

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

2:00 P.M.

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

MAY 4, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman
David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director;
David Young, Deputy Police Chief;
Steve Griswold, Captain, Fire Department;
Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician (Water Dept.)
David Desfosses, Engineering Technician (Engineering)
Alanson Sturgis, Chairman, Conservation Commission

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Planner

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

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of Forum Development, LLC, Owner, for property located at Stonecroft Apartments, Off Lang Road, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 35.5' x 48' one-story building with basement, totaling 1,630 s.f., with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 286 as Lot 24 and lies within a Garden Apartment district.

The Chair read the notice into the record and also advised the Committee that a new set of plans had been placed in front of them just prior to the meeting. He asked if anyone wished to table the matter until they had an opportunity to review the plan. Hearing no one speak, the public hearing was opened.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Anders Albertsen, of Forum Development, LLC, addressed the Committee. He explained that the new plans were essentially a verified version of what had previously been submitted. They want to construct a 1,630 sf office building and this project will not include any new paved area. The utilities are all close at hand from the apartments. The gas main is on the northerly side of Lang Road as well as PSNH cable and telephone with easy access to feed underground service into the new structure. There is an 8" water line that was constructed some years back that runs from the corner of Lafayette Road, into their Beechstone property, which is the adjacent property. They will provide the appropriate legal easements for the water line. With regard to sewer, the nearest manhole on the Beechstone property has sufficient a sufficient drop in elevation to allow for a gravity sewer line.

Mr. Albertsen indicated that the building meets all of the current requirements for handicapped access, with the associated ramp shown on the plans. Regarding parking spaces, the existing property has 181 spaces and the requirement with the proposed building is only 134. The open space will only be reduced by 1%, bringing it to 65% open space that is well in excess of the requirement.

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 moved to table and Captain Griswold seconded. Mr. Allen indicated that they had a sub-standard plan that was not clear on what they were attempting to do. The plan that was delivered at the meeting may clarify those issues but they have not had a chance to review it.

Mr. Holden asked for primary concerns to be addressed prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Cravens indicated that the water line was from a neighboring lot so it needs to be relocated so that the services come from the street however Ms. Tillman pointed out that they already have a line from the street so that would make two.

Mr. Albertsen indicated that all of the water lines on the properties are private. They are non-city streets. There are numerous water meters on each lot. This is not a normal situation where the City owns the water mains out to the street.

Mr. Desfosses was concerned that these are two separate lots, even though Mr. Albertsen owns both of them. One lot could be sold and they would then be tying into someone else's property.

Mr. Cravens asked if there were any condos on the properties?

Mr. Albertsen indicated that they were all apartments.

Mr. Cravens stated that the City does not allow water services to be served from a neighboring lot.

Mr. Holden indicated that it was obvious that the water metering system for this property was fairly complex and more than likely this Committee needed some understanding of it. At the very least, he felt they needed to see how the services were being delivered and provided to determine how this could best be tied in.

Mr. Holden felt that they were trying to move too fast and he was concerned about cross easements that might be needed and service from another lot and he could not tell what the relationship of this building was to the entire site. Mr. Holden asked for a plan showing the entire Stonecroft site. They did not need Beechstone.

Mr. Allen felt that both the sewer and water issues were large enough that they will need to meet with the applicant and work some of them out prior to the resubmission.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the handicapped spot was backwards and was in front of the handicapped ramp.

Mr. Desfosses wanted to see the edge of clearing lines on the plan. He should put the condition of the stone walls on the plan.

Mr. Desfosses asked if plans could be signed by a land surveyor?

Ms. Tillman confirmed that a land surveyor could sign the plans.

Mr. Albertsen asked whom he should contact to keep this moving.

Mr. Allen indicated he would be the contact.

Mr. Holden indicated that the site plan should note the variance received from the BOA for a use variance. He also didn't believe the plans show the edge of pavement. He would like to see more detail for a sense of how the site will work.

The motion to table until the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting on June 1, 2004 passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of Bayfield Development Company, Inc., Owner, for property located at 58 State Street, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 3-story L-shaped addition totaling 1,297 s.f., with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 12 and lies within the Central Business B district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Holden indicated that he sometimes trades some of his books at The Book Guild, located on this site, and knows the owners and asked if Attorney Pelech felt that there was any conflict. Attorney Pelech indicated that he did not feel there was any conflict and that Mr. Holden could sit on this hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Pelech indicated that their major problem was that their existing service goes over another lot and they were more than happy to give an easement as they routinely do to the City. They are dealing with two lots but only 58 State Street requires Site Review approval.

Mr. Holden indicated that the City always tries to get the services out to the principal street and this would be the appropriate time to take care of this. There are two lots going in different directions so one set of services would be going to State Street and one set of services would be going to Court Street.

Attorney Pelech wasn't sure what would be involved to do that.

Cory Colwell, of Millette, Sprague & Colwell, indicated that there would not be any problem as the existing situation has them going across the lot as it is now. There is currently no easement as this was probably done in the 1800's. There is no record at all at DPW for the lot on State

Street. The date of the utilities on the plan shows that the water main was installed in 1908 and the existing services run through that one site to serve both and they just extended that.

Mr. Holden did not believe that relying on values and utilities that are crossing lot lines are going to be to the benefit to the owners of both lots. This looks like the time to correct this.

Mr. Colwell indicated that if the City deems that both utilities, sewer and water, should go to the appropriate streets then they would have no objection.

Mr. Cravens asked about the water shut off on Court Street.

Mr. Colwell indicated that the existing service for both buildings is from Court Street, and not from the water shut off on State Street. From that shut off, the water line runs through the Court Street property to serve the State Street property.

Mr. Allen confirmed that the applicant has committed to running services from State Street and that is what they want.

Mr. Colwell indicated that the building on Court Street was less than 3 units so did not require Site Review. Therefore, they are only considering the property at 58 State Street.

Mr. Holden indicated that they should remove the Court Street property from the plan.

Mr. Colwell indicated the only reason that they showed Court Street on the plan was to show the relationship between drainage and the utility services.

Mr. Holden indicated they should work together on the title blocks. What they would probably do was issue a condition of review on the traditional building permit for Lot #7, which would be issued subject to a review of the curbcut by DPW as a result of the on-going work on Court Street.

Mr. Desfosses asked about their fire service.

Mr. Colwell indicated that they were installing a fire service in both buildings, domestic and fire. The existing gas service will be shown on the plans.

Mr. Desfosses indicated they would like to coordinate all of the utilities and install them all at the same time.

Mr. Holden asked if the electric service will be underground.

Mr. Colwell indicated that the over head electric service was existing.

Mr. Holden indicated that the service should be underground and should be made a stipulation of approval.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the service to the State Street building went across a different piece of property (the driveway) and asked if there was an easement?

Mr. Colwell confirmed that it did cross the property and there was no easement. He believed Public Service typically had an easement on all of their lines.

Mr. Holden indicated that the driveway could potentially be developed into a similar building and it could become an issue at some point. They would allow them to revisit this issue at the Planning Board.

Mr. Holden asked about stormwater runoff and whether there was a problem.

Mr. Allen indicated that he would like to hear the applicant address that issue.

Mr. Colwell indicated that the building is an existing 3-story building and the drainage is shown on the plan. There will be a gutter that will lead down into a landscaped area. In a frozen condition, the drainage will flow across the landscaped area and onto Court Street, turn the corner and flow to the catch basin. That is another reason why they have shown the Court Street area on the plan.

Attorney Pelech indicated that they have gone before the HDC for approval of the proposed structure and were approved on April 7th. The approval was to demolish the back addition and construct the new addition. They did not propose any changes to the front façade except the entranceway.

Mr. Allen asked about the current gutters and whether they were tied into the sewer?

Mr. Colwell indicated they currently had minimal gutters and were not tied into the sewer.

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 are as follows:

- 1) That the water and sewer service be connected from State Street, and by implication, the property would no longer offer services to the lot line to the rear and off of Court Street;
- 2) That the Site Plan depict the area of work that is under review by this Committee and that the title block reflect more properly the work that is being requested;
- 3) That details be provided on how to properly repair the street;
- 4) That the sidewalks must be brick and so noted on the Site Plan;
- 5) That the proposed gas services be noted on the Site Plan;
- 6) That the existing electric service be underground;
- 7) That a drainage easement burdening the back property and allowing the flow from the front property across the back property be prepared and reviewed and approved by the City Attorney;
- 8) That the gutter be repaired so when a separated drainage system is completed on State Street it can be converted and the stormwater will go into the drainage system;
- 9) That a fire service be installed which includes automatic notification of emergency services as well as a Knox box or a Master Box;
- 10) That parking calculations be determined through Lucy Tillman and noted on the Site Plan;

.....

C. The application of Liberty Mutual Group, Owner, for property located at 225 Borthwick Avenue, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a building addition, installation of electric conduit, relocation of existing emergency generators, and installation of a screen fence, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 240 as Lot 01 and lies within an Office Research district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Malcolm McNeill addressed the Committee. He indicated this was a relatively simplistic plan and was basically to install redundant electrical service to the property. This is occurring at the end of the property that is closest to the turnpike. A conditional use approval permit is in the process and no other approvals will be necessary.

Mike Leo, PE, of VHB, addressed the Committee. They are proposing a 6,000s.f. 2-story building, totaling 12,000 s.f. The purpose of the building is for an uninterrupted power supply and data center to support the existing building. They are proposing to run new electrical lines across Borthwick Avenue with the transmission lines and other power lines up and around the front of the building, to a transformer. Alternatively, they will bring them across the main access between the two Liberty Mutual buildings. As part of the addition there will be a pair of transformers allowing them to switch from the current power supply to the alternative power supply, which is basically a battery source. This location is the main data center and the computers need to run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, all year long. They are also proposing to extend the paved area around the back of the building to that they can get the equipment in and out of the building. To facilitate the proposed addition, they will have to move the existing generators out further from the building to get the vehicles in and around the building. Site improvements include some cobblestone edging around existing walkways along the front portion of the front access area as it is a very narrow walkway, along with other landscaping.

Mr. Holden asked about the proposed surface risers.

Mr. Leo indicated that the high tension power lines go across their adjacent property and the transformers will feed off those lines. They will be putting a metal rise up the power lines so that the power feed can come down and go underground, and through the buildings. They are unsure whether they will install one or both generators at this time but are asking to install both.

Mr. Holden asked about the parking lot and whether it was owned in conjunction with the Credit Union?

Mr. Leo indicated that there are two parking lots. The bigger parking lot where the power is coming from is owned solely by Liberty Mutual. The small parking lot, to the South, is owned by the Credit Union and they are not doing any work on that lot.

Mr. Desfosses indicated they would need a license for that as they are crossing city property.

Mr. Desfosses indicated he would like to see a detail for the crossings. If they are going to put a future line in they will have to have the details.

Mr. Leo indicated that it will be their primary service on the power lines so it will be owned by PSNH and PSNH will need an easement and/or license.

Captain Griswoll asked about the private hydrants and what maintenance they would have? They would like to have an annual statement of the maintenance of those hydrants.

Mr. Cravens indicated that the city will do an inspection and flushing of their hydrants.

Mr. Leo indicated that they would be willing to either maintain the hydrants themselves and provide reports or will contact the City to do the inspections and flushing.

Mr. Cravens indicated that the monitoring wells were not on the plans and need to be added. He asked indicated that they will need to be accessible to the City. He also assumed that they would be changing the flush box on the back monitoring well.

Mr. Leo confirm that the generator fuel was diesel with double wall containment and leak protection.

Mr. Cravens asked about the little building titled "previously approved utility building" as they were showing a new water line going into it.

Mr. Leo indicated that is for the fire service and not for domestic.

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 are as follows:

- 1) That the utility crossing should be shown in detail on the Site Plan, and approved by DPW (a license to be obtained from PSNH), with appropriate legal language;
- 2) That monitoring wells be shown on the Site Plan and that the well at the NW side of the property be set in a flush box that's accessible for DPW to sample;
- 3) That the service going into the previously approved utility building be noted on the Site Plan as a fire service;
- 4) That the water lines be installed in accordance with City standards;
- 5) That details of the generator insulation be provided to DPW to assure wall containment and leak detention;
- 6) That the an inspection record of hydrant maintenance be submitted to the Water Department on an annul basis;
- 7) That if the electrical service is not owned by PSNH, DPW be afforded the opportunity to review the connections once again;
- 8) That an updated easement be provided for review by the Planning Board;

.....

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 54' x 60' three story commercial building with basement, totaling 12,960 s.f.; 2) a 22' x 162' three story residential building with basement garages containing 9 residential units; and 3) a 25' x 36' three story residential building with basement garages containing 2 residential units, 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 indicated they were coming for limited review. They have had numerous meetings with city personnel, as recently as yesterday. As a result of that meeting, concerns were raised by David Holden regarding the safety factors and they will be going back to the drawing board. They are now proposing to put all of the structures into the corner of the lot. They were looking for review from the Committee today for the reduction of the impervious surface on the site and increasing green space which will reduce stormwater run off. They are utilizing existing utilities on the site which has two water services, domestic and fire, and sewer. They are working with a traffic consultant.

Mike Sievert, of MJS Engineering, indicated that there wasn't any change from this submission but there had been from the March 2nd plan. They started out with 14 residential units on the ground. They have moved the entrance and hope that it is adequate because they can't really go any further if it isn't. They are currently looking at moving the building. There is existing sewer, water and gas on the site. They are planning on bringing in two services for fire and domestic.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the current services are adequate and indicated that they will need to show the existing connections on the plan.

Mr. Sievert believed they were adequate. The utilities will be underground on the side of the entrance. At this point, the existing lot is 18% open space and their proposal is 32% open space, so they are reducing the stormwater runoff minimally.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the northeast corner and whether the drainage goes across another lot.

Mr. Sievert indicated that there is no drainage easement and it does not show up on the plan. There is a closed drainage system on the adjoining lot. They will be speaking to the neighbors to discuss drainage.

Attorney Pelech indicated that they would speak to Mr. Chinberg to discuss a drainage easement.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they had a gas service and whether it was big enough.

Mr. Sievert indicated that they had a gas service but he was not sure if the gas service was big enough.

Mr. Desfosses indicated they would need a detail on the set of plans for the street crossings. He indicated the valves need to be in the right of way.

Mr. Cravens indicated that the City only allows one water meter per lot.

Mr. Holden indicated that this was all very basic information that they should have at this stage.

Mr. Sievert indicated that they went into DPW and they didn't get the info at that March 2nd meeting.

Mr. Holden indicated that it was not the responsibility of DPW to get the information.

Mr. Sievert indicated that they are still working on everything and are trying to get a layout completed.

Mr. Holden indicated that they have a good handle on the driveway location which has been set as far to the easterly direction as possible. The Committee needs some traffic information as this will probably end up going to Traffic & Safety. Also, a landscaping plan would be helpful. The applicant has made a good start with a site plan that improves the general area. The plan before the Committee has some hazards that can be addressed by a different orientation. This is a business district, and is also a former industrial area, and he would like to see something built to the lot line, preserving open space and possibly a building in an L shape.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the proposed mid-block crosswalk and whether they did an analysis on site distance to make sure that was a safe scenario.

Mr. Sievert indicated that they did a profile of Islington Street for the March 2nd meeting for site distance coming out of the site. The site distance from the old location to the west was approximately 300'. By moving it down to the end, it will be more.

Mr. Holden asked if the bridge replacement would effect the safety.

Mr. Desfosses indicated it would probably make it slightly worse. He suggested that they re-look at moving the crosswalk next to Hovey's. Now would be the time to look at it.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses moved to table this matter until the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 1st. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Holden encouraged them to revise their site plans and also encouraged them to appear before Traffic & Safety with a modified plan as well.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of Aranosian Oil Company, Owner, and Aranco Oil Company, Applicant, for property located at 1166 Greenland Road, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 3,588 s.f. convenience store, a 24' x 36' car wash and covered fueling islands for passenger vehicles and trucks, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated

site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 279 as Lots 1 & 2 and lies within an Industrial district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Malcolm McNeill addressed the Committee. Also present were Dennis Moulton from Millette, Sprague & Colwell, as the site engineer, and Floyd Hayes and Paul Kenney as principals of the applicant.

Attorney McNeill indicated that the site had been operated since 1946 as a gasoline station and presently consists of over 19 acres. Route 33 is on one side and the Spaulding Turnpike is on the other side. There is one house across the street from the signalized intersection. They have had six hearings before the city and not one abutter has objected.

The existing condition is a 1900 s.f. convenience store with an outdated canopy. There are fuel stations under the canopy. There is presently no treatment on the site for runoffs. The site is a legal non-conforming use and the applicant could continue to use the property in its current condition. There is currently extensive parking of tractor trailers in the evening hours and approximately 42 trailers are parked on the site after hours. The proposed application would have the operation open 24 hours a day.

Mr. Holden asked what the purpose was for the trucks coming in after hours.

Attorney McNeill indicated that they park there.

Mr. Holden asked why the owner didn't do anything to prevent that.

Attorney McNeill indicated that they have attempted to do something about it but it has been a difficult process and went on to say that if they approve this project they won't have to worry about it anymore. They will monitor the site 24 hours per day.

The proposed site will enlarge the convenience store and move it back from the street more. They will put in a more viable canopy and also put one over the truck fueling area. The parking will be reduced to an area for 9 trucks. Because of concerns expressed at many levels of the City, they have done two things around the site. One is, at the request of the administration of the City, they agreed to put around the perimeter of the site the "Great Wall of Aranco", suitable for area conditions at U.S. Embassies around the world. They have provided for curbing, a small area for planting purposes, very large boulders and a Jersey Barrier all around the site to prohibit trucks from reaching this area and getting into sensitive environmental areas. This plan was never the choice of the applicant and it was never felt by the applicant to be necessary as they felt there were ways to adequately treat the conditions. This is a plan that was directly, directly, directly a request from City officials. In addition, in the event the "Great Wall of Aranco" fails, the City has also required the drafting of an Enforcement Easement which extends 50' back from the paved surface of the site. This gives the City, after reasonably warning the applicant of a breach of the wall, a spill that wasn't corrected, drainage or other substances that are not being adequately being treated before they went into the wetlands areas, the option at the applicants expense to correct the condition. The process was to first to go to the Conservation Commission as the site is in the wetlands protection district. They have been before the Conservation Commission three times and the Conservation Commission has endorsed the plan on each occasion with conditions that he will go into. They then appeared before the Planning Board for the Conditional Use Permit Approval and were denied by that board. They came back with

revised plans that included the “Great Wall” and the enforcement easement and that became acceptable to the Planning Board and approved the revised plan. The next step was the BOA with regards to various variances relating to changing non-conforming uses. They requested relief to enlarge the convenience store, construct a car wash, and install canopies and were granted approval on April 20th with conditions that there be no overnight parking of tractor trailer trucks on the site, that the carwash facility be 100% recycled, no more than 9 trucks be parked on the site and any future changes would go back before the BOA. The final step will be TAC and the Planning Board. There were issues raised regarding effects to the Great Bog and Great Bay and the Conservation Commission hired a consultant that has agreed that there was no effect.

Attorney McNeill stated that as they processed this plan with the City, there was a stage where it was absolutely clear to the applicant what this wall was to consist of. He indicated that neither Dennis Moulton or himself would ever have conceived this type of a wall structure. The applicant has used rocks and boulders in other locations but because of concerns of history and concerns of this site, the applicant went to a greater degree of security that what is normal.

Dennis Moulton, of Millette, Sprague & Colwell, indicated that there was no stormwater management on the site currently and runoff now flows towards the wetlands. There is no control of the site and trucks pull in after hours and park. They are proposing significant improvements to the site. They are also balancing the additional pavement with additional stormwater management. There are two catch basins on the site. Those collect the water to an oil/water separator, going to an oil sediment separator, connecting to a detention pond. This will allow storage of up to 12,000 gallons so that if there is a large discharge from the site, most of the runoff should be caught. Next is the dry detention area with outlets to a pipe to another spreader and ultimately the vegetative buffer strip.

They are proposing two gas canopies with will be level and catch small spills and will have stormwater grading around the canopies. They will provide parking on the front and side with loading zones in front of the dumpster. There will be storage tanks for the car wash that captures all runoff from the carwash. 75% of the water will be reused and 25% will be held in holding tanks and trucked off the site. The sewer/septic will be relocated to the front of the building and the design is currently being done up.

Mr. Moulton indicated that the city was concerned with the disposal of the car wash storage which will be pumped out of the holding tanks. A maintenance schedule will be provided for the systems and will be provided to the City in the spring and fall and that will be added to the plan. Best Management Practices for service stations will be complied with and will be added to the plan. The monitoring wells will be monitored every six months and they will also provide those reports to the City. As part of the project, when they remove pavement they will have a change to clean the site and remove any contaminated soil.

Mr. Moulton reviewed their plan of the height of the truck bumpers to the height of the barrier. Tractor trailer bumpers are 30” to 32” high. Those heights are below the top of the barrier which is 32” in height. In order for the tractor trailer to reach the barrier, they would have to get past the boulders. They therefore believe the combination of those two are adequate to prohibit tractor trailers from driving past the pavement. The area in between will be planted with a grass mix.

Mr. Allen asked about the detail of the wall where the barrier is actually on a level portion of ground but he was showing that the barrier was actually on their 3 to 1 section.

Mr. Moulton said that the detail he was showing was behind the tractor trailers and is level.

Mr. Holden asked if the rest of the barrier was lower than the bumper because if it was that was not going to be what was expected. Mr. Holden went on to indicate that the representation of the barrier was that it would hinder a vehicle and he asked if it would do that, yes or no?

Mr. Moulton indicated that yes, it would and at it's lowest it would be about 20".

Mr. Holden indicated that a bumper would pass over that height and the intent of the barrier was to stop the bumper.

Mr. Moulton indicated that they would modify that plan so that the concrete barriers would be on level ground.

Deputy Chief Young asked about the carwash.

Mr. Moulton indicated it was a touchless carwash and would b operational 24 hours a day and they would have a heating pad as you leave the car wash and a grate thereby elimination any water or ice on the roadway. On very cold days they will not be able to operate the carwash.

Mr. Moulton indicated he would add the heating pad and grates to the 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. Cravens made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Police Chief Young seconded.

- 1) That a landscaping plan be completed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 2) That this matter be referred to the Traffic & Safety Committee to be heard at their next scheduled meeting;
- 3) That a comparison of the existing traffic impact and the proposed traffic safety be provided to John Burke prior to the Traffic & Safety meeting, to include information on the queuing of the traffic light in both directions to give some idea of the adequacy of same;
- 4) That the Septic Plan be reviewed and approved by David Desfosses;
- 5) That the Site Plan be modified with a Y in the sewer system so that everything does not go into the grease trap; the sewer lateral needs to be adjusted to meet code;
- 6) That the applicant obtain state approval for the septic system;
- 7) That the bottom of the Jersey barriers shall be installed per the exhibit provided showing all details, including the elevations;
- 8) That the stormwater system be inspected and maintained in both May and September and those reports forwarded to the DPW;
- 9) That when the grades are revised, the applicant needs to make sure that the City has access to the stormwater system for maintenance purposes;
- 10) That an Easement regarding the right-of-way on City property be prepared for review and approval by the City Attorney and said easements will not preclude the City from access to the right-of-way and, if there was any servicing of the water or utilities, the applicant will restore the area to the condition prior to the disturbance;

- 11) That the Site Plan show the Portsmouth Well Head protection area;
- 12) That any construction within the Well Head Protection area should comply with the Aquifer Protection Guidelines that are on file;
- 13) That a note be added to the plan indicating that the carwash will recycle 100% of their water;
- 14) That the Applicant will provide to DPW the logs and data on the monitoring wells, their locations, sampling frequency, sampling constituents and the results of the last two samplings;
- 15) That all new underground storage tanks receive DES approval;
- 16) That the heating pad at the end of the carwash be shown on the Site Plan and the details added to the Detail Sheet;

.....

II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:15 p.m.

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