full fire hydrant on the property.
- Landscape plan must ensure clear area around new hydrant and fire department connection on north side of building.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be done.
- The applicant is showing storm drainage areas adjacent to retaining walls in two areas. These need to be detailed thoroughly to prevent hydraulic loading on the walls.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that they would augment that detail and show that there would be crushed stone under drains. Mr. Desfosses commented that a clay damn would work better. They should look at that. Mr. LaRosa noted there would be two walls. One is very short and that one

has earth right up to the level of the filtration. That one should be fine. The other one is big. Mr. Desfosses noted that they should talk to DOT about getting a slope easement. Mr. LaRosa confirmed they would discuss it. The slope easement would reduce the cost for the applicant.

- Mr. Marsilia questioned how tall the wall was. Mr. Britz responded that it was 12 feet, and questioned if it was visible from 95. Mr. Desfosses responded that it was not. The parking lot and 95 would be pretty much the same height. The structural wall needs to be designed and stamped by an engineer. The applicant should still talk about the slope easement. The detail needs to very carefully outline where the storm water is going. It should have a liner and stone inside the wall. There needs to be more detail. It has to be built just right. Mr. LaRosa responded that would be incorporated.
- • The applicant is showing fixtures that are not dark sky compliant. Due to proximity of new residential homes that are lower downslope, these need to be changed to appropriate fixtures and should also be screened.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that they would have dark sky compliant fixtures. They would provide a new fixture cut. Mr. Desfosses responded that the bulbs needed to be screened from the residential houses. Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be revised. Mr. Desfosses noted that they could not pick a high light because of the location of the lights.
- • Applicant may want to change the pavement design to provide a sturdier pavement base.
 - Mr. Desfosses noted that right now the plan outlined 2 inches of asphalt for a base, and then 2 inches of asphalt for a top layer. That may not be enough. There may not be any left when ready to put a top on. A thicker foundation and thinner top layer should be considered. Mr. LaRosa responded that they would look at it.
- • The existing drainage from the highway fill slope currently enters the lot about 100' from Maplewood. This flow is being blocked by the design which could cause flooding at the base of the wall. The applicant should pick up this flow.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that their drainage shows a low point and there is an existing culvert. Mr. Desfosses noted that the culvert is not open drainage. It is closed and comes from the other side of the highway. It drains and then goes out into the pond. Mr. LaRosa noted that currently all of the drainage flows into Maplewood Ave. Mr. Desfosses commented that the proposed wall would damn off the flow. All the water coming off the highway and down the slope nothing is picking that up. The new retaining wall is in the way of the water flow and it needs to be accounted for in the study. Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be looked at.
- • Applicant should confirm water line sizes required due to length and height above Maplewood.
 - Mr. Desfosses commented that it should be an 8-inch main no matter what. Mr. LaRosa confirmed that was fine.
- • Utility connections in Maplewood Ave shall be made at least 3 months prior to final overlay or a mill and fill will be required.

- Mr. LaRosa questioned what the anticipated date of Maplewood Ave. final overlay. Mr. Desfosses responded that it is anticipated to be next September. Mr. LaRosa confirmed they anticipated applying for water connections and utilities prior to that.
- • No Fernco type fittings are allowed for PVC to PVC connections. ○ Mr. LaRosa responded that would be revised.
- • Ductile iron water services usually have tapping valves at the main.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed those would be shown in the street. The site contractor provided a 1-inch service line, but they did not find evidence of that. Mr. Desfosses noted that a 1-inch would be too small.
- Site Plan – Given the proposed open space area is 40.3% (where 40% is required) all the open space areas included in the calculation should be shown. What is the purpose of the extended terminus area on the last double-loaded parking lot? Could it be shortened or reduced and still provide a suitable area for backing out of the last parking stalls?
 - Mr. LaRosa noted that the proposed site plan showed that it's preferable to be able to turn around the end of the long parking. That has been provided. Mr. Desfosses noted that it should be truncated. Mr. Britz noted that it could be a single space. Mr. LaRosa confirmed that was fine. Ms. Walker noted that an open space calculation exhibit would be helpful.
- • Architectural Elevations – These are much improved and make the building read more like a landmark civic building. I would only suggest that the architect consider replacing the rear cone roof over the arched ceiling with a curved-dome.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that he would pass that along.
- • Consider planting evergreen trees where the river Birch are planted as a screen to I-95 to provide better year round cover and sound dampening. ○ Mr. LaRosa responded that there is a lot going on there. The birches don't mind being wet. Mr. Desfosses commented that it would be dry if they are close to the wall. It is important to ensure the trees won't interfere with the wall.
- • The applicant should be aware that the requirements of the Highway Noise Overlay District (HNOD) will apply to this application if Planning Board approval is not received before the effective date of January 1, 2019. ○ Mr. LaRosa confirmed that was fine.
- • The application checklist needs to be completely filled out with the location (Sheet and Note) included for each item. ○ Mr. LaRosa confirmed that would be done.
- • Please provide an Executive Summary of the Drainage Analysis for all TAC members in their packets.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that he did not bring the summary today. Ms. Walker noted that was fine. Next time it would be helpful for all the TAC members. Mr. LaRosa noted the he provided 10 copies of the full study. Ms. Walker responded that she would follow up to track them down.

- • Sheet C2, Note 11 regarding an annual report on stormwater management installations. Applicant should confirm this requirement with DPW.
 - Mr. LaRosa responded that it was noted in the last section of the drainage analysis. Ms. Walker commented that it was not a standard thing that they require. Mr. Desfosses added that it was just for sensitive sites. Mr. LaRosa responded that they proposed it on this site because there is a lot of topography on it. Ms. Walker responded they might not need that.
- • The application checklist notes a Fire Truck Exhibit that was not included in the materials submitted.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that was included in the packet he had just provided.
- • The Drainage Analysis shall receive a third party peer review.
 - Mr. LaRosa confirmed that was fine. Mr. Desfosses clarified once it's done. Mr. LaRosa confirmed the study would be provided to the peer reviewer when it was complete.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone else 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** to the December 4, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
`

B. The application of **Two-Way Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **120 Spaulding Turnpike**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 6,200 s.f. vehicle storage/parking lot expansion and a 20' x 60' one-story drive up service bay addition to an existing building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 236 as Lot 33 and lies within the General Business (GB) District and the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering and Justin and Jennifer Fecto owners of Port City Nissan spoke to the application. Mr. Weinrieb commented that they were most recently here when they applied for an expansion in 2012-2013. This proposal is for a 1,200

square foot service bay/drop off area and another vehicle storage area. It's in the SRB zone and General Business on the other lot. Zoning relief was received to put the addition in and work within the actual Residential District. The original proposal had come within 200 feet of the building. The Zoning Board requested that be revisited and said they would approve it if it were 200 feet away from the Residential District. There is significant wetland on the property. They are limited on what can be done on the property. The small expansion would allow people to come into the site, drop off their vehicle for service, and then exit back out. The head in parking was eliminated on one side and was changed to parallel parking on the other side. The next area would just be vehicle storage. Storm water management would be added to control traffic and reduce the impervious area. There is a small reduction in pavement. The entire area is within 100 feet of the wetland, so they will need a CUP. There is a reduction in impervious surface and runoff. There is no increase of pavement in the buffer. There is proposed grading in the buffer. A retaining wall was considered, but it is in an Eversource easement so that was not possible. It will still be a wildlife corridor so a retaining wall may block that. When looking at the site, an old oil water separator was found. It is in rough shape. It needs to be replaced to get it up to code. When construction begins they will come back with a final detail for DPW to review.

TAC Comments:

Is the existing rain garden adequately sized to take the additional flow from the porous pavement and any other new site drainage directed there?

- Sheets A1 – A2 are referenced but not provided in the submitted materials. Mr. Weinrieb responded that was included now.
- Note 20, Sheet C-2 appears to be missing as referenced in the application checklist.

Mr. Weinrieb responded that they had re-numbered some notes and they didn't go back to update the checklist. It will be updated.

- The application checklist notes parking calculations on Sheet C-1 that appear to be missing.

Mr. Weinrieb responded that was included and updated.

- The application checklist should be updated to indicate that dark sky friendly measures are noted in Site Note 15 (versus 18) on Sheet C-2.

Mr. Marsilia commented that they couldn't exceed the travel distance for exit doors with the addition. They have to be able to exit into the new customer service area and go to the new exit doors. The architect will have to update the travel distances to prove the plan still meets the requirement. If not, then a new door will need to be added. Mr. Weinrieb responded that he would reach out to the architect. Mr. Fecto questioned what the travel distance was. Mr. Marsilia questioned if it was sprinkled. Mr. Fecto confirmed it was. Mr. Marsilia responded that it was 250 feet.

Ms. Walker noted that the site plan showed a proposed bike rack. They need to provide 5 bike rack spaces. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the area is 5 by 8 feet. They will make sure 5 can fit.

Mr. Britz commented that the plans noted a conservation seed mix in the graded areas outside, but the plans don't show what is there now. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it is sumac and brush.

Mr. Britz commented that the rain garden sizing was not going to be increased. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that was correct. There is an overall a reduction in runoff because of the impervious reduction. All of that area is infiltrating. There is a large wetland system where it will dissipate. There was benefit in increasing it for that slight amount.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone else 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 Site Plan approval** to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Desfosses with the following stipulations:

1. Sheets A1 – A2 shall be provided in the submitted materials for the Planning Board.
2. Building code compliance information on travel distance to building egress shall be reviewed and approved by the Inspections Department prior to Planning Board approval.
3. Application checklist shall be updated for consistency with submitted plans for Planning Board.
4. The detail for the oil-water separator connection and reconnection shall be reviewed and approved by DPW prior to building permit approval.
5. The applicant shall update the plans to show 5 bike parking spaces as required.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....
\

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:50 pm, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee

These minutes were approved at the December 4, 2018 TAC meeting.