

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

APRIL 30 , 2002

MEMBERS PRESENT: David M. Holden, Planning Director;
David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director;
John Burke, Parking and Transportation Engineer
Michael Magnant, Deputy Police Chief;
Charlie Jones, Fire Marshal;
Alanson Sturgis, Chairman of the Conservation Commission;
Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician; and,
David Desfosses, Engineering Technician (Mr. Desfosses left
after Public Hearing A was concluded.)

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy E. Tillman, Planner 1

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Wren's Nest Motel Corp.**, owner, for property located at **3548 Lafayette Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 180' x 50' parking area to accommodate twenty-eight spaces in conjunction with a proposed 60 seat restaurant with a bar area and dance floor within an existing building with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 297 as Lot 6 and lies within a Single Residence A district. **(This application was tabled at the April 2, 2002, meeting to this meeting.)**

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

The Chair read the notice. Mr. Sturgis moved to take the application off the table. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed on an 8-0 vote.

Mr. Gary Bowmar, representing the Wren's Nest Motel, advised the Technical Advisory Committee that Board of Adjustment approval had been received for the narrow travel lanes. Mr. Bowmar explained that besides the arrows on the pavement, additional signage would be provided at the entrance to and exit from the parking lot.

The Chair confirmed that the fire hydrant issue had been resolved. The Chair made second and third calls for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval. Mr. Sturgis seconded the motion. There was only one stipulation; that being, that internal parking and traffic signs be established as per the request of John Burke, the City's Parking and Traffic Engineer. The motion passed on an 8-0 vote.

B. The application of **Jay Gingrich**, owner, for property located at **915 Sagamore Avenue** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 24' x 72' one-story addition to an existing building with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 223 as Lot 31 and lies within a Waterfront Business district. **(This application was tabled at the April 2, 2002, meeting to this meeting.)**

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

The Chair read the notice. Jay Gingrich addressed the Committee and stated that he is proposing an addition to the culture operation in his cellar with some sort of water related business on the second floor. Mr. Gingrich felt that ample parking would be provided. He was asked to describe the parking area in back of the building. He spoke to expanding the existing gravel area. He did not feel that there would be a burden of any kind for vehicles down there; that people presently in the structure would be moving to a larger space.

Russ Foster, a neighbor, inquired as to whether there would be any increased lighting, increased noise or increased traffic.

The Chair asked if there was any one else present to speak to, for or against the application. There being none, Mr. Gingrich was invited back to the podium. He stated that the lighting would not change at all. It was noted that the lights should shine downwards and should not reflect on adjacent properties.

The question was asked whether the vehicles parked in front of the building would be entirely on Mr. Gingrich's property even when backing out. The response was in the affirmative.

The Chair stated that he understood that the people downstairs would remain the same; however, the proposal is for an expansion and he asked if truck traffic would increase. Mr. Gingrich responded by referring to the University of New Hampshire's agricultural facility and the wholesaling of lobsters conceding that there might be the potential for another truck or two. The question was asked as to the frequency of deliveries with the response being three days a week.

The Chair made a call for the third and final time for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed and awaited discussion on the part of the Committee.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses commented that he was awaiting responses from the inquiries made by the Committee at the last meeting; such as, how the gravel parking spaces would be delineated. Mr. Gingrich responded by stating, "any way the Board requests" adding that there is so much space back there that he did not think it would be an issue. Mr. Desfosses commented that the *Zoning Ordinance* requires that the gravel parking spaces be designated (or that the area be paved) and that Mr. Gingrich needed to come up with a way of doing that which is going to last; such as, wood posts in the ground with numbers for parking spaces. Mr. Gingrich replied that the only people going back there are the people from the University who are familiar with the area that

exists there now. Mr. Desfosses attempted to make it clear that Mr. Gingrich would need to do something or, in the alternative, would need to get a Variance from the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Allen remarked that the question had been asked at the previous meeting as to whether any NHDES permitting was needed for the discharge into the Creek. Mr. Gingrich commented that the discharge was essentially put in by the University. The comment back from the Committee was that the University was not the State of New Hampshire.

The question was asked if the septic system had been approved with the response being in the affirmative. It was made known to Mr. Gingrich that the approval # should be shown on the site plan.

Mr. Desfosses commented that at the previous meeting a request was made for a note to be added to the plan that Public Works would be called once the silt fence was in place so that Public Works could determine if the silt fence had been installed properly. Mr. Gingrich replied, "correct".

Mr. Desfosses went on to review the comments from the last meeting; such as, Mr. Burke having questions about sight distance and the request that a note be added to the plan that construction debris not be left in the tidal buffer zone.

Mr. Burke commented that he believed the Committee had asked that consideration be given to bringing the existing 90' to 100' curb cut into present day standards. Mr. Burke stated that he understood that Mr. Gingrich had met with the Traffic/Safety Committee; however, he, Mr. Burke, would like the front driveway redefined so that the large curb cut could be eliminated. Mr. Gingrich replied that the Traffic/Safety Committee had found it acceptable. The Chair asked Mr. Burke if the existing curb cut met City standards with the response from Mr. Burke being in the negative.

The Chair inquired as to the history of the property and wondered if it was related to the old trolley. Mr. Gingrich stated that for the past 35 years, the property had been used as the site for a business known as Al's TV.

The Chair stated that he shared Mr. Burke's concern that the proposed development meet current regulations. Discussion once again returned to the parking in front of the building and the need for vehicles to back out into the street. Mr. Desfosses spoke to the possibility of the Sagamore Avenue bridge being replaced some time in the next ten years; that the bridge approach might be widened. He cautioned Mr. Gingrich against counting on having the extra space to back out. It was noted that the right-of-way line comes close to the parking spaces.

The Chair stated that he was getting the impression that the Committee would not recommend approval of the site plan at this time. Mr. Desfosses concurred. The Chair asked the applicant to contact the Planning Department and set up a work session with the Chair, David Desfosses, John Burke and Lucy Tillman.

Mr. Desfosses moved to table the application to the Committee's June 4th meeting. Mr. Sturgis seconded the motion. The motion passed on an 8-0 vote.

.....
II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **J. Tyler Rohrer, owner, and John W. Rohrer, applicant**, for property located at **46-48 Columbia Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a three-story 2,660 s.f. (footprint) structure (the previous structure having been destroyed by fire) for use as a six unit apartment building with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 156 as Lot 16 and lies within an Apartment district.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

The Chair read the notice. John Rohrer addressed the Committee and stated that he was representing his son, Tyler Rohrer. He explained that the structure at 46-48 Columbia Street was virtually destroyed by fire in February of this year. The proposal is to rebuild on a squared up 42' x 60' foundation. The entranceway will be moved from Columbia Street to the side of the building. Nine off-street parking spaces will be provided on the same side as the entrance. Two additional parking spaces will be provided to the rear.

As far as utilities are concerned, the existing sewer connection will be used. A new water connection is proposed because the new building will have a sprinkler system. The gas connection will be coming across the far side of Columbia Court. Underground connection to utility meters will drop from an existing pole on the property line coming into the rear of the building.

The aisle will have a 24' opening to the street. Mr. Rohrer spoke to brick walls on either side of the parking lot entrance. The parking lot will drain to the rear with an 8" culvert to an existing stormwater drain in Columbia Court/Street.

Mr. Rohrer spoke to privacy fences abutting Mrs. Hill's property and an existing privacy fence by the Ross property. Trees will be retained along the back and side property lines. Curbs will be left as is.

Mr. Desfosses inquired as to whether the two catch basins coming from the Ross property would be tied into the new drain line with the response from Mr. Rohrer being in the affirmative if they can be found. Mr. Desfosses made it clear that the applicant would need to find them and tie them in.

Lighting will be on the corners of the building and will be downshielded to light the front of the building and the parking area.

The question was asked as to snow storage with the reply that it would be stored on the grassy area to the rear of the property. That being the case, Mr. Desfosses commented that the drain line should be a perforated line.

The Committee then referred to a memo from the Chief Building Inspector, Rick Hopley, that indicated that the first floor would have to be handicapped accessible. Mr. Rohrer stated that they were looking at providing a ramp to the right hand side of the entry way adding that in order

to accommodate such a ramp, it may be necessary to lower the foundation. Mr. Desfosses asked what that would do to the basement. Mr. Rohrer explained that they are going to have to go in and remove part of the basement floor for the footings; that it may be possible that they will have to take the foundation and the basement floor down as well. Mr. Desfosses stated that sump pumps might need to be installed as the area is all clay adding that any sump pumps should be tied into the drain line.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the two existing back out spaces and suggested that they be used for handicapped spaces, if appropriate so that there is a minimal number of people backing out into the street as possible.

Betty Hill, an abutter who lives next door to this property, addressed the Committee stating that she has lived there since 1956. She spoke to the stone wall abutting her property and that of Mr. Rohrer's adding that there is a 4' fence on top of that. She stated that the neighbors are concerned about the front door facing their back yards adding that the house had been very active with comings and goings 24 hours per day.

It was Ms. Hill's understanding that the parking requirement was one to an apartment. The Chair informed her that the ratio is 1 ½ to an apartment. Mr. Desfosses commented that previously parking was on the sidewalk.

The Chair asked for any new speakers. There being none, Mr. Rohrer was allowed to speak again. He explained that the previous building was set up more like a rooming house with four – three bedroom units. He thought that the new building would be set up more for professional couples resulting in the reduction of late night activity. He further stated that previously part of the front stairs were situated on City property so they really feel that the entrance would be better on the side. He went on to state that the previous parking spaces were non-conforming. The proposal provides a full conforming parking lot with exit to and entrance from Columbia Street.

Mr. Rohrer spoke to a proposed 6' high privacy fence on Mrs. Hill's side. Mr. Desfosses questioned the need for such a fence.

Mr. Richter asked that a note be added to the plan regarding street excavation for the gas service.

There being no further speakers, the Public Hearing was closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Richter seconded the motion. Mr. Cravens inquired as to the size of the fire service with Mr. Rohrer responded that it would be 4". Mr. Rohrer felt that the existing water service should be looked at as to potability stating that tenants were having problems with the water.

Stipulations:

1. That a note be added to the plan that all work in the street shall be done in accordance with the Excavation Permit process;
2. That the domestic water service be sized by a plumber or a mechanical engineer and be installed in accordance with City standards;
3. That the first floor shall be handicapped accessible;
4. That if sump pumps are installed, they shall be tied into the drain line;

- 5. That exterior lighting shall not shine onto adjacent properties;
- 6. That the drains from the adjacent rear property be tied into the drain for this site;
- 7. That the drain lines shall be perforated to pick up any ground water caused by melting snow;
and
- 8. That the site plan indicate the appropriate number of handicapped parking spaces.

The motion passed on an 8-0 vote.

~~~~~  
Let the record show that Mr. Desfosses left at this time.  
.....

B. The application of **Raymond Grasso, owner, and Kevin Ravenelle, applicant**, for property located at **2859 Lafayette Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 60' x 40' one-story car wash facility with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. The existing structure will be demolished. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 286 as Lot 20 and lies within a General Business district.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

The Chair read the notice. Attorney Bernard W. Pelech addressed the Committee informing them that Wayne Morrill from Jones & Beach and Steve Pernaw, traffic engineer, were present to answer any questions the Committee might have.

Attorney Pelech stated that the project had been to the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board; that a Conditional Use Permit had been granted. Furthermore a Variance had been granted by the Board of Adjustment to allow the building to be closer to Lafayette Road than that required by the *Zoning Ordinance*.

Attorney Pelech reminded the Committee that the site was the former Dunkin' Donuts site which is now located on an adjacent lot. He stated that they were attempting to use the approved site plan for Dunkin' Donuts and to use existing pavement as much as possible.

Attorney Pelech went on to state that the car wash will use a substantial percentage of recycled water resulting in less demand on City resources. The curb cuts for Dunkin' Donuts have been mirrored. A 12' widening easement will be given to NH DOT. They anticipate receiving a Driveway Permit in the near future.

Wayne Morrill of Jones & Beach went over the specifics of the site plan explaining that the car wash will have three bays and six vacuum islands. Thirteen parking spots will be provided. The proposal calls for granite curbing and a closed drainage systems using a Vortechs system.

Mr. Morrill stated that the wetlands had been reflagged by NH Soils; that two parking spaces had been removed with one space relocated on site. The dumpster has been relocated to a better spot for pickup. Mr. Morrill spoke to a 2" type K copper line and a 2" force main. A new gas service will be installed by jacking underneath the highway as open cutting of Route 1 is not anticipated at this time. He spoke to the catch basins with grease hoods as shown on sheet C-3. Mr. Morrill also spoke to the network that would recycle the water used to wash the cars explaining that the water would be used again for the undercarriage of the cars.

Mr. Morrill spoke to five pole mounted lights. Landscaping would be similar to that proposed with the Dunkin' Donuts plan.

Attorney Gerald Giles addressed the Committee and stated that he and Harry Jarvis own an abutting property. He expressed his concern about drainage adding that he did not object to the car wash; however, he does not want any more water on his property. He stated that the site in question is going to be pretty much all paved. He commented that Ricci and Labrie had built a road to the rear that acts as a dam with only one culvert going underneath that road; that water just essentially collects there. He stated that the argument that flow will not be increased does not make sense to him. He felt that the volume of water would be increased.

Mr. Morrill referred to the submitted drainage report which concluded that the post rate would be less than the present rate. The Chair asked that a drainage report be submitted to Attorney Giles for his drainage engineer.

Mr. Morrill went on to state that the present site is about one-third pavement with structures; that the stormwater flows with no treatment, no curbs to stop rate; that the proposed site would slow down that rate with functional grease hoods and the Vortechs system. In response to a question from the Chair as to the design year, Mr. Morrill stated that the design was calculated for a 50 year storm. Mr. Morrill went on to state that the flow is concentrated to one spot; that by the placement of riprap, erosion would be controlled.

The Chair made a third and final call for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

#### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Sturgis inquired as to snow storage. Mr. Morrill stated that it was not shown on the plan; that the snow would be stored at the southerly end of the property which abuts the Dunkin' Donuts property.

Mr. Burke inquired as to the traffic generation for the site. Steve Pernaw, traffic engineer, responded that they anticipated the highest peak would be on a Saturday at mid-day with 31 incoming and 32 departures adding that, in his opinion, the use would be quite weather dependent.

Mr. Burke asked if any analysis had been done of the center turn lane. Mr. Pernaw responded that he was asked to do trip generations. Mr. Burke stated that he was concerned what with Patriots Park, Dunkin' Donuts, and St. James Church being high trip generators together with White Birch Plaza. It was Mr. Burke's opinion that developments on either side would affect this driveway. Mr. Pernaw felt that there would probably be a 50/50 split northbound and southbound.

Mr. Burke then asked about cars queuing in front of the driveway. Mr. Pernaw responded that the proposed use is a convenience use.

Mr. Cravens inquired as to how much water is estimated to be used on a peak day. A gentleman from a car wash service responded that the amount would be 1,300 gallons per day. In response to a question as to the time of closing, the response was that the facility would be open 24 hours a day and that the site would be unattended except for those people who are there during the day emptying the trash.

Mr. Cravens asked for a comparison with other car washes explaining that in a drought condition he would be concerned about a water intensive business. The representative from the car wash stated that the proposed facility would be a new car wash with state-of-the-art equipment. In other words, the facility would be more efficient than what is out there at the present time; that the new facility would measure the length of every car. The representative stated that a normal car wash uses 50 to 60 gallons per car; that the proposed car wash would use 26 gallons per car.

Mr. Cravens inquired as to the status of the wells monitoring the underground storage tank. Mr. Morrill reported that the tank has been removed and that NHDES has indicated that there is no longer a problem out there. Mr. Cravens asked that the wells be capped to protect groundwater.

Mr. Cravens moved to recommend approval of the site plan. Mr. Richter seconded the motion. Mr. Cravens noted that the Vortechs system should be cleaned semi-annually and asked that certain sections of the drainage report be noted on the plan.

The question was asked about the possibility of suds migrating into the Vortechs system. The response from the car wash service representative was that all suds will enter the recycling system.

Stipulations:

1. That the following sections from the Drainage Report be noted on the plan: Sections 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8;
2. That the monitoring wells be capped and abandoned in accordance with NHDES standards;
3. That a queuing analysis for existing and built conditions be forwarded to John Burke, the City's Parking and Transportation Engineer;
4. That the application be reviewed by the Traffic/Safety Committee with a recommendation and report back to the Planning Board;
5. That a note be added to the plan that the applicant shall call David Desfosses, Engineering Technician, Public Works Department for an inspection of the silt fence prior to the commencement of construction;
6. That the attorney for the applicant, Bernard W. Pelech, work with Planning Department staff regarding the Vortechs system.

.....

C. The application of **Kelly Warren Revocable Trust, owner, and Scott Warren, applicant**, for property located at **132 Chapel Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for the following: 1) a 10' x 22' two story addition to the rear of an existing structure; 2) a 14.5' x 22' two and one-half story addition to the front of an existing structure that includes the removal of the existing front porch; and, a 4.5' x 17' one-story porch addition on the northerly side with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 6 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

The Chair read the notice. Anne Whitney, architect for the project, addressed the Committee. Ms. Whitney explained that the project received Planning Board approval in January of 2000; that the project was instituted in 1996; that the Historic District Commission approval was challenged by an abutter. The challenge went to Superior Court and is in the process of getting

resolved; that there has been an agreement as to a change in design. Ms. Whitney stated that the changes have been made.

The proposal now calls for a two-story addition to the rear of the structure, an addition to the front and a porch on the side. Historic District Commission Approval was received in July of 2001. The applicant is now ready to complete the Planning Board process.

With regard to utilities, Ms. Whitney explained that the electric, telephone and sewer service will not be changed; that they serve the existing building. A 4" water main will be installed for the sprinkling of the building.

Mr. Richter pointed out that the 4" water main is right next to the gas line and suggested that the water line be relocated. Mr. Richter advised Ms. Whitney that a new brick sidewalk would be installed in five weeks and asked that she consider where the break in the sidewalk would be before the City begins work.

The Chair made three calls for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

#### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

The Chair jokingly commented that when the project started, he had hair. Ms. Whitney responded that hers was all brown at that time. The Chair recalled that drainage was an important issue with the previous proposal and called for a structure on site. Ms. Whitney explained that with the reduced size of the addition and with the use of a snow retention and gutter system, that the stormwater runoff would be controlled without a catch basin on site.

Mr. Richter asked if the power lines to Bow Street would remain overhead. Ms. Whitney responded in the affirmative. The question was asked if there was a sewer easement in place, and if so, that it be shown on the plan.

Mr. Sturgis moved to approve with stipulations. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on the overhead lines. Ms. Whitney explained that nothing was really changing on that side of the building. The Chair read the requirement from the *Site Review Regulations* concerning the undergrounding of utilities. Mr. Sturgis commented that he thought it would be unreasonable to require underground electrical service where the overhead line comes in to the existing.

#### **Stipulations:**

1. That the existing sewer easement be indicated on the plan;
2. That there should be more than five feet of separation between the new fire service line and existing utilities; and,
3. That the timing of the installation of the water line be coordinated with Tom Richter, Engineering Technician, Public Works Department (as a new brick sidewalk is scheduled for Chapel Street).

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that an exemption be given to the regulation concerning underground utilities. In other words, the Committee felt that the electrical and communications lines could remain above ground. The motion passed on a 7-0 vote.

D. The application of **325 State Street LLC, owner and applicant**, for property located at **325 State Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a five-story 28,324 s.f. (footprint) building for office, retail and apartment use with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. The existing structure will be demolished. Ninety-six covered parking spaces will be provided. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 116 as Lots 1, 2 and 6 (lots to be combined) and lies within the Central Business B and Historic A districts.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

The Chair read the notice. Eric Weinrieb, Professional Engineer with Altus Engineering, addressed the Committee and stated that he was present representing 325 State Street LLC and pointed out that Bob Kenney, one of the principals of 325 State Street LLC, was also present. At this point in the proceedings, Mr. Weinrieb asked that the Committee enter a Work Session mode rather than hold a Public Hearing. The Committee agreed and left the dais to stand around the table placed in front of the dais.

Mr. Weinrieb spoke to the proposal for the redevelopment of 325 State Street where the First National Bank building presently stands. He directed the Committee's attention to a model of the proposal which included the surrounding area. The proposal calls for 69 parking spaces in the basement and 30 on the first floor at the back edge of the building. It is anticipated that the first floor front would be a retail/restaurant mix. The third, fourth and fifth floors would contain 45 apartment units.

The site contains 31,627 s.f. spread out over three parcels. The proposal calls for a 28,000 s.f. building which meets all coverage requirements.

Mr. Weinrieb commented that a lot of improvements would be done. Half of them would be done with the Porter Street condominium project with the other half to be done with this project including the relocation of utility poles and the eventual undergrounding of utility lines.

The Chair commented that the scale of the project was amazing.

Mr. Weinrieb explained that currently stormwater runoff flows into the system in Porter Street. The proposal calls for roof drains which would enter a closed drainage system in the street. Water service will be from State Street. Sewer line will enter onto Fleet Street. The gas service will be from State Street.

Mr. Weinrieb stated that he had submitted a traffic report to John Burke; that in his opinion (Weinrieb) the increase in traffic would not be significant. It is anticipated that with both projects completed the a.m. weekday trip ends would be 107 and the p.m. weekday trip ends would be 121.

The proposed offsite improvements would include the coordination of the traffic lights on State Street together with some signage in the Market Square area.

Bob Vincent stated that he was representing himself and spoke to the Bank of NH parking lot adjacent to the Unitarian Universalist Church which is available for parking for Sunday services and other occasions. He wondered if the proposal would in any way impact on that agreement with the Bank of NH. In other words would the parking requirements generated by the proposed facility in any way put pressure on that lot during church services. The response was in the

negative. The Chair did comment, however, that the proposal meets all land use requirements, but Sunday morning parking is a free for all.

The comment was that the roof would be open space and not include amenities for the building (other than utilities).

Mr. Weinrieb commented that the proposal had been through a long process with the Historic District Commission; that the approval has been appealed by a resident of Portsmouth; that the Request for Rehearing would be considered at the Commission’s May 1 meeting. The request for a work session was based on the fact that a Request for Rehearing had been submitted.

Mr. Vincent commented that one of the spotlights for the North Church steeple is attached to the existing building. Mr. Vincent wondered if the applicants would consider putting the light back on the property (the proposed building at 325 State Street) with the response being in the affirmative.

It was understood that Phase 1 of this project, the Porter Street condominiums, would be going back to the Traffic/Safety Committee.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Fire Marshal Jones made the motion to table the application to the June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Committee. The motion was seconded and passed on a 7-0 vote.

.....

E. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 and Chapter 400 of the Pease Development Authority Site Review Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of **The Kane Company, applicant**, for property located at the corner of Corporate Drive and Oak Avenue to be known as **230 Corporate Drive** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 45,000 s.f. one-story building for office and light industrial use to be constructed in two phases: 30,000 s.f. in Phase 1 and 15,000 s.f. in Phase 2. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 315 and lies within an Airport/Business/Commercial district.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

The Chair read the notice. Bob Duval from Kimball Chase addressed the Committee stating that he was present on behalf of the applicant, The Kane Company. The proposal is for a build to suit for SMC manufacturing. The proposal calls for two phases: A 30, 000 s.f. structure in Phase 1 and possibly within a year, a 15,000 s.f. structure. Seventy parking spaces will be provided with Phase 1 and twenty spaces with Phase 2.

The site in question was the site of duplex housing which has since been torn down. All that remains at the present time is an open field with cul-de-sacs. The proposal will provide more impervious area than presently exists. By routing drainage through several long treatment swales and a detention basin, post development flow will be reduced somewhat, according to Mr. Duval, from pre development flow.

New utilities will be coming off new main lines in the street. The buildings will be sprinklered. Power will come off from Oak Avenue. Mr. Duval spoke to the enclosed dumpster and the snow storage area just beyond the phased in parking. With regard to landscaping, Mr. Duval explained

that there are specimen trees on site; that the proposal is to supplement that with quite a bit of tree planting. He reiterated that the site is basically an open field; that the proposal is to fill it in to have a park like look.

Mr. Duval went on to state that the proposal is not a very complex project; that it involves the creation of a five acre lot in the Pease Commercial zone. He anticipated that traffic generation would be moderate.

The Chair made three calls for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Cravens moved to recommend approval with stipulations. The motion was seconded. Mr. Richter commented that Mr. Desfosses had concerns about the drainage study. It was left that he would review it and make any comments to the Planning Board. Mr. Richter spoke to a maintenance schedule for the drainage structures.

Discussion ensued on truck deliveries and the reason for the 28' to 38' aisle widths. Mr. Duval commented that they were needed for turning radius. Mr. Burke commented that it is a long way for a pedestrian to cross and asked if a "safe refuge" island had been considered.

The Chair commented that this project would affect other intersections already being impacted and that the usual stipulation should be included with regard to the Traffic Master Plan.

Stipulations:

1. That the site plan indicate that a maintenance schedule and reports from clean outs of the drainage structure(s) be submitted to the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department;
2. That the drainage study be reviewed by David Desfosses, Engineering Technician, with comments to the Planning Board;
3. That the applicant shall continue to work with the Pease Development Authority (PDA) and the City of Portsmouth in the preparation of the Tradeport Traffic Master Plan with the applicant contributing to traffic improvements in an amount to be determined by the PDA;
4. That the applicant consider installing a "safe refuge" island in the middle of the entranceway;
5. That the site plan shall conform to the parking island regulations contained in the PDA regulations;
6. That the applicant shall enter into an appropriate agreement between the City and the PDA regarding sewer service;
7. That as utilities are provided underground, any superfluous rights-of-way or easements be abandoned;
8. That the site plan contain a sidewalk detail;
9. That the landscaping plan be subject to the approval of Planning Department staff; and
10. That the site plan indicate that the water service be 2" type K soft copper.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment was had at approximately 4:10 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Barbara B. Driscoll, Administrative Assistant in the Planning Department.