

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

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

2:00 PM

AUGUST 6, 2019

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner; Sean Wheeler, Fire Department

MEMBERS ABSENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief

ADDITIONAL STAFF PRESENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the July 2, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Cracknell moved to approve the minutes from the July 2, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Cate Street Development, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **428 Route 1 Bypass, Cate Street, 55 Cate Street, 161 Cate Street and 1 Cate Street**, requesting Site Plan approval for the redevelopment of the properties into a mixed use development, including 22,000 s.f. +/- retail space, 22,000 s.f. +/- office space, 250 residential apartment units; Proposed Residential Building A: 4-stories, 132 units, 24,850 s.f. footprint and 141,885 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Residential Building B: 4-stories, 118 units, 21,350 s.f. footprint and 110,170 Gross Floor Area, and 23 townhouses; Proposed Townhome Buildings A: 8,640 s.f. total footprint and 25,920 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Townhome Buildings B: 11,440 total footprint and 34,320 Gross Floor Area, and 510 parking spaces with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 172 as Lot 1, Map 173 as Lot 2, Map 165 as Lot 2, Map 163 as Lot 33 and Map 163 as Lot 34 and lie within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (This application was postponed at the July 2, 2019 TAC meeting.)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Desfosses moved to hear Old Business Item A and New Business Item A together and vote on them separately, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

Attorney John Bosen, Rick Lundborn from Fuss and O'Neil, and Gregg Mikolaities from August Consulting were present to speak to the application. Mr. Lundborn addressed the outstanding TAC comments.

TAC Comments:

- Are access easements to lot 165/1 (the abutting townhouse project) being provided? Please explain.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they have a series of easement notes in the subdivision plans. This easement can be added to those notes.
- All stormwater structures that need to be cleaned should be adjacent to the roadway or some other accommodation made to provide truck access
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they have moved the water quality unit off the bike trail. Some utilities have been moved to the street or parking area, so they can be easily maintained.
- Last month we asked for an exhibit showing the locations of any known hazardous soils overlain atop the sewer and drainage layouts. Was that provided? We could not find it.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they were not reporting any hazardous materials at this time. The underground tanks will be removed. Mr. Mikolaities added that they submitted the report to Ransom for peer review.
- The drainage study will need to be reviewed and approved by the third party reviewer. Please confirm that no additional flow is being directed toward the Bartlett St drainage system.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that these items were easy to address and would be taken care of. One pipe will be upsized because it is currently undersized. The overall flow will be reduced.
- Is SMH 1066 on the edge of the bypass being shown to be replaced somewhere?
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they would replace the structure. They would pull services from Kia into the side and do something similar for service to the U-Haul.
- The roadway plans are pending final review by the third party reviewer.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they would go through the comments about the signage and ensure they are addressed in the plans. The biggest comments were on the alignments and curbing and those were addressed. Ms. Walker noted that there was a comment about the right turn that was still problematic at the intersection from Cate St. to Route 1. That is not just a signage issue. Mr. Lundborn responded they could stagger the stop bars.
- The diagonal pavement markings in the center island in front of the U-Haul driveway should be angled the other direction.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they would remove that from the plan. TEC said it is not necessary.
- The parking spaces at the easternmost driveway on Cate Street are too close to the driveway intersection with Cate Street. At least one or two should be located elsewhere, so as not to cause conflicts with traffic turning in and out of the driveway.

- Mr. Lundborn responded that there were one or two too close to the intersection. There is room to slide them to the other end of the bank of parking spaces.
- On CT-201, the truck backing in behind the retail building will be backing and turning in the pedestrian shared space area. Trucks should be restricted to hours when pedestrians are not present.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that the concern was that this would be done during business hours. They will work with the client to limit the time of day to off hours. Ms. Walker commented that it should be added as a note.
- Please provide a detail for the bike racks. They should be the inverted U style.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they would put in the single use not the wave.
- A written plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Portsmouth Fire Department prior to the demolition, alteration, and/or construction identifying a qualified person as the project's Fire Prevention Program Manager and detailing the project's fire prevention program in accordance with NFPA 241 – 2013 edition.
 - Ms. Walker commented that it was just a standard note from the Fire Department. Mr. Lundborn confirmed that it would be added.
- In order to count as community space, the “wide pedestrian sidewalk” portion located on the applicant's property needs to be a minimum of 10' wide and must be located between the building façade and the public right-of-way. Not all of the locations identified on the plans appear to meet this definition. Any sidewalk located on City property cannot be counted toward the community space requirement. This proposed wide sidewalk along the future public road is only shown on the CS-002 sheet, not on any of the other plan sheets and appears to be in conflict with the front yards of the proposed townhouses. No details have been provided on the surface material, landscaping or other details.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that they would remove the wide sidewalks from the calculation. Mr. Cracknell commented that the pocket park should have better access ways. That would increase the community space. Ms. Walker agreed that connectivity was a problem. The park should appeal to the broad public not just the people in the project area. The Planning Board won't approve it as proposed because it's not detailed enough. Mr. Lundborn confirmed that would be updated.
- Please provide more detailed plans and descriptions of the design, layout and amenities proposed for all of the community spaces. These spaces will need to be designed to meet the requirements for the different community space types as described in the Ordinance in order to be approved by the Planning Board as community space.
 - Mr. Lundborn commented that this was addressed above.
- The reserve parking areas as delineated do not meet the intention of the zoning ordinance, which was to provide for a separate area for future parking that is covered with grass, ground covers, or other plant materials and could easily be converted to a parking area. The proposed parking spaces are spread out throughout the project site and would require reconstruction of the islands and curbing in order to create the additional spaces. The applicant should either provide the required parking or request a parking conditional use permit from the Planning Board to reduce the number of spaces provided.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded as the layout evolved they ended up 16 spaces short. This is not directly on a transit route, so they looked at the site to see where they could put in additional spots. If it had to be built then it would reduce the landscaping. Ms. Walker noted that another solution would be to ask the

Planning Board for a CUP to reduce parking. Another option would be to identify a reserve parking area that is just a field that could become parking if needed. The preference would be to not to build it if it was not needed. Mr. Cracknell noted that it could be in the dog park if needed. If everything were connected then more community space would be added. Then the dog park would not need to be added as community space. That area could be identified as reserve parking, and not be built.

- More detail is needed for the configuration of the front yards of the townhomes along the roadway, portions of the yards appear to end abruptly at the pavement edge. What are your proposed treatments in these locations to delineate yard from sidewalk? Why was no landscaping plan provided for this portion of the project development?
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that the developer intended to sell that off and didn't want to commit someone to their landscape designs. The abutting landscaping theme can follow through to that area. Ms. Walker requested clarification on the boxes in the front yard of the townhouses. Mr. Lundborn responded that they would have front stoops. The last bank would have an extension of the sidewalk to the stoop. All stoops are square. They are close to the sidewalk, but not in the sidewalk. The wedge is remnant. It could be concrete or garden. Ms. Walker commented that the plan should be zoomed in to show more detail.
- Wherever a concrete sidewalk is proposed within a landscaped island the curbing should be vertical concrete or granite and not sloped granite due to high failure rate of the concrete where it meets sloped granite.
 - Mr. Lundborn responded that this would be revised and updated.
- For the mountable curve proposed for the separate at the townhouses, a 3 inch 1:1 slope granite curb may require some sort of warning in the form of signage or pavement markings.
 - Ms. Walker questioned if there was any further warning needed. Mr. Lundborn responded that they could signify it in some way. Ms. Walker commented that it would need to be approved by Eric Eby.
- The proposed additional spaces would significantly reduce the landscaping proposed for the traffic islands.
- The drop-off lane should use textured pavers versus paint to indicate this is a drop-off area.
 - Mr. Cracknell questioned what was between building A and the retail space. Mr. Lundborn responded that it was textured concrete. Mr. Cracknell questioned if it was a raised area. Mr. Lundborn confirmed that it was raised.
- .

Ms. Walker commented that this project had a peer review of storm water, roadway and traffic. There are probably some items in there that need to be resolved. It can either be postponed to be resolved before the next TAC meeting or could move forward to Planning Board. Outstanding items would need to be resolved before going to Planning Board.

Mr. Wheeler requested clarification that there was language in the easements to prevent roadway changes that would negatively impact the Fire Department between the abutting buildings and this new one. Mr. Lundborn confirmed that was included in note 12 on sheet 4.

PUBLIC HEARING

Dave Gross was an abutter and pointed out that the existing Cate St. crossed over the bridge and questioned whether the bridge would remain open. Ms. Walker responded that the plans show that being kept open at that is the City's intention at present. Mr. Gross noted that the road comes close to their building and there will be a considerable amount of noise from the straightaway to the corner. The developer should be required to provide barriers to block out additional road noise.

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

Ms. Walker noted that there was a lot still outstanding and the submission for this month's Planning Board is two days away. The preference would be to have TAC input on the community space and other items. Mr. Marsilia agreed.

Mr. Cracknell moved to **postpone** this item until the September 3, 2019 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Cate Street Development, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **428 Route 1 Bypass, Cate Street, 55 Cate Street, 161 Cate Street and 1 Cate Street**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to reconfigure six (6) lots comprised of 10.37 acres and a city right-of-way to three (3) lots with a new city right-of-way as follows: Assessor Map 163, Lots 33 and 34, Assessor Map 165, Lot 2, Assessor Map 172, Lot 1 and Assessor Map 173, Lot 2 to become Proposed Parcel A consisting of 260,789 s.f. and 940.14 ft. of frontage on a new proposed right-of-way, Proposed Parcel B consisting of 126,500 s.f. and 226.72 ft. of frontage on U.S. Route 1 Bypass, Proposed Parcel C consisting of 52,813 s.f. and 441.89 ft. of frontage on a new proposed right-of-way consisting of 139,622 s.f. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 172 as Lot 1, Map 173 as Lot 2, Map 165 as Lot 2, Map 163 as Lot 33 and Map 163 as Lot 34 and lie within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. LU #19-18.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Cracknell moved to **postpone** this item until the September 3, 2019 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Foundry Place, LLC, Owner**, for property located on **Hanover Street**, requesting a second 1-year extension of the Site Plan Review approval that was originally granted on November 16, 2017 and granted a 1-year extension on August 23, 2018 which will expire on November 15, 2019. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 138 as Lot 62 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5) District. LU #19-154.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney Tim Phoenix, Gregg Mikolaities from August Consulting, Ania Rogers, and Doug Reynolds were present to speak to the application. Mr. Phoenix noted that the letter from July 2, 2019 outlines what they are trying to do.

TAC Comments:

- Why are you requesting an extension request in advance of receiving amended site plan approval for the proposed revisions that are pending at the Board of Adjustment? If you are not planning to proceed with the plan as originally approved, why seek an extension so far in advance of the expiration of the approval?
 - Attorney Phoenix responded that the reasons are outlined in the letter. Planning Board will likely not hear this application until September and the applicant wanted to provide additional time for any unforeseen delays in approval of the extension. They are not willing to let this project approval lapse until they know have they have what they need for the other project, which will take longer than November to receive all required approvals.
- CB 3530 has been removed by the Hanover St project, erase it from view
 - Mr. Phoenix confirmed they have no objections
- PSMH3 has been replaced by the Hanover St project, erase it from view
 - Mr. Phoenix confirmed they have no objections
- The SMH and sewer line shown to be removed in the private portion on Hill St will still need to be removed but they are already retired.
 - Mr. Phoenix confirmed they have no objections
- Water supplies are being shown to the buildings on the other side of Hill St. That is incorrect, they receive water from Hanover St
 - Mr. Phoenix confirmed they have no objections
- Developer should look into having Lyman construction install conduit to 329/339 Hanover St now before road is paved to avoid future fees.
 - Mr. Phoenix confirmed that was a good idea
- 319 Hanover and lot 125/11 needs to be fed from Hanover St as well for power/comm as the overhead system will not be available for its use. Remove the future pole near the end of Hill St as it will not be needed.
 - Mr. Mikolaities responded that he spoke with Kim Rogers who walked the site with Mr. Desfosses. It was his understanding that it was ok for the pole to stay there. Mr. Desfosses noted that it was still at odds with the electrical plan. They are putting in a conduit on Hanover St. tomorrow because the road will be paved. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that they would work with the City to find a resolution.
- Given the delay in construction of this lot, could the lot be used as access to the garage while construction occurs on Lot 3 that would otherwise require a lane closure on Foundry Place?
 - Mr. Phoenix responded that he was not sure it could happen permanently, but maybe some of it. They have to provide parking. Ms. Walker noted that the comment was about talking about it before the final CMMP was approved
- A written plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Portsmouth Fire Department prior to the demolition, alteration, and/or construction identifying a qualified person as

the project's Fire Prevention Program Manager and detailing the project's fire prevention program in accordance with NFPA 241 – 2013 edition.

- Mr. Phoenix confirmed the note would be added.

Mr. Phoenix commented that he understood second requests were not taken lightly. There is a good reason for it and they meet the requirements for an additional extension. Nothing has changed from the project other than these comments.

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. Cracknell moved to **recommend approval** of this item to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Marsilia with the following stipulations:

1. The plan should be updated to reflect that CB 3530 has been removed by the Hanover St. project.
2. The plan should be updated to reflect that PSMH3 has been replaced by the Hanover St. project.
3. The plans should be updated to reflect that water supply for the buildings on Hill St comes from Hanover St.
4. The applicant shall meet with DPW to determine whether plans should be updated to reflect electrical/communication utility lines fed from Hanover St and to remove any overhead utility poles.
5. A note shall be added to the plan that a written plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Portsmouth Fire Dept. prior to the demolition, alteration, and/or construction identifying a qualified person as the project's Fire Prevention Program Manager and detailing the project's fire prevention program in accordance with NHPA 241 - 2013 edition.

The motion passed unanimously.

C. The application of **Dagny Taggart, LLC, Owner** and **Ambit Engineering, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **3 Pleasant Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for a proposed addition and renovation to the existing bank and office building with a 4,816 s.f. +/- footprint, 21,397 s.f. +/- gross floor area and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 31 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5) District. LU #19-161.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mark McNabb from Dagny Taggart and John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. There is currently a brick building there that was built in 1911. The sidewalks were

improved in the 1980s. There are a couple of alleyways and a parking lot that used to be associated with the bank. There is not a sufficient elevator to accommodate ADA for the building. There is an addition in the back that is at an odd angle. There are also fire separation issues in the back. The project involves minor demolition to the addition in the back to make way for the proposed addition. There will be the same number of stories. Mr. McNabb commented that the addition is on the lot line, so they applied for a variance. The Ordinance states that a lawful non-conforming building may enlarge the non-conformity provided it's the minimum amount to comply with code. This entire addition is for an ADA elevator and code compliant stairway. They are aware they need a restrictive easement to allow window and door openings. Mr. Chagnon noted that the proposed addition would be 600 square feet. There is a landscape plan that shows other improvements to the site. The proposal is to bring the curb out around two parking spaces to provide more sidewalk space. The space would turn into a loading zone with proper access. Mr. McNabb added that the plan includes a bike rack as well. Mr. Chagnon noted that the area between the buildings will be graded flat. It will be hardscaped, so it could be driven on. The material for outdoor dining is temporary and will be removed for the off season. There will be a new gas connection on the north side. The water service and electrical service will remain the same. The grease trap and sewer connection will be on Penhallow St. The plan shows a profile of the sewer that provides a solution for 3 Pleasant St. and the building to the south. Mr. McNabb added that it provides a comprehensive sewer solution for all those buildings in the back. There are not a lot of existing easements. This would clean up the easements and sewer and water for that area.

TAC Comments:

- The proposed trees on sheet L-1 are quite large, confirm with City Arborist that trees of this size will survive and the means and methods for planting and maintenance.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the honey locusts are 3-4 inch caliber. They do not have an overly large canopy. The trees could grow to 40 feet wide, but they don't anticipate a mature spread because of the urban location. It is a larger tree, so it won't look out of place among the existing trees. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they would contact the City Arborist. Mr. Desfosses noted that he raised the question for the City Arborist. This will be on the Trees and Greenery agenda next month. Anything bigger than 2.5 inches typically does not survive.
- Sheet P1, why can't the sewer be installed in a single slope instead of having the drop manhole?
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they could raise up the slope but it would be tight. Mr. Desfosses commented that his preference would be to get rid of the drop manhole and match the crown on Penhallow St. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would look into it and make the change.
- Verify that the ReRa building will have sewer accommodations
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that was on the first sheet of the Site Plan. Mr. Desfosses noted that this comment was just there as a placeholder to know they are responsible for fixing it if something happens in construction. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct.
- The City uses 6" curb downtown, please modify the detail.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that this was revised.
- Drain manhole invert to be brick

- Mr. Chagnon responded that this was revised.
- On sheet C3 there is a tip down ramp that leads to a loading zone on the street. This needs to be made clear to pedestrians that this is not a sidewalk, as it leads into parking spaces.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that a tip down provides a better access for a vehicle to maintain transformers. Ms. Walker noted that the problem was that the tip downs are typically for pedestrians. They should work with Mr. Eby on this comment to understand the best way to treat it. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they could just remove the tip down and put in a curb all the way across.
- The loading zone proposed on Pleasant Street will need approval from the PTS Committee and City Council.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they understood. Ms. Walker added that all public right of ways need City Council approval as well.
- If the alleyway on the north side of the building is meant to allow occasional vehicle traffic, the opening at Pleasant Street will need to be wider to allow for a vehicle to turn in from Pleasant without driving over the curb and sidewalk.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they submitted an exhibit that shows the actual existing width. It doesn't provide any less maneuvering space than what is there now. There is sufficient space because matches what is there now. Ms. Walker questioned if driving over sidewalk and curbing a concern or issue. Mr. Desfosses and Mr. Wheeler agreed it was not an issue.
- Are you proposing to include any bicycle parking for the site.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that it was in the packet on the landscape plan. There will be two bike racks.
- A trip generation memorandum should be provided to document the existing vehicle trips and the proposed trips to be generated by the renovated and expanded building.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be provided.
- This project design requires a variance for the rear yard setback as well as approval from the HDC.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the application had been filed.
- Will the proposed building satisfy the requirements for building height maximums? If not, is the applicant intending to seek a variance or provide community space in conjunction with the proposed Daniel Street development? If the intention is to utilize the community space provision, then the details and location of the community space need to be included in this application.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the application is intended to go forward as a community of development. It shows the combined area of street parcels. The community space shown on the exhibit is 27%.

Mr. McNabb commented that they did not want the project for the building to get bogged down with the off-site improvements of the parking space and loading zone. Mr. McNabb hoped that they would not hold up the whole thing on that. Ms. Walker responded that TAC has input but final approval for the off-site work would be up to City Council. Those items are outside the site plan review. They might want to think about having an alternative to show if the off-site improvements don't get approved.

PUBLIC HEARING

Attorney Derek Durbin represented LBJ properties who own 22-26 Market Square and 21 Daniel St. Engineer Paul Connolly was present as well. The applicant probably answered most of the questions they had today. Mr. Durbin's clients live on the west coast, so there was a delay on getting notice. They did not have a chance to speak with the applicant or review the plan ahead of time. The overall concern was to ensure that the RiRa building has an access easement that runs through the alleyway and restaurant seating and greenery. Delivery trucks access the back portion of the building because it is easier to do that than go through the front. There are no objections the abutters' just want to make sure that the ingress and egress issues are carefully considered. Mr. Connolly agreed that they understand from plans today that moveable planters, chairs, and tables will occupy the alleyway. Clear access will be replaced by the ability to deliver goods in the proposed loading zone. The alleyway will be reconstructed to be level from building to building. The proposed improvements are aesthetically pleasing and nice.

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

Ms. Walker commented that it sounded like all comments can be or have already been resolved. The preference would be that it goes to PTS and Trees and Greenery before the Planning Board. Mr. Desfosses agreed.

Mr. Cracknell moved to **recommend approval** of this item to the Planning Board for the September meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses with the following stipulations:

1. The proposed trees on Sheet L-1 shall be reviewed and approved by the Trees and Public Greenery Committee.
2. If possible, the drop manhole should be removed from Sheet P1 and the sewer line should be installed in a single slope where the crown should match the existing pipe on Penhallow Street.
3. The curb detail should be updated to reflect a 6" curb.
4. The drain manhole invert should be shown as brick on the detail.
5. The tip-down ramp on Sheet C3 leading to the loading zone on the street should be removed.
6. The loading zone and sidewalk widening in the public right-of-way along Pleasant Street shall require review and approval by the Parking, Traffic Safety Committee and City Council.
7. A trip generation memorandum should be provided to document the existing vehicle trips and the proposed trips to be generated by the renovated and expanded building.
8. The Board of Adjustment and Historic District Commission land use approvals shall be secured prior to Planning Board review and approval.
9. A no-build easement shall be provided on the abutting property of Lot 42, Map 107 in order to allow for the building to be located on the property line. The width of this easement shall be reviewed and confirmed by the Building Inspector.

10. A note shall be added to the plan that a written plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Portsmouth Fire Dept. prior to the demolition, alteration, and/or construction identifying a qualified person as the project's Fire Prevention Program Manager and detailing the project's fire prevention program in accordance with NHPA 241 - 2013 edition.

The motion passed unanimously.

D. The application of **2422 Lafayette Road Associates, LLC, Owner** and **Tighe & Bond, Applicant**, for property located at **2454 Lafayette Road** requesting a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 10.1112.14 of the Zoning Ordinance to provide less than the required minimum number of off-street parking spaces. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 273 as Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District. LU #19-91.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney Bernie Pelech and Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. Mr. Crimmins commented that they received approval in 2016 and the parking requirements were different then than they are now. 620 spaces were required and the maximum allowed was 825 spaces. The Viridian was completed and they went in front of the Board for amendments. They were approved under the old parking requirements. The most recent special amendments were for the old Big Lots. It will be converted to a pins arcade and bowling facility. The Planning Department requested updating the parking based on the current Ordinance. There no longer is a shopping center use listed, so the analysis was done on gross parking on all the individual uses. That would require 1,400 parking spots, which is almost double what is there now. They are seeking CUP to allow for less parking. The parking analysis showed that Saturday peak demand required 638 spaces, which is similar to what was required in prior approvals. There are alternate modes of transportation. This project was approved in the gateway zone and has a multi-use path along Lafayette Rd. and Constitution Ave. It will be tied into future improvements. There is a COAST bus structure and bike storage on site. Based on the calculation and additional modes of transportation there is sufficient parking.

TAC Comments:

- The parking demand analysis has been performed correctly. In fact, it may be a little conservative as it assumes that both the residential and shopping center peak demand occurs at the same time, when in reality they won't.

Ms. Walker had no objection to the analysis. It was a good approach and they make a good case.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the parking lot is still quite large and they should require the applicant to submit a yearly inspection report on the storm water BMPs to ensure maintenance is working. Mr. Crimmins agreed.

Mr. Marsilia clarified that there would still be bollards to separate parking from the Viridian and the shopping center. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that as correct.

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

No vote was required. TAC comments will be shared with the Planning Board.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cracknell moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:34 p.m., seconded by Mr. Marsilia. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee