

MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

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

JANUARY 3, 2006

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, Debbie Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief; and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief.

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
Mr. Holden introduced Len DiSesa as the new Police Department representative.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. The application of **The Hill Unit Owners Association, by Paul Demars, President**, for property located **off Deer Street**, commonly known as "The Hill", wherein site plan approval is requested to add 13+ new parking spaces, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 26 and lies within a Central Business B, Historic A and Downtown Overlay Districts. (This application was tabled from the November 29, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Mr. Holden called for any speakers. Seeing no one rise he recommended that this matter be tabled. He indicated that it was his expectation that this matter was to be tabled again.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to table this application until the January 31, 2006 TAC meeting. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

The motion to table to the January 31, 2006 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....
2. The application of **Lewis A. and Ruth Cicero, Owners, and Changing Places, LLC, Applicant**, for property located **off Falkland Way** wherein site review approval is requested for the creation of 24 new town home units on a proposed 8 lot subdivision, with all of the proposed lots having access off of a proposed extension of Crescent Way extending through to Saratoga Way, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are

shown on Assessor Plan 212 as Lot 123 and lies within a General Residence B District; (This application was tabled from the November 29, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to take the application off of the table. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton, of AMES MSC, addressed the Committee. Also present was Attorney Bernie Pelech. As was stated, this application is for a new subdivision off of Falkway Way. They are proposing 23 new townhouse units, a new roadway and drainage improvements, and water, sewer and utilities. This matter was tabled to pursue additional items with this Committee and he reviewed those items:

Concerns from the November 29, 2005 TAC meeting:

- 1) That an on-site meeting be scheduled between the applicant and David Desfosses of DPW to review drainage;

An on site meeting was scheduled and they met with David Desfosses on the site, they walked the length of the drainage pattern and found that it flows from the low area of the property to the Public Housing and PSNH properties. A 36" drain leads to an established way to a river. From discussions, they revised their drainage by splitting the drainage into two components. One addresses the stormwater run off from the current houses on Raleigh way, from a low point on the property. From the low area, they proposed closed drainage around the development to a rip rap outlet, level spreader, which would provide a sheet flow of water into the existing low area of wetland and channel that flow from the adjacent property. The second component of runoff is generated by the roadway itself. There is a separate closed drainage system. At the intersection of Saratoga, it is connected by a separate closed drainage system, along the back of the proposed houses out to a rip rap outlet, leading to a treatment swale. By separating the flow they accomplish two things. One is that they provide treatment for run off from the roadway and also provides linear treatment to the existing run off from the houses on Raleigh Way. From discussions on site, there was concern of the downstream effects. They prepared a supplemental drainage calculation which addresses that and Mr. Moulton handed out that analysis to the Committee. Based on a visual inspection of the outlet they determined evidence where the high water mark was evidence. Once they established the base line flow they just plugged in the expected flows from pre and post development situations. Based on their analysis they feel that downstream impacts on the project are minimal at best.

- 2) That Saratoga Way be reviewed to determine whether it meets the standards required for additional traffic created as a result of the proposed development;

Based on their on site meeting, it was decided that they propose an additional 2' widening at the end of Saratoga Way where it meets Raleigh. This matches the width of the travel lane at the far end of Saratoga.

- 3) That the Grading Plan be reviewed for accuracy and omissions;

Mr. Moulton believed he picked up all omissions and corrected the Site Plans accordingly.

- 4) That the water line should be 10” connecting to the 8” at the Raleigh Way intersection, with two new connections coming in off of the line and a 10” stub from the property line so that City could extend to Atlantic Heights for another feed;

Mr. Moulton indicated that they revised the plans to show 10” water lines all the way out to Raleigh Way with two new connections.

- 5) That a meeting be scheduled with the applicant and Tom Cravens and David Allen of DPW to discuss off-site improvements on the water mains;

They met with Tom Cravens and Peter Rice and they discussed two possible scenarios for improvement. He believed the result of their determination was that improvements to the current line on Kearsarge would be the best way to go. Mr. Cravens agreed and indicated that they were still working on some figures.

- 6) That the Planning Department will review the “cut through” that is being used on private property and provide a report at the next TAC meeting;

Mr. Moulton indicated that he will defer to the Committee to see how that is done.

Concerns from the November 2, 2005 TAC meeting:

- 1) That the applicant meet with the City Community Development Department to coordinate lighting;

Mr. Moulton confirmed that they got the specs from the Community Development Department and those have been noted on the plans.

- 2) That a 10’ vegetative buffer easement shall be prepared by the Applicant and reviewed and approved by the City Attorney;

Mr. Moulton indicated that will be added to the Subdivision Plan and will be subject to review.

- 3) That all topographical features shall be shown on the Site Plans;

Mr. Moulton believed that had been accomplished.

- 4) That the applicant shall work with Steve Parkinson and Deb Finnigan, of DPW, to determine what the city shall require for a Traffic Study;

Mr. Moulton indicated that part of their packets included a report that should be sufficient.

- 5) That there shall be an independent inspector for the proposed roadway as this will eventually be a city street;

This has been agreed to and will be part of the Site Review Agreement.

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. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden indicated that the first issue was drainage. He asked Mr. Desfosses to summarize what the issues are.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the issue comes down to the fact that the project proposes to drain their stormwater onto property of PSNH and the Portsmouth Housing Authority. They have received a drainage analysis that tells us that their increasing flow out to the adjacent property will raise the elevation to the adjacent property by 4/100 of 1 foot, or approximately ½ “. He believed they need some sort of legal sign off that that is insignificant, or confirm that it is insignificant. He wasn't sure who would decide that. He believes it is agreed that it is a very small amount but he felt they needed some sort of legal statement from the City Attorney.

Mr. Holden indicated to Mr. Moulton that he was looking at the drainage study for the first time. His reading was that there would be some increased flow on adjacent property but it would be very minimal, around ½”. Mr. Holden asked, in terms of percentage, what was the increase on the adjacent property?

Mr. Moulton indicated he believed it would be about 3%.

Mr. Holden stated that one of the criteria that they have to look at is whether the off site disposal and transport of stormwater run off is capable of being adequately handled by existing facilities. He asked Mr. Moulton is he was stating that the increased run off on adjacent properties could be handled or is it such a small increase that it is insignificant?

Mr. Moulton stated that they were both correct.

Mr. Holden asked if they have any permission from abutting property owners for the increase or do they believe they need it?

Mr. Moulton indicated that he would defer to legal council on that issue.

Mr. Desfosses agreed that the run off is very minimal and probably insignificant but it does not meet the letter of the criteria.

Mr. Holden asked if, before the Planning Board meeting, this would be researched with a recommendation to the Planning Board.

Attorney Bernard Pelech, counsel for the applicant, indicated that he didn't have a problem with some sort of a condition being placed on the property. His only concern is that the Housing Authority is a federal agency and it may take some time to get a letter of consent or agreement.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Desfosses to make that a condition that prior to approval by the Planning Board, a report be provided to DPW and the Planning Board showing that there is either approval by the adjacent property owners to the increase or that some agreement is in place to allow the same.

Mr. Desfosses agreed to make that condition.

Mr. Britz asked about the two drainage structures, the swale and the level spreader, and asked if they were going to be planted and he was concerned about erosion in the wetland buffer. He would like to see them protected. He asked what is going to keep the sediment from flowing out? Mr. Britz asked that a condition be made that the structure itself will be fully stabilized before use.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there was anyway to show an armored slope from both the outlet of the treatment swale and the bypass culvert to the toe of slope or the stone wall.

Mr. Moulton indicated it would depend what they find out there.

Mr. Holden felt they should try to be aggressive with their treatment now and if something less is required they can adjust it but it would be difficult to go more stringent.

Mr. Desfosses stated that they have had a lot of level spreaders and most of them fail pretty quickly. He would rather have an armored slope. As far as the slope uphill of the swales, with the concentrated flow, they should probably use some smaller stone and run it right down the hill so there are no problems in the future.

Mr. Holden asked if that could be handled by a detail?

Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it could.

Mr. Holden asked about the second concern that Saratoga Way be reviewed. He knows that both Mr. Desfosses and Ms. Finnigan reviewed it and asked where we stood?

Ms. Finnigan indicated that Mr. Desfosses had the discussion with the engineer at the site.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the existing condition is that the road, which was a dead end with one driveway off of it, was originally built by the City five years ago and was 20' wide, widening out because there is parking on the right hand side. Now that is going to be a through way and it is appropriate that the road be two full lanes which is typically 24' wide. It is shown as 22' but should be 24'. The hydrant at the corner would have to be adjusted.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the condition would be to widen Saratoga to 24' and relocate the hydrant as required.

Mr. Moulton indicated for clarification that the 24' width is only the last couple of 100' where it meets Raleigh, just where there is no parking.

Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct. He stated specifically about 100' from Raleigh southwest down Saratoga on the right hand side, approaching the project.

Ms. Finnigan asked if that will impact parking and should it be labeled?

Mr. Desfosses did not believe it would effect parking at all.

Mr. Holden asked that the applicant meet with Ms. Finnigan to make sure it meets all requirements.

Mr. Holden believed the grading plan has been revised so that can be removed from the stipulations.

Mr. Cravens felt they should carry over the waterline stipulation. They are fairly close to finishing however the stub is not shown on the plans. Mr. Cravens felt they could finish up before the Planning Board meeting with a detail.

The stipulation asking that the applicant meet with Tom Cravens and David Allen to discuss the water main can be combined with the previous item.

Mr. Holden confirmed that a report would be provided by the Legal Department to the Planning Board as to the available options.

Mr. Moulton confirmed that lighting has been coordinated with the Community Development Department.

Mr. Holden believed Attorney Pelech and the City are still meeting to do the 10' vegetative buffer so that remains to be completed.

All parties confirmed that topographical details are now on the plans.

Mr. Holden asked Ms. Finnigan if the traffic plan was sufficient for the requirement that there be a traffic study?

Ms. Finnigan felt it could have been better but it meets her needs. She asked that they put a stop sign and stop bar at the intersection at Saratoga and Raleigh.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the stipulation for an independent inspector will remain.

The Committee then added their new stipulations:

Mr. Desfosses stated that on Lot 1, the water service is shown crossing the lot line and needs to be amended. Also, on Sheet 5, the sewer lateral is very steep and he would like them to put in a drop manhole to take care of that. He asked if they did test pits for the treatment swale?

Mr. Moulton indicated that they did not do any test pits.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they knew whether there is good material underneath? Mr. Desfosses would like that put on the detail at least so that, if there is not good material, the contractor can fix it in the field.

Mr. Desfosses asked where is the wooden guardrail that is on the plan?

Mr. Moulton stated it was towards the rear of two houses where there are steep slopes.

Mr. Desfosses asked them to upgrade the detail so that it is the same post as the guardrail. It would be cheaper as it would be a standard post. He also asked for a 3x8 horizontal section. If they used 6 x 6 they would have to drive them by hand.

Mr. Desfosses asked for a fill detail for the roadway cross section where it crosses the fairly good size ditch. He felt they would need a well graded material, not rock fill. He would like to see a detail on that.

Mr. Britz asked about the corners of the lots that are near the wetland buffer where there are very steep slopes and he indicated that he was concerned about yard debris going into the wetland. Could they have some sort of education for the homeowners?

Attorney Pelech confirmed that one is 30'.

Mr. Britz felt it was a steep hill.

Attorney Pelech asked what Mr. Britz would propose?

Mr. Britz indicated he would like some sort of education to the landowner, either in the deed or signage on site, so they are aware they cannot dump land debris.

Attorney Pelech indicated that language in the deeds would be fine and he will work with Mr. Britz on that.

Mr. Holden asked if the street lighting was set far enough apart to meet the City standards?

Mr. Moulton indicated that they were 150' apart.

Mr. Desfosses felt that was good. They are post mounted lights. He asked how many luminaires?

Mr. Moulton was unsure.

Mr. Desfosses confirmed that they were very similar to the kind they have downtown so they would be appropriate.

The motion to approve with the following stipulations passed unanimously.

Stipulations from the January 3, 2006 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1) That prior to approval by the Planning Board a report shall be provided to DPW and the Planning Board either that there is approval by the adjacent property owners to the increased drainage flow or that some Agreement is in place to allow such drainage flow;
- 2) That the two outfall structures (one swale and one level spreader) shall be fully constructed and stabilized before use;
- 3) That a detail be added to the Site Plans showing an armored slope from both the outlet of the treatment swale and the bypass culvert to the toe of slope or the stone wall;

- 4) That Saratoga Way be widened to 24' for approximately 100' near the intersection with Raleigh Way where there is no parking and that the hydrant be relocated as required;
- 5) That the applicant shall meet with Debbie Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, to review the revised Site Plans to make sure that Saratoga Way meets all requirements;
- 6) That the water line should be 10" CLDI connecting to the 8" main in the Raleigh Way intersection and to the future 10" on Crescent, with a 10" diameter stub to the Portsmouth Housing Authority property line so that the City could extend the line for a looped feed;
- 7) That a meeting be scheduled with the applicant and Tom Cravens and David Allen of DPW to discuss off-site improvements on the water mains;
- 8) That the Planning Department will review the "cut though" that is being used on private property and provide a report at the Planning Board meeting;
- 9) That a 10' vegetative buffer easement shall be prepared by the Applicant and reviewed and approved by the City Attorney;
- 10) That a stop line and stop sign shall be added to the Site Plans at the intersection of Saratoga and Raleigh Way;
- 11) That there shall be an independent inspector for the proposed roadway as this will eventually be a city street;
- 12) That the water service as shown crossing the lot line on Lot #1 shall be amended on the Site Plans;
- 13) That on the road profile, the sewer is shown very steep and a drop manhole should be added uphill to relieve the slope;
- 14) That a detail showing well drained material 2' below the treatment swale shall be added to the Site Plans so that the Field Contractor will be aware of it;
- 15) That it is recommended that the wooden guardrail detail be upgraded to a 6 x 8 post and 3 x 8 horizontal section;
- 16) That a full detail of the roadway cross section where it crosses the large existing ditch showing well graded fill under the road be added to the Site Plans; and
- 17) That language shall be added to the deeds of the two lots that border the wetland buffer, relative to the prohibition of dumping debris in the wetland buffer zone, and said language shall be approved by the Planning Department and the City Attorney;

.....

3. The application of **Marilyn Rath, Owner, and Portsmouth Fabric Company, Applicant**, for property located at **112 Penhallow Street** wherein site review approval is requested to construct a 679± s.f. second floor addition to the existing one story section of the building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 20 and lies within Central Business B, Historic A and Downtown Overlay Districts; (This application was tabled from the November 29, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Rummler, of Interface Architects, representing Marilyn Rath, of Portsmouth Fabric, appeared. Also present was Gretchen Rath, Owner, and Charles Griffin, counsel. Mr. Rummler indicated that there were two items of concern from the last meeting. One was that the parties meet with the City Attorney to discuss the party wall issues. Both parties have done that independently and they have also discussed it directly today. From their perspective they have responded to any questions or concerns

that were brought up in the abutters letter and their position is that the application is not contrary to the guidelines that were questioned and in their discussions with the Planning Director and the City Attorney. Mr. Rummler felt that rather than get into a detailed analysis of those concerns, they will wait to see if there are any questions. The concerns of Dave Allen about clarification of the site drainage issues were addressed. John Chagnon spoken to Dave Desfosses and a note has been added that clarifies that the downspouts will not be connected to the sanitary sewer system. The roof drainage of the proposed addition will mirror the existing roof drainage system. There will be no additional area of catchment.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Rummler if, as a matter of right, they believe they can construct the addition as proposed.

Mr. Rummler indicated that was correct.

Mr. Holden asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application

Attorney Sharon Somers, appeared on behalf of Judith Tausch. Attorney Somers indicated that she had appeared at the two previous meetings. She reiterated comments and objections that were voiced at some length at the previous meetings. She was unable to meet with the City Attorney and Mr. Rummler as she was away. Since that time the parties have had discussions to accomplish two things. One to provide her clients with a level of information so her client can make an informed decision about this and secondly to discuss some modest litigation measures. As a result they are making some progress and are continuing to speak and hopefully will result in some resolution. The chief Site Review criteria they are objecting to would then become moot. If that is not possible, then they would be present on the 19th before the Planning Board to reiterate their concerns at that time.

Mr. Holden asked, for the record, if they maintain that this application does not meet criteria F of the Site Review Regulations?

Attorney Somers confirmed that was correct.

Attorney Charles Griffin, representing the applicant, spoke next. He stated, with respect to criteria F they do not believe this is an objectionable feature. There are no New Hampshire cases on point but he did some research and found cases from New York and Pennsylvania. Attorney Griffin also pointed out that Site Review also encompasses the zoning ordinance, and there was a similar Supreme Court case last year where the Court said it looks at the area where the project is being constructed. This is a downtown area with 0 setbacks, yet they still have open space. They feel they will not pose any hazard or danger and this is legally permissible, the Zoning Ordinance allows it and the HDC has issued a letter of appropriateness.

Mr. Holden asked, based on his stance, criteria F does not apply in this instance and this application meets all applicable Site Review regulations.

Attorney Griffin confirmed that was correct and should a court suit arise, they would the interveners.

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 indicated, based on what he has heard and discussions with the Legal Department, he did not find any criteria preventing this committee from approving the application, however, he hoped that the parties would continue their discussions.

Mr. Allen moved to approve with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen requested a revised plan reflecting a note that the storm drains and roof drains are not tied into the city sewer.

Ms. Tillman asked for clarification from Mr. Rummmler regarding the revised plans. The latest plan that the Planning Department had a revision date of 10/17/05 and she asked if there was an additional revision that they did not have?

Mr. Rummmler confirmed they had provided an overlay of the roof drainage from the last meeting and the Site Plan was revised yesterday. He would get a copy of that to the Planning Department.

Mr. Holden stipulated that the applicant work with Planning Department and DPW to review the Site Plan prior to submittal to the Planning Board.

The motion with stipulations passed unanimously.

- 1) That a note shall be added to the plans stating that the storm drains and roof drains are not tied into the City sewer;
- 2) That the applicant shall work with the Planning Department and DPW to review the revised Site Plans prior to submittal to the Planning Board;

.....

4. The application of **T-Beyer Realty, LLC, Owner**, and **Tina Montgomery, Applicant**, for property located at 141 Banfield Road wherein amended site review approval is requested to revise the loading docks and the striping of the existing paved area, and the removal of the landscaped islands, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 254 as Lot 3 and lies within an Industrial district. (This application was tabled from the November 29, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton, of AMES MSC, representing Lisa Montgomery and Bill Sylvester, appeared before the Committee. Also present was Bernard Pelech, counsel for the applicant.

Mr. Moulton recapped the issues brought before TAC as the past meeting.

Major items of concern to the Committee are the following:

- 1) That stormwater management needs to be incorporated into this plan to conform with the present use and site conditions;

Mr. Moulton believed all that needed to be done was add the contours from the previous site plan showing the proposed drainage swale be added and incorporated into this plan and shown properly. Also, at issue was a question as to the structure at the proposed low end of the property. There was some confusion on that structure and it was thought to be a manhole but it was exactly what was proposed at the time. There was no catch basin structure proposed on the plan. At the request of the owner, David Desfosses and Dennis Moulton reviewed changes to the drainage and it was suggested by David Desfosses that they provide an apron and rip rap.

- 2) That all previous stipulations from prior Planning Board and Conservation Commission approvals shall be added to the Site Plans;

Those stipulations are all listed on the plans.

- 3) That the Planning Department will complete a zoning review regarding the propane tanks currently stored on the site;

Mr. Moulton assumed that had been done. They did find a permit issued by the City of Portsmouth for those tanks and the Fire Department okayed the spacing of the tanks.

- 4) The Site Plans should show the proposed fencing;

Guardrails were a concern of the Committee. It was suggested that they change the guardrail detail and they have incorporated that into the plan. They are shown along the edge where the pavement meets the buffer.

- 5) That a new Site Review Agreement will be required, along with a corresponding bond to be posted with the City in an amount to cover all proposed site work;

They will agree to that.

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 if the propane tanks were being used for heat or for sale?

Mr. Moulton indicated it was to heat the building.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the guardrail. He felt it would be cheaper if they switched the detail, same as was discussed in the previous Falkland Way hearing.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations.

Mr. Desfosses requested that a stipulation be added that the guardrail be upgraded to a standard detail.

Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

Mr. Britz asked what was on the plan where it was labeled stone apron? He asked if they will be able to park there? Can they mark it so they can't park there?

Mr. Holden asked if they will have some sort of wheel stop or why not curbing like most parking lots?

Mr. Moulton indicated it would be a grassed area.

Mr. Allen felt they should show guardrails or curb stops.

Bill Montgomery, the owner, indicated he would prefer guardrails.

Mr. Desfosses stated there should be guardrails to where light is on the north side of the plan.

Mr. Holden felt that would accomplish what they are looking for.

Ms. Finnigan requested that all parking spaces be painted as tape does not last.

Mr. Holden indicated that stipulations #1 – 4 from the previous letter of decision can be eliminated.

The motion to approve with stipulations passed unanimously.

- 1) That the guardrail detail shall be upgraded to a 6 x 8 post and a 3 x 8 horizontal section and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 2) That guardrails shall be extended along the roadside of the parking lot, and so noted on the plans;
- 3) That all parking spaces shall be painted (and not taped) and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 4) That a new Site Review Agreement will be required, along with a corresponding bond to be posted with the City in an amount to cover all proposed site work;

.....

5. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 and Chapter 400 of the Pease Development Authority Site Review Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of **Pioneer Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **29 New Hampshire Avenue**, wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of two buildings, each being 2-story office buildings with 11,600 ± s.f. footprints, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 302 as Lot 5 and lies within the Business Commercial District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dirk Grohenhuis, of HTA Kimball Chase, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He indicated that the project is the redevelopment of an existing site consisting of 3.7 acres at the Pease Tradeport and is

zoned commercial. The project consists of two new buildings with 11,000 s.f. footprint. They will be constructing it as a phase project, constructing one new building, demolishing the existing building and then constructing the second building, which would be identical to the first building.

Mr. Holden asked if this application is for both buildings.

Mr. Grotenhuis confirmed that was correct, as well as the demolition of the existing building. The main entrance to the parking is off of New Hampshire Avenue, where the existing entrance is. They intend on keeping the access in the same spot. The parking lot is currently a large expanse of parking in front of the property. That would be removed and brought back to a 50' setback along New Hampshire Avenue and the parking would then go into the lot between the two buildings and on the southern side of the south building and the east side of the site. They would propose a number of sidewalks to make a site interconnection as well as a connection to the roadway. He took a look at the sidewalk that connects the site today and there is ample area to discharge the connector into a non park space, access to dry aisle and then access to the other side of the sidewalk. That would provide some intersite connection. Another interconnection item was the additional site access to the eastern side that would provide better circulation and interconnection to the parking lots. They have been in conversations with abutting properties for cross easements for access point and drainage. It had been calculated that there is excess capacity in the drainage swale next door. They are discharging some additional stormwater off to the eastern most parking area. If a cross easement were not granted by adjacent property controller they would have to enlarge their proposed system towards the front of the lot where they can expand the infiltration system they are proposing. So, they could accept and drain the entire site with zero net storm increase.

Mr. Holden asked why they wouldn't do that anyway, realizing that they need the driveway easement, but to avoid the drainage easement?

Mr. Grotenhuis indicated there was a cost savings by not having such a large sediment removal unit. Those systems are designed for the flow and they can reduce that flow a little bit and reduce the size of unit. The underground detention area is already accepting some drainage from this site and keeping it within the same water shed.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that they need to have a meeting once they have all final calculations on drainage. It is not complete today but they are almost done.

Mr. Holden asked if they could amend the record to the satisfaction of DPW so that a report can be provided to the Planning Board?

Mr. Grotenhuis confirmed that could be done.

Rob Martel, of Berard-Martel Architecture, Inc., addressed the Committee. He described the site as having two identical buildings and he showed them the schematic design. They will have one or two colors of bricks, a metal roof with the color to be determined. There will be glass windows on the ends and elevations. The construction of the building will have a steel frame, concrete doors, pitched roofs, and a flat area in the center of the building for the mechanical units. There will be roof drains associated with the building and those will be drained internally.

Mr. Desfosses asked if that connection would be shown on the site plans?

Mr. Martel indicated that they would be shown. Also, the buildings will be sprinkled and they are looking to locate the electrical unit around the front entrance.

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. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Cravens asked that the note on the Utility Plan regarding tapping the main should be amended to say that the tapping sleeve and the tap on the main shall be supplied and installed by the Portsmouth Water Division. Also, the two water services should be shown for the property; one domestic for the whole property with only one meter and one fire service. There should be a note on the Detail Sheet about concrete casing around the water main coming too close to the sewer and it should specify a sleeve rather than an encasement or that the sewer shall be encased in concrete. Also, on the standard detail of the hydrant setting, the note should require that the hydrant meet Portsmouth Water Division standards rather than NHDOT standards

Mr. Desfosses asked that the drainage portion be finalized in a meeting with DPW for design and a report back to the Planning Board. There should also be a scheduled maintenance of the subsurface.

Mr. Allen commended the applicant for going forward with that type of design. The City is pressing for this type of system. (front drainage system). There is a separator that they will need a maintenance schedule and report sent to DPW to verify that maintenance has been performed.

Mr. Allen also asked that the existing hydrant in the southwesterly corner of the building, there should be a note that it is to be removed and abandoned as part of this project.

Ms. Finnigan asked that, at the entrance onto New Hampshire Avenue, they put a stop line and stop sign to delineate the site. She also asked if they did an impact study to determine the traffic impact on New Hampshire Avenue?

Mr. Grotenhuis confirmed that had been done and they sent that report to the PDA for the TIIF impacts. They did not find any deficiency in the area that would require mitigation.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that she would like to see the report and have a copy provided to the Planning Board.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold indicated that automatic notification of emergency forces is required and a knock box on both building, hopefully near the main entrance.

Deputy Police Chief Disesa asked if they were planning any type of burglary alarms?

Mr. Martel indicated they had not discussed that at this point.

Mr. Grotenhuis stated they have not included them at this point.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that there was not a sign detail for the handicapped parking space.

Mr. Holden indicated they should be providing concrete sidewalks in front rather than bituminous that is presently there. Also, they should confirm that all lighting shall be Dark Sky Friendly. Mr. Holden indicated that they are recommending that easements or license be obtained for access and egress cross-easements subject to approval by the DPA for content and form. Also, the same for the drainage with a report to the Planning Board at the time of their meeting. Mr. Holden asked that an appropriate payment be made into the TIIF fund, per the PDA requirement, with a report to Debbie Finnigan so that she is aware of how that is working out.

Mr. Allen indicated they were proposing a sewer easement over the property.

Mr. Holden asked that the sewer easement be reviewed by the City Attorney.

Mr. Holden asked about addressing how people would be crossing over the lot line and they discussed fences and roses. He asked Mr. Grotenhuis how they stood with that?

Mr. Grotenhuis went to the site and did a site walk. He feels there is adequate area to allow sidewalk access between the proposed parking and the retail area in the corner. He would relocate where it is shown on the proposed plan to go directly to the drive aisle and not to the parking spaces. They would then cross the driveway to another crosswalk on the other side of the building.

Mr. Holden asked if there was any hindrance to pedestrians crossing at the shortest point?

Mr. Grotenhuis indicated he would take the sidewalk that was put in. There are also undetermined areas adjacent to the site that they are leaving in tact for that.

Mr. Holden asked about bike racks and motorcycle pads?

Mr. Grotenhuis confirmed they would be added to the site plan.

Mr. Allen asked that the drainage pipes on the Site Plans be consistent between what the notes say and what the plans show.

The motion to approve with stipulations passed unanimously.

Stipulations from the January 3, 2006 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1) That the note on the Utility Plan regarding tapping the main should be amended to say that the tapping sleeve and the tap on the main shall be supplied and installed by the Portsmouth Water Division;
- 2) That two water services should be shown for the property; one domestic for the whole property with only one meter and one fire service;
- 3) That the note on the Detail Sheet about concrete casing around the water main coming too close to the sewer should specify a sleeve rather than an encasement or that the sewer shall be encased in concrete;

- 4) On the standard detail of the hydrant setting, the note should require that the hydrant meet Portsmouth Water Division standards rather than NHDOT standards;
- 5) That the drainage portion shall be finalized in a meeting with DPW to review the design for a report back at the Planning Board meeting;
- 6) That a maintenance schedule of the subsurface drainage system shall be provided to DPW and a yearly confirmation report be filed showing that the maintenance is being performed;
- 7) That a note should be added to the Site Plans that the existing hydrant in the southwesterly corner of the building should be removed and abandoned;
- 8) That the entrance onto New Hampshire Avenue should have a stop line and a stop sign to delineate the site;
- 9) That the traffic impact study shall be provided to Debbie Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, and the Planning Board for their review prior to the next meeting;
- 10) That automatic notification of emergency services is required along with a knox box on each building by the main entrance;
- 11) That a sign detail be added for the handicapped accessible parking spaces showing the MUTCD standard;
- 12) That concrete sidewalks be provided along the front of the property and for all walkways and sidewalks need to be built to Portsmouth DPW standards;
- 13) That all lighting shall be "Dark Sky Friendly";
- 14) That an easement or license shall be obtained for access/egress cross-easements for the property subject to the approval by the PDA as to content and form;
- 15) That a sewer and drainage easement shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by the City Attorney;
- 16) That an appropriate payment shall be made into the TIIF fund, per the PDA requirement, with a report to Debbie Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer;
- 17) That bike racks and motorcycle pads shall be added to the Site Plans; and
- 18) That the drainage pipes on the Site Plans shall be consistent between what the notes say and what the plans show.

.....

II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:30 p.m.

.....

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