

**MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

2:00 P.M.

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

MARCH 2, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lucy E. Tillman, Acting Chairperson
John Burke, Parking and Transportation Engineer;
David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director;
David Young, Deputy Police Chief;
Steve Griswold, Captain, Fire Department;
Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician (Water);
David Desfosses, Engineering Technician (Engineering)

ALSO PRESENT: n/a

.....
The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **Public Service Company of New Hampshire**, owner, for property located at **400 Gosling Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of the following: a) a wood fire boiler, b) an air emission control device and ductwork, c) a wood conveyor constructed over the existing coal conveyor extending from Lot 1 over the railroad parcel to Lot 2A, d) a 200'± x 300'± wood chip storage building including all wood chip handing equipment; and, e) relocate fireside wash recycle all with associated paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 214 as Lots 1 & 2 and lies within a Waterfront Industrial district. **(This application was tabled at the February 3, 2004 TAC meeting.)**

A motion was made by Mr. Desfosses to take the application off the table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair read a letter from Attorney Robert Ciandella into the record, indicating that they would not be going forward and requested that the hearing be tabled indefinitely. They further requested that all parties work to schedule a Special Meeting in the future.

A motion was made by Mr. Desfosses to table this matter indefinitely. Mr. Burke seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of **The RLD Revocable Trust & The AMD Revocable Trust** for property located at **3201 Lafayette Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 2,926 ± s.f. two-story office building, after removal of the existing office building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 291 as Lot 7 and lies within a General Business and Garden Apartment/Mobile Home districts. **(This application was tabled at the February 3, 2004 TAC meeting.)**

The Chair read the notice into the record.

A motion was made by Mr. Desfosses to take the application off the table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton, of Millette, Sprague & Colwell, spoke to the application. The lot is in excess of 200 acres, mostly used for a mobile home park. The site they are concerned with is to the front which is used for a law office. The application is to replace a trailer office with a two-story structure, just under 3,000 s.f. They will provide 8 parking spaces as required. The additional paved area would slightly increase the runoff on the site. At the last meeting there were several concerns.

The first was that they confirm the location of the sewer and water lines on the property. They did a dye test that was not conclusive. They assume that they go to the southwest of the property to Lafayette Road. They had incorrectly indicated a sewer manhole, which they corrected. Therefore, they will have to rely on the contractor to locate them on-site.

Mr. Desfosses asked how he even knew it wasn't septic. Mr. Moulton indicated that the owners had no recollection of ever having septic on the property.

Mr. Moulton said they went to Traffic & Safety and it was agreed that the current use of the property required the driveway cuts. This is where the school buses come in and pick up children who live in the mobile home park. For safety reasons, it is important to keep all accessways open. They did agree that they would reconfigure them to 35' width. The removal of additional pavement at the entrances will add to the landscaping on the site and will improve the runoff. They added 3 lights to the site. It was agreed that the swale to the left side of the parking lot would remain the same, per discussions with David Desfosses.

Mr. Moulton indicated that the internal paved areas would be reduced to enhance stormwater treatment.

Ms. Tillman asked if he addressed #2 from the previous meeting and Mr. Moulton indicated that he indicated that the water line connection was mislabel on their plan.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen made a motion to table. Deputy Police Chief Young seconded the motion. Mr. Allen felt that the Site Review Regulations were very specific and that part of developing a site plan was being able to give a contractor a set of plans that they can build something off of. He felt that sewer, wastewater and water should be engineered ahead of time. It may have to change but if someone was building this now, they would have no idea where the sewer and water were located.

The motion to table passed unanimously. This matter will be rescheduled for the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting, scheduled for March 30, 2004.

.....

C. The application of the **City of Portsmouth, SAU #52**, for property located at **50 Andrew Jarvis Drive** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 13,711 s.f. irregular shaped two story addition to the Industrial Arts Department, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 229 as Lot 3 and lies within a Municipal district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bradlee Mezquita, of Appledore Engineering, addressed the Committee. He indicated that they had appeared before the Conservation Commission for their Conditional Use Permit application and had received a recommendation for approval. They then appeared before the Planning Board and received approval.

They plan to add an addition to the rear of the High School. As part of the project, they will relocate the water line and re-route some of the existing drainage structures on the site. As part of this project, there will be the displacement of some parking spaces but they will end up with a zero loss at the end of their project.

Mr. Cravens thought that the main water service came into the portion of the school that is coming down.

Mr. Mezquita indicated that they are not disturbing that area so they were not concerned with disturbing the existing line.

Wayne Blais, of Cutter Construction, indicated that the new water service enters the boiler room now. The old water line has already been shut off. They will be cutting and capping the old water line.

Chairperson Tillman asked that they make a note of that on the plans.

Mr. Desfosses asked about drainage.

Mr. Mezquita explained that they essentially have catch basins. They are proposing to re-route the drain line and tie it into what was the existing 60" line. The basin needs to be cleaned out and is almost completely submerged. That water cuts through to the old location of the tennis court, under the football field, and eventually empties into Sagamore Creek.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the impervious area was less than what is existing? Mr. Mezquita confirmed that was correct. Stormwater treatment was discussed at the Conservation Commission and they will follow DES site specific regulations.

Chairperson Tillman indicated that the Planning Board would be very interested in the treatments and asked if there would be any reports or documentation for them to review.

Mr. Desfosses requested a maintenance schedule be set up and noted on the plans.

Mr. Burke said that the plan effects a change in the circulation and asked Mr. Mezquita to address that.

Mr. Mezquita indicated that they will change the section in the front of the school and make it one-way and the traffic will circle around the entire building.

Mr. Torrey indicated that the buses enter on Andrew Jarvis and exit on Summit Avenue. This will separate the bus traffic from the rest of the traffic flow. They felt this would improve the traffic conditions on site.

Mr. Burke felt this would effect Lafayette Road and he thought maybe they should re-visit the original studies. He was also concerned about the three way intersection at the top of Summit Avenue and how that would work. He sees a potential problem.

They also discussed the policy on student parking, the fees that were charged vs. the cost of riding the buses. Mr. Burke indicated that he would like to see the buses used more.

Mr. Allen felt that there was a traffic issue on weekends when Summit Avenue was closed off. He felt a comprehensive traffic flow study was necessary.

Chairperson Tillman felt that the traffic flow issue should be treated separately from this application.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Burke made a motion to approve with the following stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded.

- 1) That the three-way intersection on the property needs to be reviewed by Traffic & Safety with an on-site review on March 16, 2004 at 8:00 a.m. and the Traffic & Safety Committee meeting on March 18, 2004 at 8:00 a.m.;
- 2) That the termination of the existing water line through the area being demolished to be marked on the plan;
- 3) That the drainage maintenance schedule be provided and approved by DPW;
- 4) That the water lines be installed to City Water Department standards;
- 5) That the School Board review their current policy on parking prices to address the issue of lack of parking on the site and to promote city transportation;
- 6) That further information be provided regarding the drainage treatment for inclusion in the Planning Board packet.

The motion to approve with stipulations passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Eric & Martha Stone, owners, and Sierra Construction, Applicant,** for property located at **1039 Islington Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for construction of the following: 1) a three story commercial building with basement with a total of 9,600 s.f.; 2) a 25' x 180' two-story building with basement garages containing 10 dwelling units; and 3) a 25' x 72' two-story building with basement garages containing 4 dwelling units for a total of 14 dwelling units on the site, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 171 as Lot 14 and lies within a Business District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernie Pelech addressed the committee. He indicated that they were proposing a mixed use of 14 townhouses, meeting the standards of affordable housing, plus a larger retail structure providing artisan space which complies with the 2/3 residential 1/3 retail zoning requirement. He stated this was a difficult site to work with. The shape of the lot makes access difficult. They are attempting to enhance the site with landscaping and provide some affordable housing in the city.

Mike Sievert, of Sierra Construction reviewed the site plan. He indicated that the existing structure will be torn down. The commercial three story building will sit in the southerly corner of the lot. The other longer units, a 10 unit and a 4 unit residential building will be towards the north and east. Those are three story buildings. The entry levels are garages with the 2nd and 3rd stories being living space. By removing most of the pavement they are increasing the open space and they are meeting the setbacks. They are taking the 72' entrance and reducing it to 30' and bringing the entrance to the northwesterly side. They will re-grade the entrance and lessen the slope. They are proposing to cut back the guardrail and bring it back into the site. The site distance out of the property is impacted by the grades and the guardrail. Drainage will be improved by taking impervious space away. Utilities will be tied into the existing utilities. Landscaping will be done by Woodburn Associates. They have added extra screening in certain locations.

Mr. Cravens asked about the water lines and what the white boxes on the plans were for?

Mr. Sievert indicated they didn't appear to represent anything and he would remove them.

Mr. Cravens stated that the 16" water main in the street may actually be in the grass area across the street.

Mr. Cravens also recommended additional set in valves to the building. He asked if the units were going to be condos?

Mr. Sievert confirmed that the residential units and the commercial building were going to be individual condos.

Chairperson Tillman indicated that she had a real problem with the parking spaces backing out into the entrance of the site. Also, she had a problem with the four spaces in the back, backing towards the end of the building. She asked if they had 24' at the back.

Mr. Sievert indicated he had 24' but it wasn't a straight configuration.

Chairperson Tillman did not feel that there was adequate maneuverability.

Mr. Desfosses did not feel that there were really 24 parking spaces, but rather there were 14, because 10 of them belonged to someone's condo. Also, the driveway going out Islington Street was still too close to the bridge.

Chairperson Tillman did not understand the dumpster area and the fence was not delineated.

Mr. Sievert confirmed that there were two separate dumpsters – one for residential and one for retail. He explained how the dumpster trucks would enter the site, back around, empty the dumpsters and exit the site.

Chairperson Tillman commented on the fact that there are parking spaces directly in front of the condo garages.

Mr. Allen also felt that there would be a big problem with cars parking in front of each condo garage door. He did not feel that was a good plan and it would cause numerous problems.

Mr. Sievert indicated that they would post signs indicating no parking in front of the garage doors.

A brief discussion followed about putting the garage entrance in the rear however there did not appear to be enough space to accomplish that. It would require a 24' travelway per zoning requirements.

Mr. Burke agreed that there was not adequate space for cars to back out of the parking spaces near the entrance. Also he did not believe they would approve a skewed driveway and the entrance was definitely a problem. Mr. Burke indicated that there were no design plans for the bridge but that bridge does not meet the height requirements so it will have to be raised.

Chairperson Tillman asked if there was any reason why access to the site couldn't be at the property line.

Mr. Desfosses didn't see any reason why it couldn't be on the property line.

Chairperson Tillman asked why they didn't continue their sidewalk to the edge of the property? It is just past the crosswalk.

Mr. Sievert indicated that there was no other sidewalk in the area and there was no reason why it couldn't be extended. There is no crosswalk there now so that is a proposed crosswalk on the plan.

Mr. Allen indicated that the parking spaces did not work and they were exactly at the required number of spaces. He felt they needed to improve that situation. There were also things that needed to be worked on regarding water.

Mr. Allen made a motion to table to a work session. Deputy Police Chief Young seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

It was agreed that Chairperson Tillman would set up a meeting to be held at the Planning Department.

.....

E. The application of **Richard P. Fusegni, owner** and **DSP Shopping Center, LLC, Applicant** for property located at **1574 & 1600 Woodbury Avenue** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 4,500 s.f. one-story building for restaurant use with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 238 at Lots 16 & 17 and lies within a General Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernie Pelech addressed the Committee. He indicated that they had started this plan back in 1998 and this was their fourth version. Their last approval was a favorable approval by TAC and the Planning Board. They have now reduced the size of their building, thereby reducing the need for parking on adjacent properties. The side and rear setbacks are still the same and they have the same buffer zone in the front. They reconfigured the service area behind the building. No change to the parking layout or entranceway. The last time they were before the Committee there was the issue of widening and adding the right hand turn lane which they took care of. They received approval from the State of NH with regards to the signalized intersection. All hardware is in place and they worked with John Burke on that.

Attorney Pelech reviewed the previous Planning Board stipulations. They received final Subdivision approval. The site plan reflects sloped granite curbing. The landscaping plan was approved by Ms. Tillman and they have not changed it. They have addressed the traffic signalization interconnect. They complied with the traffic signal requirements. The building will be sprinklered and connected to a masterbox. The conduit for the fire alarm system will be installed during the construction process. They submitted a drainage study. This was part of the master plan for the Durkin Square Shopping Center. The drainage pipes are already in place around the site and they will tie right into the existing drainage system.

Luke DeStefano, of Bohler Engineering, spoke about the plan. He pointed out the reduction in the square footage of the building as well as some minor modifications. Primarily the changes were in the service area in the area of the building. In order to reduce encroachment into the existing accessway, they reconfigured the ramp area. The new design elongates the ramp along the western edge of the building, leading directly to the loading area, which eliminated the need to encroach on to the western portion of the property. They pulled the trash enclosure in which allowed for more landscaping. The drainage and utilities are basically being tied into the existing infrastructure that was installed as part of the Durkin Square Shopping Center. Gas, water and electric will ultimately tie back out to Woodbury Avenue, per the plan that was originally approved by TAC.

Chairperson Tillman asked if the ramping area was for deliveries in the back of the building and not for the public.

Mr. DeStefano confirmed that it was to be used solely for deliveries and employees. There are a few electrical doors in the back but also an employee service entrance.

Chairperson Tillman could not find the open space calculation on the plan.

Mr. DeStefano indicated that the previous plan was 26% when 20% was required and felt they were still just about the same.

Chairperson Tillman indicated that they added an island so the calculations were probably slightly different.

Mr. DeStefano indicated he would add that calculation to the plan.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification of the yard hydrant that did not appear to be tapped off before it entered the building.

Mr. DeStefano indicated it would be used for irrigation and they would review the plan.

Mr. Burke asked how they were handling the signal timing and coordination plan? He felt the study was probably 4 years old and asked if they were planning to resubmit a signal plan and design?

Mr. DeStefano indicated that their plan has not changed and based on their reduction of square footage, they did not do any redesign plans.

Mr. Burke indicated that another traffic study wasn't necessary but they generally would get a plan showing the timing. Mr. Burke indicated that they just spent a ton of money on that corridor which wasn't there when they did their initial plan. The off sets and splits would have to be adjusted.

Mr. Desfosses requested that a clean out of the sewer service be done because it's been so long. He also requested that the same thing be done for the drain lateral on the roof drains as there is no manhole where the intersection is. He also wanted to know if they had looked at the drainage system on the shopping center and whether it was working properly.

Mr. DeStefano stated that they had not.

Mr. Desfosses asked that someone review the system to make sure that it was it working order and that a report be forwarded to him at DPW.

Chairperson Tillman asked if there would be any blasting at the site.

Mr. DeStefano indicated that there was ledge on the site but they were unaware how much blasting would be necessary. It is their intention to do everything without any blasting.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Mr. Cravens seconded. The stipulations were as follows:

- 1) That the open space calculation be added to the site plan;
- 2) That the site plan be modified to add a separate water feed to the irrigation hydrant;
- 3) That the existing water service be abandoned consistent with city standards, that the tap on the main in the street will be performed by the City Water Department and all on site water piping be constructed according to City standards;
- 4) That a traffic signal timing and coordination plan be submitted for review by John Burke, DPW, prior to a building permit being issued;
- 5) That a traffic signal layout plan be re-submitted to John Burke, DPW for review and approval, prior to a building permit being issued;
- 6) That the sewer service be cleaned out;
- 7) That the drain lateral going from the roof drain have a clean out;
- 8) That a report, stamped by an engineer, be prepared relative to the shopping center drainage system, confirming that it is working properly, for review and approval by David Desfosses, DPW, and that the results of the report be tied into any bond posted for the project;

- 9) That all blasting be in accordance with the City blasting ordinance;
- 10) That a Knox box be installed on the building;

From the August 16, 2001 Planning Board Meeting:

From the Technical Advisory Committee:

- 1) That the applicant apply for Final Subdivision Approval as part of the application process;
- 2) That the site plan indicate sloped granite curbing for the island;
- 3) That the landscaping plan be reviewed by the City Arborist or her designee;
- 4) That the applicant’s traffic engineer be available for the “tweaking” of any traffic signalization interconnection;
- 5) That the new traffic signal pedestrian regular heads be LED and all markings be plastic taped with the exception of the lane lines on Woodbury Avenue;
- 6) That the building be sprinklered;
- 7) That the master box be connected to the municipal system;
- 8) That the conduit for the fire alarm system be installed during the construction process; and,
- 9) That the drainage study be submitted to the City’s engineering department for review.

From the Planning Board:

- 1) That the dumpster be fenced in; and
- 2) That a stop sign be installed as one exits out of the restaurant parking lot.

The motion to approve with stipulations passed unanimously.

.....

F. The application of **Robert L. Casella, LLC, Owner** and **Portsmouth Computer Group, Applicant**, for property located at **30 Mirona Road Extension** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 1,255 s.f. one-story addition to the right of an existing structure, and a 1,200 s.f. 2nd story addition over an existing garage, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 253 as Lot 4 and lies within an Industrial district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, addressed the Committee. He indicated this was a 1 acre lot in an industrial district. It was originally a tool and dye manufacturing company. The applicant would like to use it for office use. Portsmouth Computer Group is a Portsmouth based business who work with computers. They are a business that wants to stay in town and would like to make this their new home. They plan to build an addition on the right side of the existing structure and also add a second story addition on the left side. They are proposing to take a gravel parking area and pave and stripe it so that it would conform with the current requirements. The addition is slightly into the front setback and the parking area is within the required parking

setback. Variances were granted by the BOA in February. The site slopes towards Mirona Road, which is the flow for stormwater runoff. The site has an easement through the City that consists of drainage useage. The proposal is to continue with the slopes as is, essentially raising up slightly to provide the pitch to move the water up to the parking lot. The water would move to the front of the lot where there is a catch basin. The east side of the lot and the cul-de-sac flows to another catch basin on the other side of the lot. The dumpster is screened in, there is handicapped access and parking, raised grade and curbing and landscaping improvements.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Cravens moved to approve with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded. The Stipulations were as follows:

- 1) That they confirm the location of where the existing water line comes in;
- 2) That a 5' wide concrete sidewalk be constructed along the front of the property. Said sidewalk be built at grade and to City standards.

The motion to approve with stipulations passed unanimously.

.....

II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:45 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Jane M. Shouse, Administrative Assistant in the Planning Department.