

MINUTES OF MEETING  
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

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

AUGUST 30, 2005

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician, Steve Parkinson, Director of Public Works; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief and David Young, Deputy Police Chief.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Lucy Tillman, Planner

.....  
**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. The application of **Saco Avenue Professional Building, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **125 Brewery Lane**, wherein site plan approval was requested to construct a 4-story, 64' x 240', 15,500 ± s.f., 48-unit residential building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 154 as Lot 2 and lies within a Business district. (This application was tabled at the August 2, 2005 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Deputy Police Chief Young made a motion to take the application off of the table. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the Motion. Said motion passed unanimously.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering, representing Saco Avenue, appeared before the Committee, and handed out revised Site Plans.

He reviewed the status of the outstanding stipulations.

He was asked to meet with the Public Works Department regarding drainage in the area of Jewell Court. He met with representatives of the Public Works Department on August 9th and due to vacations, he was unable to finalize plans until today. He reviewed how they addressed the main drainage issues.

On Sheet C-5, on Chevrolet Avenue, by the back entrance to the facility he introduced, just south of back entrance, a catch basin . That will pick up run off from the low point and tie into a manhole.

The next area was a drain manhole at Jewell Court. Underneath building B there is a note to install a temporary connection. They are going to re-combine the drainage because the City is still in flux regarding future details of the drainage/sewer separation. There is also Note #7 on C-5 that indicates that the final location of DMH 1P will be determined by the City.

They left catch basin 1P to the northeast of Brewery Lane and to the left of building B.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that they added some cut and plug notes on Sheet C-3 and inverts on existing drains were added. They looked at how the separated storm drainage at Plaza 800 would connect into this system. The existing pipe runs easterly to an existing manhole. They will abandon that line and replace CP 17 to allow that separated drainage to be connect to proposed drainage on site at CP 18. The City would be responsible for construction on Plaza 800 property.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there were two low spots?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that CB 19P is the relocation of a catch basin that is over the sewer. That catch basin sits in a bowl and they would like to repave that.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they would be doing pavement chipping?

Mr. Chagnon indicated they would be and that would have to be added to the plan.

Mr. Desfosses asked if 16P on Chevrolet was a low point on the road?

Mr. Chagnon indicated it was.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that another issue was that they are showing the existing driveway going to the south side of the Malt House Exchange. That driveway will stay as is and is not on their property. The sidewalk proposed on Chevrolet is now shown going right to the property line and connecting with the driveway.

Mr. Chagnon indicated those were the changes to drainage as a result of the meeting with the Department of Public Works. He continued on reviewing the outstanding stipulations from the last TAC meeting.

1) That the Sewer Construction Agreement be approved by DPW and the Legal Department:

Mr. Chagnon would like to have that Stipulation remain and they will finalize that at a later time.

2) That a sidewalk easement from Chevrolet Avenue to Brewery Lane be provided for review and approval by DPW and the Legal Department;

Mr. Chagnon would like to have that Stipulation remain and they will finalize that at a later time;

3) That dye tests be completed on site to provide information regarding sewer pipes;

Mr. Chagnon would like to have that Stipulation remain and they will complete those tests at a later time;

4) That drainage and sewer easements shall be provided for review and approval by the city Legal Department;

Mr. Chagnon would like to have that Stipulation remain and they will finalize that at a later time;

Mr. Holden felt that some of those stipulations need to be done before Planning Board approval. The dye tests need to be done for TAC, not the Planning Board. He is concerned that too much is being pushed off that is expected to be done in 1 ½ weeks. Mr. Holden agreed they have done a lot of work and are moving forward but they still have some work to do. He asked what happens if they have a Construction Agreement plan that their client doesn't agree to – who is preparing that Agreement?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that on May 2<sup>nd</sup> they proposed an Agreement to the City and gave a written proposal of that to the City. It was his understanding in a meeting with the Legal Dept. in July was that they could work on that Agreement after the plan was approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Holden disagreed. He felt the agreement needs to be done in large part at this level.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that identifying where the pipes go, etc. have all been done. The cost allocation will be negotiated in the future.

Mr. Holden indicated it needs to be negotiated before it goes to the Planning Board.

Mr. Allen stated he believed it was between now and approval when these things should be worked out. And, he also pointed out that the TAC members had just received the plans today at the meeting. He felt there was a "leap of faith" here.

- 5) That the parking spaces on Brewery Lane shall be restriped with the sidewalk going behind them;

Mr. Chagnon understood that the 5 spaces along Brewery Lane in front of Building B should be re-striped with the sidewalk going behind them. There was also talk about parallel parking spaces going in the area. He distributed a parking plan to the members showing room for two spaces along the front. There is a problem with this shift as the floors are at street grade so putting in a raised sidewalk would mean they would be trapping water behind them and having a detrimental impact on the building. They need to work on this stipulation.

Mr. Holden felt it was in the City's interest in seeing the sidewalk. He asked if the building element makes this difficult?

Mr. Chagnon handed out an alternative diagram. This diagram allows for two parking spaces and a significant closing in the sidewalk gap.

Mr. Holden asked if it was his assumption that the City would allow the vehicles to back out into the street?

Mr. Chagnon stated they would not count them as part of the required parking.

Mr. Holden asked why not get rid of them?

Mr. Chagnon stated there are two offices in the building that have entrances on that side so it would impact those businesses.

Mr. Holden felt this would create a potentially unsafe condition.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that the parking spaces have been there a long time.

Mr. Holden confirmed that they were left to be determined at a later date. The City's Zoning Ordinance does not allow for business parking spaces to back out into the street. He asked if this was a right of way?

Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it was.

A discussion followed concerning the parking spaces on Brewery Lane.

Mr. Chagnon continued reviewing the previous stipulations from the July 5<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting:

- 1) That the sewer plans for Plaza 800 be reviewed with DPW;  
Mr. Chagnon confirmed that had been done.
- 2) That the applicant review the water line so that it can adequately handle 48 residential units;  
Mr. Chagnon confirmed that had been done.

Stipulations from the May 3<sup>rd</sup> TAC meeting:

- 1) That the five parking spaces on Brewery Lane which were “tabled” in Phase I shall be addressed to determine whether they are legal or non-conforming;  
Mr. Chagnon confirmed that this was pending.
- 2) That a note be added to the Site Plans that all temporary sidewalks be removed and replaced with City standard sidewalks with appropriate grades;  
Mr. Chagnon indicated that a note has been added to Sheet C-4.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Mr. Holden confirmed that the first six conditions are still outstanding. He suggested continuing with the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Parkinson indicated that the cross bar was after the cross walk and it should be the other way.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the bumpouts on the curbing would have to have tip downs on them (not sharp corners). He asked if the handicapped ramp tipdown needs to be moved down 3’ so that it is protected?

Mr. Chagnon indicated he didn’t do that as he wants a flat area for access and maneuvering room.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that he was talking about the other one, on the corner of Building C. They should be consolidated so that there is one big tipdown and the curb should be flush.

Mr. Chagnon asked if that would create a cross flow that is more than 20’?

Mr. Desfosses suggested that they work that out on-site.

Ms. Tillman asked what material all of the sidewalks were on the property?

Mr. Chagnon indicated the sidewalks were concrete.

Ms. Tillman referred to version 2 of the blowup of parking spaces and asked why it was 24’ wide for 2 parking spaces?

Mr. Chagnon felt they needed the extra space for turning.

Mr. Allen asked about recombining the sewer and stormdrain system and if that was set up so that when the stormdrain becomes available they can just run the pipe and not have a conflict? He further indicated that the drainage must go over the sewer with no conflict over Jewell Court. He suggested doing a detail for the plans.

There was a discussion regarding drainage and catch basins.

Mr. Chagnon indicated he needed to arrange for some dye testing and verify drain elevations before re-designing the plan.

Mr. Holden indicated that redesigning the old part of the City is difficult and they applaud his work. He felt they have come a long way but he wants the Construction Agreement approved and the dye tests run. Mr. Holden proposed keeping the first 6 stipulations active, however the May 3<sup>rd</sup> and July 4<sup>th</sup> stipulations are taken care of. He asked the Committee if they were comfortable tabling this to allow it to proceed?

Mr. Allen made a motion to table.

Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden stressed the importance of getting the revised plans filed prior to the next meeting for the Committee members to review.

They reviewed new stipulations that should be added to the tabling motion:

Mr. Parkinson confirmed that the cross walk and cross bar need to be switched.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that all curb protrusions should have tipdowns on them. He suggested doing an on-site to discuss further.

Mr. Holden suggested that someone from Planning should also be included in that inspection.

Mr. Allen indicated that the drainage system should be designed so that they can connect into an extended Jewell Court drainage system.

Mr. Holden indicated they would look into whatever they can do on parking spaces. He suggested getting together with Steve Parkinson, himself & the Legal Department to work something out and to avoid anything backing out into the street. Also, all sidewalks will be concrete.

Ms. Tillman asked if the Brewery Lane cross walk crosses to the Griffin property. She asked if they need permission for that?

Mr. Chagnon stated that Mary Griffin is in agreement with the proposed cross walk.

Mr. Holden indicated they would like something in writing on that. Also, he asked how it was noted that the City was responsible for connection CB16 & 17 on Plaza 800 property.

Mr. Allen requested that they show a stub out of their system.

Mr. Holden asked if there was anything else major to consider?

Mr. Desfosses followed up with just getting rid of the parking spaces on Brewery Lane.

The Motion to table to the October 4<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting passed unanimously.

Mr. Chagnon asked if Stipulation #2 could be brought forward (sidewalk easement)?

Mr. Holden confirmed he would like to see a Draft to get moving on it. He is most concerned with Stipulation #1 (Sewer Construction Agreement)

.....

2. The application of **K & S Energy, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **1400 Lafayette Road**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a one-story 10' x 48' building addition, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 252 as Lot 7 and lies within a General Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

John Chagnon, Ambit Engineering, representing K & S Energy Inc., addressed the Committee. He indicated they were proposing to construct a 10' x 48' addition to the rear of the building. There is an existing septic system that needs to be relocated. The site is not attached to public sewer. He distributed State approval letters on the septic. They will be connecting the electrical service to the back of the building and water service currently comes in on the other side and there will be no change. He reviewed the Site Plans which consisted of three sheets. The Existing Conditions plan shows existing boundaries and conditions of the site. Sheet C-2 shows the utilities which he pointed out to the Committee members. The dumpster would be brought forward. Six parking spaces are part of the variance approval plan which received approval from the Board of Adjustment in May. The first variance was a 30' rear yard where 50' is the minimum; an 11' side yard where 30' is the minimum and a 15' right side yard where 30' is the minimum. Six parking spaces are required for the site and they are also shown on the plan.

Also present was the owner, Samuel Haddad, and his Attorney, Bernard Pelech.

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

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Allen felt that parking spaces 1,2, and 3 were problematic and believed they were safety issues and non-functional.

Mr. Desfosses agreed with Mr. Allen and also added parking spaces 5,6, and 7 to his comment.

Mr. Parkinson agreed that parking spaces 1,2, and 3 appear to be problematic coming in.

Attorney Pelech confirmed that parking spaces 4,5, and 6 exist at the present time and are probably part of a present approval. They have not had problems with them. The vast majority of individuals who frequent the store will not use any spaces but rather will park at the pumps and run in and buy their items. He acknowledged that it is a very tight site.

Mr. Holden asked if it was an over intensive use of the site?

Attorney Pelech did not believe so and reminded him that the Board of Adjustment had granted the variances. He felt that if there was concern about the three parking spaces then maybe they could extend the island.

Mr. Parkinson commented that if they did that then parking space #1 would be totally un-useable.

Mr. Holden asked what they wanted the Committee to do? Did they want to proceed with the hearing or did they want to redesign the site?

Attorney Pelech asked exactly what spaces they have difficulty with?

Mr. Desfosses confirmed that parking spaces 1,2,6, and 7 are the worst.

Mr. Holden stated that, per Site Review regulations, the application met two of the criteria for disapproving a Site Review Application:

- b. The site development will not comply with all City Ordinances and Codes.
- j. That the proposed volume and arrangement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic flow, including but not limited to parking areas, intersections, roads or driveways, and traffic controls will create an unacceptable increase in safety hazards and traffic congestion.

Attorney Pelech felt they might be able to eliminate parking space #7 as they don't need it and parking space #1 can probably be relocated. They could try to put some parking in the rear. It would then have to go back to the Board of Adjustment for the accessway.

Mr. Holden noted that parking space #4 also blocks access to the dumpster.

Attorney Pelech indicated they would have to relocate the dumpster.

Mr. Holden felt more comfortable if they redesigned the plans and then meet with staff members to discuss.

Ms. Tillman asked if the "Waste Oil Tank" is being removed ?

Mr. Chagnon stated that should be removed. The Septic Plan indicates that it's being removed and it will not be needed.

Mr. Holden asked if there would be any car repairs on site?

Mr. Chagnon confirmed that there would not.

Mr. Allen made a motion to table this matter to a time uncertain.

Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The Motion to table to a time indefinite passed unanimously.

.....

3. The application of **Portsmouth Casey Home, Owner, and Heyland Development, Applicant**, for property located at **1950 Lafayette Road**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 2 ½ story office building, with a 3,280 ± s.f. footprint and a 1 story 6,000 ± s.f. function hall, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 267 as Lot 7 and lies within an Office Research district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Richard Salvo, of Engineering Alliance, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He indicated that they met with the Planning Department in mid-July to discuss the project and they also attended a Pre-TAC meeting on August 2nd. They have submitted a curbcut permit to NHDOT and they have received tentative approval.

The site is 2.3 vacant acres on Route 1 in an Office Research zone which abuts a residential district. The office building grew in size from their original idea and the parking increased accordingly. Also the Knights of Columbus meeting hall is now part of this project. This site will act as a condominium and those two tenants will act as the condominium association. There will be one-way access off of Route One and a two way exit onto the service road. The road will be constructed along the full length of the back property line.

The stormwater management system acts as two different sections. There is a high section that drains into catch basins and discharges into the stormwater detention basin area. The existing drainage swale flows under the driveway to mitigate the run off of the impervious surfaces. The soils in this area are well drained. The existing wooded area in front will remain as screening from the residential area as it is 100' within a residential district. The lights are dark sky friendly and a Landscape Plan has been submitted.

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. Holden asked about the dimensional requirements. When this area was re-zoned, there was a special OR zone for some lots and was this one of them?

Robert Iafolla introduced himself as the original owner and indicated that yes it was. He believes it is Lot 1-5 now.

Mr. Holden stated that it reduced the amount of depth and street frontage and it only has to be an acre.



Mr. Parkinson asked if someone was present to talk about their traffic report. He didn't see where the function hall aspect was included in the parking calculations.

Mr. Salvo indicated they will get back to them with ITE information.

Mr. Desfosses noted that it certainly doesn't account for a 200 member function hall.

Mr. Allen noted they have a 6" fire service and they will need 8" for the hydrant.

Mr. Cravens indicated they could reduce it once you get to the hydrant but it must be 8" to the hydrant. He would also like a detail on the utility plan showing how the meter is arrange. The pipe will go into the first building and will then be piped into the next.

Mr. Holden asked if they would be irrigating the landscaping?

Mr. Salvo confirmed they would not.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the proposed leach and catch basin could be pulled more towards the development? Maybe slide it 20'?

Mr. Salvo stated that he tried to have it fall within the natural low point but they can move it.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they want to move the water services under the driveway?

Mr. Cravens felt it would probably be easier if they do it in the driveway.

Mr. Salvo stated the valves should be in the City right of way.

Mr. Holden asked if they need a curbcub from DOT?

Mr. Salvo indicated that they almost have the last piece of information (deed) for the 12' swap of land adjacent to Lafayette Road.

Mr. Holden noticed that the sign is shown 20' from the property line.

Mr. Salvo indicated that the sign should be adjusted to reflect 12' of state deed.

Mr. Britz asked how the leaching basin would work?

Mr. Salvo stated that, although it is within part of the forested area, it is part of where the entrance will be. The forest will be all around it and the soils are all low drain.

Mr. Britz asked that it be graded even though it's not going to be paved.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they would have an enclosed dumpster?

Mr. Salvo indicated that was shown on Sheet C-4.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold indicated that City Ordinance required automatic notification of emergency forces in the building. Also, a Knox box on each building.

Mr. Holden asked if the lighting plan was showing dark sky friendly?

Mr. Salvo indicated that was shown on Sheet C-8.

Mr. Desfosses requested that ETC must be changed to ETCF

Mr. Desfosses asked if the pole was on the neighbors property?

Mr. Salvo believed it was right on the property line.

Mr. Iafolla confirmed that the pole was exactly on the property line and the State's 12' deed is part of that. PSNH would have to cross the State line to access the pole.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the clearing line would run up the driveway.

Mr. Holden commented that the lighting plan looks like they have done a very good job of keeping lighting down.

Mr. Salvo stated that the lights spill off site at the end of the service road where they feel it should be lit.

Mr. Desfosses asked who owns the road?

Mr. Iafolla indicated that at the time that Lafayette West Industrial Park was developed in 1983, the lots westerly to this site were all sold. The neighbor owns the roadway with an easement across it.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the easement allows them to put a light pole in that easement?

Mr. Iafolla was 99% sure that it did.

Mr. Holden asked for a count of trees that are greater than 6" that will remain.

Mr. Salvo indicated that they were looking to be able to thin out the trees similar to what they did next door.

Mr. Holden asked if the catch basin was landscape-able?

Mr. Salvo confirmed it was in a grass area so yes it would be landscaped.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee if they had enough information to move forward?

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the only issue is parking for 200.

Mr. Parkinson stated he would prefer to see a traffic report before approving.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to table.

Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden asked the applicant to work with the Department of Public Works and the Planning Department to revisit the post service road so that it is consistent with abutting properties.

Mr. Parkinson indicated that there is no reference to the function hall component relative to traffic and that needs to be addressed specifically.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the south side of the driveway where there are 3 white pines. He would like to retain all trees in that area that are greater than 6”.

Mr. Holden asked if there were sidewalks out to the street?

Mr. Salvo stated there is no sidewalk proposal as this is only an entrance in and there is no sidewalk on Lafayette Road or the service road. Nevertheless, it is the only entrance into Route One so they could walk through the parking area to get to Route One. There are concrete sidewalks in front of all buildings and they are accessible to handicapped entrances.

Mr. Holden asked what the required parking is vs. what has been provided.

Mr. Salvo indicated they have not provided any more spaces than what is required. He also confirmed that the sidewalks are bituminous.

Mr. Desfosses indicated there should be 8” concrete curbing along the sidewalks.

Mr. Holden asked if there were bumpers or traffic stops by the snow storage area?

Mr. Desfosses indicated it was grass so it shouldn’t be a problem. He asked if the State was asking for a deceleration lane?

Mr. Salvo indicated that the entrance is 27’ off the center line so they will not have a deceleration lane but there will be an area they will need to add pavement to on Route One. This is not shown on their plans as it just came in but will be shown next month.

Mr. Holden indicated they will need State approval for a curbcut.

Mr. Salvo asked if correspondence from the State showing they are on board would be acceptable?

Mr. Holden indicated that whatever satisfied Parkinson would be acceptable.

Mr. Parkinson confirmed that a letter advising they will be approving is fine.

The motion to table to the next meeting passed unanimously.

.....

4. The application of **Richard W. Edgerly, Owner**, for property located at **154 Fleet Street**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 3,246 ± s.f. 4-story building with basement, after removal of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 6 and lies within a Central Business B, Historic A and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, appeared on behalf of the Applicant, Richard Edgerly. Julie McDonald of DeStefano Architects was also present. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that the project

received approval from the Historic District Commission. He reviewed the Site Plans with the Committee.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that the Cover Sheet shows the façade of building.

The next sheet is the standard boundary survey and existing conditions plan. He noted on the southerly side, there is a 10' wide passageway that is owned in common by the owner and the abutter, Michael Delacruz. There is a jog in the back that is currently utilized by the building on Map 17, Lot 4 for air conditioning pads.

Sheet C-1 is the demolition site plan. The project is going to begin with the removal of the existing building and tapping of existing utilities. The sheet also shows removal of on street parking spaces during construction.

Sheet C-2 shows the layout and landscaping. One of the things noted is that they are actually going to be adding a parking space along Fleet Street. They will go from two to three off site parking spaces as they are giving up a curbcut. The passageways will be repaved with bituminous concrete and concrete sidewalk between the buildings and grassed areas in the back for pedestrian access. Between the buildings to the north, they will install a gate and fence panel. The site is very close to Gilley's so nighttime security is a concern. Mr. Chagnon had a letter from Mr. Furina, of 168 Fleet Street, attesting to no objection to site work being done on his property during construction. Some minor changes need to be made after a meeting with Mr. Furina.

Mr. Furina is desirous of maintaining the access between the two buildings during construction. They will provide in the plans an unfettered pedestrian access. He wants to be able to maintain the sidewalk in the future and they are agreeable to providing an easement for the sidewalk that is on their property. They will provide Mr. Furina keys to the gate.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that they would revise the plans to show the same type of fence rather than chain link. They will install a panel and gate for security to back the doors and that will be added to plans.

Mr. Desfosses asked how high the gate is?

Mr. Chagnon indicated it was 6 feet high. Sheet C-2 also shows the overall building dimensions. There will be two retail shops on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor level, an elevator and corridor areas.

Sheet C-3 is the utility and grading plan. They plan to connect sewer from Fleet Street. There is no separated drainage currently in front but there is to the northeast. They will catch roof run off with down spouts running through the buildings with a catch basin at street level.

Mr. Desfosses asked how far underground the roof drain would be?

Mr. Chagnon indicated 50'.

Mr. Desfosses meant vertical.

Mr. Chagnon indicated about 3'.

Mr. Desfosses was not comfortable with a roof drain running through the building. Someone could mistake it for a sewer drain.

Mr. Allen indicated they should extend the drain line in front of their property.

Mr. Chagnon felt that passageway is really "juiced" with electric wires and he would like to avoid it.

Mr. Chagnon went on to say that the water service is existing. They will provide a knox box and enunciator announcing city fire alarm system. They show grading on the plan with tip downs for elevations.

Sheet D-1 shows standard details.

Deputy Police Chief Young asked if they had a traffic & safety plan in place for during daytime hours. He noted that the street is very narrow. He also asked if there would be staging area concerns?

Mr. Chagnon pointed out notes on the plans regarding coordinating street closures. There is no relationship with the contractor yet so it is not finalized.

The Chair called for speakers.

Bob Kennedy, owner of property located at 175 Fleet Street, expressed his concern with the street being so narrow in light of his parking lot across the street. People just come in and take over his parking lot and prevent him from using it. He is also concerned with street closure and how that will be handled.

Mr. Holden advised Mr. Kennedy that he was in the right place for those questions and they will attempt to work out some answers. He asked if the parking lot was the Gilley's location?

Mr. Kennedy confirmed that it was.

Tony Furina, of 168 Fleet Street, spoke to the Committee. He had a concern of the exit for his tenant remaining open during construction. Also, how would the integrity of his foundation be maintained during construction? He thinks it is a fine project and will add to Fleet Street.

Mr. Chagnon addressed Mr. Kennedy's concerns. If he owns a private parking lot, construction workers are not allowed to use that unless they have permission and they will make them aware of that. They should figure out a construction point person who would be available to neighbors for them to call. It's a little early to talk about street closings but there will be some need for that. They will not be frequent and they will attempt to develop a plan to keep one lane open and keep traffic moving as much as possible. Mr. Furina should have no problem making the light motion sensor work. They will try to provide some reassurance that construction will not effect his existing foundation.

Mr. Holden asked if the motion sensor activated security light was on the plan on the left but not on right?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that the plans show three separate lights.

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 made a motion to approve. Deputy Police Chief Young seconded.

Mr. Cravens requested that the plans should reflect that the abandonment of the existing water service, should be supervised by the City Water Department.

Mr. Desfosses asked for a detail on the awning. He wants to know how it is supported and confirm that it is tall enough.

Mr. Desfosses asked about footings? Are they within the right of way?

Mr. Chagnon indicated they would be going to the City Council for approval of some footings.

Mr. Holden stated that they need detail with the understanding that if they are in or under the right of way they will need City Council approval.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the footings wouldn't be designed until after approval. The architect will need approvals for the awning entrance canopy.

Mr. Holden reminded Mr. Chagnon that any protrusions, such as windowsills, would require approvals. He further indicated that they could dramatically simplify this if they would bring the sidewalk in 6" on the property.

Mr. Allen stated that the drainage line would be extended sometime so he recommends that the building drainage line to be brought to the southerly end of the City drainage line. Also, he referred to Note #6 on Sheet C-3 where it indicated that there would be no restaurant use. Mr. Allen felt this was an opportunity to put in a grease trap for any potential restaurant. The note claiming no restaurants on the Site Plan may not have any legal standing.

Mr. Holden recommended a stipulation that the applicant and the City work on the issue of a grease trap. More often than not the grease trap is needed.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stated that any type of kitchen would need a hood system and vertical ducts are preferred. This was just something to consider for the future.

Mr. Chagnon pointed out this was a high point in the street so another catch basin was not necessary.

Mr. Allen didn't feel that another catch basin was necessary but rather just wants the drainage line extended. If the street is going to be torn up to build this, this is the time to put it in.

Mr. Desfosses concurred and added that to extend the drain line later would mean tearing everything up again.

Mr. Allen indicated that the intersection of Fleet and Congress would be separated and brought down Fleet. They can work with him on that and show him design elevation.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold mentioned the issue of a Knox box and fire alarm box.

Mr. Parkinson confirmed that all projects in the downtown area need a Construction Management Plan. The closing of parking spaces and streets will require approval from City Council. The drain line construction will take up parking spaces and there will be a fee for those lost spaces. A plan should lay out the proposed use of the City right of way for staging areas, which will not be the streets. Suzanne Woodland would coordinate that.

Ms. Tillman referred to Sheet C-2, overall building dimensions and setbacks. The building comes very close to the right and left sides. She asked if they will need approvals from abutters for footing easements?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that they do not anticipate going over the property lines on the sides.

Ms. Tillman indicated that parking should be reviewed for accuracy. Also, the front left of the building where the sidewalk tips down and there is a transition right at a doorway. She asked if this is a problem?

Mr. Chagnon felt that they may want to shift the door but that would be an HDC issue.

Mr. Desfosses felt that they were only tipping up a tiny amount.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that was correct, because the road slopes.

Ms. Tillman asked if there was a handicapped accessible entrance to the building?

Julie McDonald, DeStefano Architects, indicated that the center entrance is handicapped accessible from the sidewalk to each first floor unit.

Mr. Holden asked if the basement level was retail?

Mr. Chagnon indicated the basement would be a combination of warehousing for retail and storage units for residential.

Mr. Holden felt that needed to be reviewed in light of the ordinance. He also asked if they would be blasting for the basement?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that he did not know the subsurface conditions.

Mr. Holden stated they will need that information as it will concern abutters. He indicated he would like to nail this down. He asked if the fences shown on the plans were approved by the HDC?

Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they were approved by the HDC.

Mr. Holden asked about an easement for the electrical service to come in?

Mr. Chagnon indicated it was in the passageway so it was not necessary.

Mr. Holden asked if there was a need for an easement for electrical, wouldn't this be the time to get it?

Mr. Chagnon confirm that, yes, they will need what PSNH tells them.

Mr. Holden asked how the shared driveway would be handled? There should be a note on that.

Ms. Tillman asked where the curbing was on the concrete walk?

Mr. Chagnon pointed out the Detail Sheet that shows a curb that wraps around the side and is at grade.

Ms. Tillman asked if the chain link fence had gone to the HDC?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that it was the replacement of an existing fence.

Mr. Holden suggested making a note that it is "replacing in kind".

Mr. Holden asked if the air conditioning for the adjacent property was on the applicant's lot?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that it was not.

Mr. Holden felt that TAC should see this again before going forward. He suggested they get the management plan underway.

Mr. Allen made a motion to table.

Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Holden suggested to Mr. Chagnon that he get the revised plans and attend the next Pre-Tac.

.....

**II. ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 4:20 p.m.

.....

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