

MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

SEPTEMBER 4, 2007

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works, David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; and Deputy Fire Chief Steven Griswold;

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Deborah Finnigan, Traffic Engineer;

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **68 State Street, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **68 State Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 7,370 ± s.f. 4/5 story mixed use condominium building, after demolition of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 13 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District and the Historic District A; (This application was postponed from the July 31, 2007 TAC meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Britz seconded the motion. The motion to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, was present with Attorney Paul McEachern and Jen Ramsey, from Somma. They handed out a new set of plans to substitute for the set previously sent out in the packets. He provided a letter which explained how they addressed the stipulations.

Mr. Chagnon reviewed the individual stipulations from the August 3rd letter.

1. That a recalculation of the open space should be noted on the Site Plans;

They provided a separate exhibit showing their open space. One space is on the east side of the driveway and one is on the west side of the driveway. Mr. Holden confirmed that the property on left side of building belongs to this property.

2. That a contribution towards repaving State Street shall be discussed due to the numerous patches in front of the three individual properties owned by the applicant;

Mr. Chagnon pointed out on the Site Plan where they will mill and resurface the street. Mr. Desfosses was satisfied with that.

3. That Court Street should show a tipped down area in hatched brick and the change in grading should be better delineated;

They have adjusted the grade at the request of David Desfosses.

4. That a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) will be required;

They agree that this plan shall be required.

5. That the Site Plan shall be revised to show the correct placement of the building and that the setbacks off of the existing buildings shall be labeled;

The building is properly shown and they have added setbacks at the request of David Desfosses.

6. That a note shall be added to the Site Plans stating that the Homeowners Association shall be responsible for the maintenance of the interior garage drain;

They have added a note to the Site Plans regarding the maintenance of the interior garage trench and Note 10 was added for that.

7. That a meeting shall be held with the City's Legal Department, Planning Department and Applicant's Legal counsel to determine whether the open space for this plan meets the spirit and intent of the Zoning Ordinance;

Mr. Chagnon felt that the new plan has shown the spirit and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

8. Page two. That all notes on the plan stating that Court Street is under construction should be removed;

They have removed that from all of the sheets and have added "See actual plans for utility locations";

9. That the sewer service shown coming out of the existing building needs to be verified and shown on the Site Plans;

They have received some ties from DPW, Peter Rice, and the sewer stubs shown on the drawings reflect what was provided to them.

10. That a meeting shall be arranged by the Applicant to meet with PSNH;

They first met on site and then again on the 28th. The plans that are dated the 29th are the result of a second site walk where they show a pole on the south side where there will be transformers and there will be a single conduit under Court Street which will access the building. They have shown a detail regarding some notes on Sheet C-1 regarding the jacking and permits that will be required and notes about placing the sidewalk in kind. They also show the conduits that will be required for telephone and cable.

11. That subsequent to the meeting with PSNH, the City will determine what needs to be repaved and re-sidewalked;

They determined that they need to re-sidewalk the brick in front of the building and where there is no disturbance on the Court Street side, they are not showing anything.

12. That absolutely no excavation shall be allowed on Court Street until a time uncertain;

They acknowledge this.

13. That a note shall be added to the Site Plans stating that the fire service shall be sized and a new fire service will come in from State Street;

A new service has been shown on Sheet C-3.

14. That information for capacity use surcharge flow in gallons per day, gallons per minute and peak flow and at what times shall be provided to the City for domestic water service;

This stipulation will carry forward and they will take care of that at a later time.

15. That a letter be provided from the utility company confirming that the gas service is adequate;

There has been a letter entered into the file that confirms the availability of gas service.

Mr. Chagnon stated that concluded the stipulations from the last meeting.

Mr. Holden reviewed the stipulations and felt that from the July 3rd meeting stipulations #2 & #4 would remain open. From the July 31st meeting stipulations #11, #12 & #14 would remain open. The Committee members indicated that they did not have a copy of the previous letter of decision so they were unable to confirm which stipulations were still outstanding. Mr. Holden indicated they will keep all stipulations open.

Mr. Holden indicated that they had not opened up a public hearing as they had concluded it however he asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak. Seeing no one rise, he called for a motion.

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

Mr. Desfosses felt that all of the utility decisions have been made and the last discussion is that they haven't told the applicant what to do with the sidewalk on State Street from the utility pole to the property line. There will be four conduits laid underneath where the sidewalk is and they need to make a decision of whether to pave that or have them install a brick section. Mr. Desfosses felt it was open for discussion. Mr. Holden stated it was in the Historic District so assumed it would be brick. Mr. Desfosses indicated another option would be have them patch it. Mr. Allen felt they should go with brick as patching would just be another thing that would fall apart. Mr. Holden recommended brick also. Mr. Desfosses made the stipulation that the sidewalk from the property lines will be brick.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the pole details on the last page and noted that both are labeled State Street and should be corrected.

Mr. Desfosses referred to Page 3-C, Note 11, which discusses the conduit installation. He asked them to add to that note that it is very clear that Court Street will not be dug into. Also, as part of that note, it should have a stipulation that as part of the jacking or boring, if there is an accident and anything happens to the paving on Court Street, the applicant will be responsible for doing a full milling and overlay from Atkinson Street to Marcy Street with a 1 ½" thickness. Mr. Chagnon felt that seemed a little excessive and felt it might be more appropriate to say that the area shall be determined by Public Works. Mr. Desfosses was fine with that wording and that the applicant would coordinate with Public Works.

Mr. Desfosses also added, not as a stipulation, that he will be looking for the bond to include work that is being done jacking on Court Street. He will look for that when reviewing an estimate.

Mr. Desfosses also indicated that on multiple pages of the Site Plans, there are notes referring to re-striping for 58 State Street and should be deleted and a note added stated re-striping shall be redone as shown.

Mr. Allen asked if the water service is existing that they put in off of Court Street? Mr. Chagnon stated that is what he was told. He was told to put everything in in accordance with the plan and that is what was shown on the plan. Until he sees the as-builts he can't be sure. Mr. Allen needed to have that verified as if this were to go to a contractor, he could very likely go digging in the street as that is what is shown here. It has to be either a proposed shut off or it's an existing shut off. That needs to be solved between now and Planning Board. Mr. Chagnon explained the reason that was shown that way before is because they were still under construction. They can show it as an existing feature out to the shut off. Mr. Allen agreed with that.

Mr. Holden asked if Mr. Allen would like a report to the Planning Board. Mr. Allen assumed there will be a revised plan. Mr. Chagnon suggested it be made a stipulation.

Mr. Holden asked what they are proposing for landscaping? Mr. Chagnon pointed out a tree and some bushes. Ms. Tillman asked what the dimension of area for the tree to grow in was? Mr. Chagnon stated it was 6' x 12' Ms. Tillman noted that they called for an urban landscape tree. Mr. Desfosses stated he felt that a London Plane tree works good.

The motion to approve with stipulations passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

Comments from the July 3, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

1. at a recalculation of the open space should be noted on the Site Plans;
2. That a contribution towards repaving State Street shall be discussed due to the numerous patches in front of the three individual properties owned by the applicant;
3. That Court Street should show a tipped down area in hatched brick and the change in grading should be better delineated;
4. That a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) will be required;

Comments from the July 31, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

5. That the Site Plan shall be revised to show the correct placement of the building and that the setbacks off of the existing buildings shall be labeled;
6. That a note shall be added to the Site Plans stating that the Homeowners Association shall be responsible for the maintenance of the interior garage drain;
7. That a meeting shall be held with the City's Legal Department, Planning Department and Applicant's Legal counsel to determine whether the open space for this plan meets the spirit and intent of the Zoning Ordinance;
8. That all notes on the plan stating that Court Street is under construction should be removed;
9. That the sewer service shown coming out of the existing building needs to be verified and shown on the Site Plans;
10. That a meeting shall be arranged by the Applicant to meet with PSNH;
11. That subsequent to the meeting with PSNH, the City will determine what needs to be repaved and re-sidewalked;
12. That absolutely no excavation shall be allowed on Court Street until a time uncertain;
13. That a note shall be added to the Site Plans stating that the fire service shall be sized and a new fire service will come in from State Street;

- 14. That information for capacity use surcharge flow in gallons per day, gallons per minute and peak flow and at what times shall be provided to the City for domestic water service;
- 15. That a letter be provided from the utility company confirming that the gas service is adequate;

Comments from the September 4, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 16. That a City standard brick sidewalk shall be installed on State Street from the utility pole to the property line;
- 17. That the Street names on the pole details on the last page of the Site Plans shall be corrected;
- 18. That a note shall be added to Page 3-C stating very clearly that Court Street shall not be disturbed and, as part of the jacking or boring, if any accident shall occur, the applicant shall be responsible for a full milling and overlay for a section of the street to be determined by DPW;
- 19. That the notes on the Site Plans referring to re-striping for 58 State Street shall be deleted and replaced with a note indicating that re-striping shall be redone as shown;
- 20. That the water service shall be shown as an existing feature out to the shut off until confirmed by a review of the as-builts of Court Street;
- 21. That the tree shown on the Landscape Plan shall be a London Plane tree and so labeled.

.....

B. The application of **The Hill Unit Owners Association, Owners**, for property located **off Deer Street, commonly known as "The Hill"**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to add a loading area to be used in common with abutting property owned by Parade Office, LLC, and to add 16 on site 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 the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District A; (This application was postponed from the July 31, 2007 TAC meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Britz seconded the motion. The motion to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

There was no one present to address this application so Mr. Holden suggested tabling it to the end of the Agenda to see if anyone appeared.

Mr. Allen made a motion to table the application to the end of the meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Public Service Company of New Hampshire, Owner**, for property located at **400 Gosling Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 1 ½ story (5,260 s.f. footprint) warehouse building, after demolition of two existing warehouse buildings, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 214 as Lot 1 and lies within the Waterfront Industrial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

David Sill, Engineer from PSNH, gave a brief overview of their project. They are trying to replace two on site warehouse buildings to make an expansion. They are trying to make the change and limit the disturbances to the rest of the site. In terms of function of the warehouse, it will be similar to the current use. There is no office space, just a desk, no bathrooms. The materials to be stored in the warehouse are the same as previously. They received three variances for setbacks.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked for more detail on what was going to be stored in the new building. Mr. Sills referred to the last page of an exhibit which they had provided to the Committee.

Dick Despins, Station Manager at the Schiller Station, was available for questions. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if there will there be any copper in the building? Mr. Despins stated there was some cable on site but only as associated with machinery. Deputy Police Chief Disesa asked if the current warehouse was alarmed? Mr. Despins confirmed it is not alarmed and there are no plans to alarm the new warehouse.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen asked if there are any floor drains? Mr. Sills indicated that none were proposed.

Mr. Holden asked if a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan was needed? No one on the Committee felt it was needed. Mr. Holden asked about additional site lighting or sidewalks? Mr. Sills stated that they revised the site so vehicles could maneuver better.

The motion to recommend Site Review approval passed unanimously.

.....

B. 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 **Two International Group, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **75 New Hampshire Avenue**, wherein site review approval is requested for the construction of a 29,900 ± s.f. 3- story office building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 306 as Lot 004 and lies within the Airport, Business and Commercial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Jennifer Viarengo, of Appledore Engineering addressed the Committee. She displayed the existing conditions plan and she pointed out the streets surrounding the site. The old gym has since been removed along with two smaller buildings and their new plans will reflect that. Their plans also show their intent to subdivide the lot into three separate lots. The project is a 3-story 29,900 s.f. office building. The project has 286 parking spaces with 70 below grade in the parking garage. This project will obtain LEED certification. There are three different drainage points and they have proposed an

underground detention basin. There will be water quality inlets constructed to improve the water quality that drains to New Hampshire Avenue. The garage area will have a floor drain to collect melted snow from cars which will go to an oil water separator, connecting to the closed drainage system. They also talked about the garage area not being able to be flooded if there was a back up in the drainage by the street. With the proposed building they will have standard water, sewer and electric connections, fire service proposed from New Hampshire Avenue. There is an existing gas easement which goes through the site and that area will remain untouched.

Mr. Allen asked if the floor drain in the garage is going to the storm system, Ms. Viarengo indicated that is what they have done in the past. The oil water separator will remain in the garage and go to the drainage system from there. Mr. Allen felt they might want to check local codes on that as he was not sure they allow that.

The chair called for public speakers.

Mary Powers, was employed by Environmental Service but was present representing herself. She is concerned about a large stretch of trees on the site between their building and the proposed building. The trees are large and quite mature. They will add cooling to the paved areas, etc. She is hoping they don't have to remove the trees

Ms. Viarango stated that the trees being referred to are shown where the proposed loading area is. It is also the area closest to the main entrance. They have no objection to saving one or two but working with the development as it is engineered right now, they have tried to save another group of trees adjacent to this one. They are also coming back and adding a tree line of maples along the back. Mr. Holden stated this is one of the few projects proposing parking within the structure. Ms. Viarengo indicated that is to help with the overall land area. They are also assigning fuel efficient vehicles for incentives. They are trying to limit the overall disturbed area. Mr. Holden clarified that they will look and see if they can preserve a tree or two in that general area. Ms. Viarengo confirmed that was correct and added that if they put an island in that area she has to put two parking spaces and a loading space elsewhere. Mr. Britz explained that he thought the reason the trees are being taken away is because the trees that are there now are on a lot line. Ms. Viarengo confirmed that was correct and the lot lines are being changed.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there was any way they could utilize the existing paved area as their paved area. Ms. Viarengo indicated that the loading itself is to be by the door. By preserving where they can and working with limiting the development area as they are doing it, their approach is to have a happy medium. Mr. Desfosses felt if the lot is minimum size, then the lot line cannot be adjusted to create their parking area near the trees because there is no where to go. Ms. Tillman asked if the parking could be put over to the right to save the trees? Mr. Desfosses felt they probably could but then they would lose development opportunities on the parcel. Maria Stowell, of the PDA, confirmed that the PDA had looked at several versions of this plan and were satisfied with this final plan.

Ms. Viarengo indicated that they are attempting to get a variance on the loading berths. Mr. Holden stated that most buildings don't need much loading now. Ms. Viarengo stated they are willing to look at the situation and they may be able to save some trees.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses stated for the record that they went through the closed drainage system and did a hydrological analysis and he asked what the results were. Ms. Viarengo indicated that they did a hydrolic analysis where their system pipes back in from the street to the detention for the garage. By a

revision of lowering their underground detention basin ½ foot they will be okay from a pipe design perspective for a 100 year storm not to flood the garage underneath. That is also where the valve comes into play. Mr. Desfosses again indicated that he assumes they ran a hydrolic analysis of the out fall of the closed drainage system up to the tie in point. He knew they were lower their flow rate but unless they are matching time they could be affecting the system somewhere and he asked if they ran that analysis. Ms. Viarengo stated they had not done so between this morning and the meeting however they did an analysis so that if they were submerged in New Hampshire Avenue in 2' or 3' because there was a block, what would be the effect of the drainage system on site and that is where they are looking to lower the basement and put the valve in to keep it from backing up in the garage. She felt that to do an entire analysis of what was downstream they would be doing an entire analysis of everything that contributes. Mr. Desfosses was not sure that wasn't appropriate as the system is so old. Ms. Viarengo stated they are less at peak flow. Mr. Desfosses understood that but asked if the time was different or is it the same? Mr. Viarango did not know. Mr. Desfosses indicated they need to let him know.

Mr. Cravens noted that the lot is showing two existing buildings and the new one. The water service rules are one service per lot. He asked what will be the status of the other two buildings water service. Ms. Viarengo stated that the other two buildings are demolished and the Bayring building remains. She stated they would want their own water service. Mr. Cravens indicated that they will have to talk about that more.

Mr. Cravens referred to Sheet C-5, both water service notes are pointing to the same line so that needs to be corrected.

Mr. Cravens asked what type of fuel the emergency generator will use? Ms. Viarengo stated it was diesel. Mr. Cravens asked how it would be contained? Mr. Dan Plummer, of Two International Group, stated it was self contained. Mr. Cravens also confirmed that it would be a double walled tank with an alarm.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked what will be in the building? Ms. Viarengo stated it would be office and it is more than one company. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if this would be a 24/7 operation? Ms. Viarengo stated none of the businesses operate 24/7 and it will not have a security alarm.

Dan Plummer, of Two International Group, confirmed they will have a fire alarm but no security alarm. The building is locked up other than normal business hours.

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

Mr. Desfosses asked that the access driveways be removed, curbed in and the sidewalk sections be repaired. That the applicant look at downstream drainage system and ascertain if it will be adequate regarding the difference in flow. That New Hampshire Avenue was paved last year so if there is any damage to the street the entire cross section will be milled 1 ½" and repaved, not including driveway, curb inlet and the 1' section on the side. Utility cuts must be repaired and where the basin gets pushed out to the street.

Mr. Desfosses asked about their lighting plan and whether all fixtures were Dark Sky Friendly? Ms. Viarengo confirmed they were and were designed to meet LEED credit. Their full height is 25'. Mr. Allen felt they may need to relocate the light on the drive entrance as they are spilling over the property line.

Mr. Cravens asked for the water service for 11 Manchester Square shown on the plans. He asked them to correct the 8" and 4" water service where it is pointed for clarity. They should indicate that the

vacant building has been demolished. And, they should revise Note 21 regarding the Aquifer Protection Guidelines to add that this project is within the Wellhead Protection Area.

Mr. Cravens asked if they planned to have any irrigation system? Ms. Viarengo stated they are looking to use the low tolerant plants and they will have a system with soil sensors and water sensors with double sensors to limit irrigation, all per LEED. Mr. Cravens felt they could use a smart sensor. It takes the information from satellite photos to determine whether or not it should be irrigated. He also asked for 6" of top soil and irrigating shall be done according to the City Water Ordinance between 10 pm and 5 am. Mr. Cravens indicated that he will meet with the applicant to discuss dual water services on the lot.

Mr. Allen asked to meet with the applicant to go over the disposition of the floor drains in the garage and one option is to have trench drains without an outlet to them as long as they are keeping outside drainage out and they only have run off from the cars. He thinks they will have to go to the sanitary sewer and it will not be able to take a floor drain.

Mr. Allen asked them to show on the plans what curb cuts are getting closed off.

Mr. Desfosses asked about concrete sidewalks? Ms. Viarengo stated that was correct and they would match along New Hampshire Avenue and up to the Bayring building. Mr. Holden recalled requesting "repairs to sidewalks". Mr. Desfosses stated they are showing construction of new concrete sidewalks. Ms. Viarengo confirmed they have been requested by PDA to provide concrete sidewalks along the frontage of the lot along New Hampshire Avenue and up to the property line. Mr. Holden asked to make that a stipulation.

Mr. Britz asked, to the maximum extent possible, the trees between DES and the proposed building be saved, with the understanding that there is a loading area. The intent would be to protect as many trees as possible. Mr. Holden suggested that that applicant seek a variance with the PDA. Mr. Britz understood they are already working on a variance.

Ms. Tillman indicated that if a variance is granted to eliminate a number of loading areas, could that area be stipulated to remain open and have trees planted. Ms. Viarengo stated that would put parking all the way on the other side of the building. She can look at these trees that they want to save but they have large roots as well. Mr. Holden stated that if they are just going to put parking in where the loading berths are, it is self defeating their real purpose of building a green building. TAC was trying to be gentle but the idea was to preserve something that they can't ask them to preserve. Mr. Plummer stated that it took quite a bit of effort and delay to save the group of trees that remain on the plans. Mr. Holden reiterated that they are trying to craft an idea that they can use them a little bit to get relief from the loading berth requirement but it was never the City's intent to get rid of the loading berths and put in more parking. They would like to actually preserve some more trees. Ms. Viarengo was more concerned about how to construct the accessways around it without affecting the trees. Mr. Holden asked that if they are just going to remove the loading berths to put parking in, what is the point? Maria Stowell of the PDA stated that the point is that they would remove other parking spaces in the rear leaving more green space. Ms. Viarengo pointed out the 22 spaces would be eliminated and moved into where the loading berth is. Mr. Britz indicated that it would be his wish that all mature trees be saved. Mr. Desfosses stated that they can look at this at their meeting, after the variance has been granted, and come to a resolution.

Ms. Viarengo confirmed their variance hearing is the Tuesday before the PB meeting.

Ms. Tillman asked Mr. Desfosses, when he asked to remove the paths, did he also include the building foundations that are left and that the area be loamed and seeded? Mr. Desfosses believed the foundations are already moved. Ms. Viarengo confirmed that the areas have been stabilized so that they can reuse materials. The area will be loamed and seeded when they are done, per agreement with

the PDA. Ms. Stowell confirmed that they are still working on that language but for this project they should ask that area be loamed and seeded.

Mr. Allen stated that effective July 1st, as part of the City's new water ordinance, they have a capacity use surcharge for both water and sewer so the applicant will have to provide their average daily demands for both water and sewer, stamped by a Professional Engineer, and those numbers will be used to calculate the fee for a new water and sewer service. Ms. Stowell believed they provided that in their waste water flow but they should keep it as a stipulation. Mr. Holden also asked for a stipulation to make payment to the PDA for their transportation improvement fund.

Mr. Holden understood that all curbcuts will be eliminated, except the one off of New Hampshire Avenue and the final site plans should show the one active curbcut. Mr. Holden asked about their landscaping plan. Ms. Tillman indicated she had not had a chance to look at it yet. Mr. Holden asked them to have that wrapped up for the Planning Board.

Mr. Holden asked about concerns with construction activity or street closures? Mr. Holden indicated that shall be coordinated with DPW and Maria Stowell at PDA.

The motion to recommend Site Review approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That the Site Plans shall note that the access driveways shall be removed, curbed in and sidewalk sections repaired;
2. That the applicant shall look at the downstream drainage system and ascertain if it will be adequate regarding the difference in flow;
3. That, as New Hampshire Avenue was paved last year, if there is any damage to the street during construction, the entire cross section shall be milled 1 ½" and repaved (not including the driveway, curb inlet and the 1' section on the side);
4. That all utility cuts shall be repaired where the basin gets pushed out to the street;
5. That the applicant shall review the lighting on the drive entrance for spillage over the property line;
6. That the water service for 11 Manchester Square shall be shown on the Site Plans;
7. That the 8" and 4" water service shall be corrected on the Site Plans for clarity;
8. That the Site Plans shall reflect that the vacant building has been demolished;
9. That Note 21 regarding the Aquifer Protection Guidelines shall be also include that this project is within the Wellhead Protection Area;
10. That any irrigation system shall comply with the City Water Ordinance and operate during the hours of 10:00 pm – 5:00 am;
11. That 6" of top soil shall be provided for irrigation purposes;
12. That the applicant shall meet with Tom Cravens, of DPW, regarding dual water services on the lot;
13. That the applicant shall meet with representatives of DPW regarding the disposition of floor drains in the garage;
14. That the applicant shall be responsible for providing concrete sidewalks along the property line;
15. That the applicant shall meet with representatives of DPW to discuss the elimination of the loading berths, the relocation of parking spaces and their efforts to save as many mature trees as possible;
16. That the applicant shall provide anticipated water and sewer demand for the project and include references of where that demand came from, ie., a similar type of office building in another area or industry standard, and said report shall be stamped by a licensed engineer;
17. That the Landscape Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department;
18. That all construction activity and street closures shall be coordinated with DPW and the PDA;

.....

C. The application of **Seacoast Trust LLP, Owner**, for property located at **150 Route One By-Pass**, wherein Site Review approval is requested for the placement of a 50' x 8' mobile coach to be used for diagnostic services in an existing parking lot, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 231, as Lot 58 and lies within a Single Residence B (SRB) District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Peter Weeks, appeared on behalf of Seacoast Trust, LLP. They obtained a variance for the placement of the mobile coach in the parking area as an expansion of a non conforming use. The zone is residential although it has been used for medical use for 40 years. They are doing no construction but are just placing a mobile coach on the property and putting arborvitae placement on three sides to buffer it from the view of the adjoining properties and the By-Pass. PSNH will be bringing in additional overhead service from an existing pole. There is no new sewer, water or construction. He provided them with the site planning guide provided by the mobile coach company. He is looking for what the Committee would like to see on the Site Plan. All parking requirements are complied with.

The Chair called for public speakers.

Michael Donner, of 152 Hillside Drive, stated that his home looks directly down at the facility. He has questions about how the application has been proposed. He asked what type of equipment will be in the coach. Is it MRI or cat scan equipment? He has a background with the Federal Communications Service and he knows how some equipment can interfere with electric service. Is this a separate business venture or is it part of Sports Medicine. MRI and cat scan equipment can be very loud and his neighbors would be the recipients of any loud noise. When hospitals bring in something like this in a commercial district they are sited with many conditions. His concern is sound, any electromagnetic electricity problems and will they have bathrooms.

Mr. Weeks pointed out that the mobile home is on the opposite side of the building from Hillcrest Drive. They submitted a list of specifications from Alliance Imaging which will answer some of their questions. The average decibel level measured at a distance of ten feet from the outside wall of the mobile coach, during operation of the scanner, is 48 decibels. There will be a generator in case of a power failure but the power will be bringing in 480 volt shore power, which will be supplied through a 3-phase Russel Stoll connection. There will be no bathrooms in the site. There will be bathroom facilities in the adjacent building where the patients will go to register. Mr. Holden asked if PSNH will provide the primary power and if the generator is emergency only. Mr. Weeks confirmed that was correct. Ms. Tillman asked where will it be located? Mr. Weeks stated the emergency generator would be under the coach. Mr. Holden asked what the fuel will be? Mr. Weeks indicated he will find out. Mr. Holden asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Weeks stated that the variance allows from 7:00 am – 8:00 pm, Monday – Friday, and 7:00 am – 12:00 pm on Saturday. Mr. Holden felt that the decibel level exceeds what would be allowed during certain hours. Mr. Weeks confirmed that it does comply during their hours of operation. Mr. Desfosses also added that sound is measured from the property line. Mr. Holden asked that they have someone present at the next meeting who is familiar with the equipment to answer questions.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if there would be any interference with police cruiser computers? Mr. Weeks did not believe so but he will look into that. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa confirmed he would like that checked into.

Mr. Desfosses asked about lighting? Mr. Weeks confirmed there would be no additional lighting. Mr. Desfosses asked about the lighting at the front door? Mr. Week indicated that they will provide an existing lighting plan.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the equipment manual states there is another manual they have to go by but they don't have that manual. It says that the coach should not be placed next to vehicular traffic and they are placing in on the side of a vehicular aisle. Mr. Weeks indicated that the company has been involved in the placement of the coach. Mr. Desfosses asked if PSNH had anysues in putting the coach directly under a power line? Mr. Holden asked why they even have overhead power? Mr. Desfosses explained that the building is serviced from Middle Road and there is no power on the By-Pass. They have three private utility poles. Mr. Holden asked if they had a waiver for the overhead power on the previous site plan. Mr. Weeks believed that they did. Mr. Holden felt they will have to look at that more. Mr. Desfosses continued to explain that their service from the pole which is directly next to the proposed coach to the building is underground, but the line coming through the woods is above ground. The wire to the coach will be about 4' long and he's not sure they could hook up an underground service to this coach. He felt that was a good question. Ms. Tillman asked if it would require a transformer pad? Mr. Desfosses believed they just tapping into an existing wire. Mr. Weeks stated they are going to tap on the existing wire. Mr. Desfosses asked for confirmation on that.

Mr. Allen wanted to make sure the emergency generator exercise is done during normal business hours.

Mr. Holden asked how the coach is going to be secured? Can a wind move it or is it sitting on tires. Mr. Weeks stated it is sitting on tires with metal leveling plates on existing pavement or the existing pavement will be cut out and concrete poured for underground supports. Mr. Holden asked if this is for the exclusive use of patients to Sports Medicine? Mr. Weeks confirmed it was.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked about a security alarm system? Mr. Weeks did not believe they would have an alarm system.

Ms. Tillman asked about the water requirements for the coach, pages 15 – 24 of the manual. She asked how do the medical techs wash their hands if there is no water and is the humidifier for the unit itself? Mr. Weeks will get the answers to those questions.

Mr. Holden stated they will need an engineered site plan.

Mr. Desfosses stated it should have all details from the electrical worked out and there should be a detail on the concrete pad.

Mr. Holden indicated he would like to know if a waiver on overhead power is appropriate. They would like to see decibel information that was provided in the letter because if it exceeds it, it would have to go back to the BOA. He would also like a note saying this use is confined to patients of the existing facility. Otherwise, it might be an expansion of use. They need to look at that to make sure they don't have an expansion.

Mr. Allen asked if the walkway shown heading to the coach is new? Mr. Weeks stated it was existing.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this matter to the October 2nd TAC meeting. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to October 2, 2007 passed unanimously.

Comments from the Technical Advisory Committee:

1. That the applicant should identify what fuel will be used for the emergency generator;
2. That the applicant shall have someone from Alliance Imaging at the next TAC meeting to address concerns, including decibels exceeding City Ordinance;
3. That the applicant shall confirm that there will be no interference with Police Cruiser computers;
4. That an existing lighting plan shall be provided for review and approval by DPW;
5. That the applicant shall confirm with PSNH that there is no conflict in placing the coach directly under a power line and where the electricity will come from;
6. That the applicant shall meet with the Planning Staff to review prior waivers for overhead power lines on the site and to explore whether this is for the exclusive use of Sports Medicine and not an expansion of use;
7. That a note shall be added to the Site Plans indicating that any emergency generator exercise shall be done during normal business hours;
8. That the applicant shall explain the water source for washing hands and for the humidifier;
9. That the existing and proposed Site Plan shall be prepared and stamped by a Professional Engineer;
10. That all electrical details shall be included on the Site Plans;
11. That there shall be a detail for the concrete pad on the Site Plans;

.....

D. 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 **Emerson Process Management, Applicant**, for property located at **130 International Drive**, wherein site review approval is requested to expand an existing parking lot by adding 43 parking spaces, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 306 as Lot 006 and lies within the Industrial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Michael Mates from Kimball Chase presented. Also present was David Unger, of Emerson Process Management. They are proposing a parking expansion at the northwest edge of the property consisting of approximately 43 parking spaces. They are not proposing any utility work, just expansion of asphalt. The existing drainage sheet flows down the drive aisle towards the existing detention pond. At the time of the original development in 2001, this parking was planned for and approved by the PDA and the drainage was sized for this expansion. They are not proposing any modification to existing drainage except they are adding some rip rap to the edge of the parking lot. One is for the proposed drainage swale. They are replaving part of the existing parking lot as it is chewed up. Currently there are no shrubs in the islands and they are adding six shrubs down each island along with trees at the ends of the islands.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there is any substantial vegetation where the proposed lot is going? Mr. Mates confirmed it is all just grass.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses asked if this expansion clearly was needed and more importantly, will it affect the traffic.

Maria Stowell, of the PDA, indicated that the applicant should provide them with the growth they have had since they built the building and provide some explanation of why they need more parking spaces. Mr. Holden asked if they supported the TMA would they need the parking? Mr. Holden suggested they meet with the TMA provider and also confer with the PDA regarding their parking needs and any concurrent fees that would be appropriate.

Mr. Allen asked what do they manufacture? Mr. Unger explained what they manufacture and how their shifts work.

Ms. Stowell stated that the open space calculations that are on the plans are old and they should revise the plan to show the new standard. Also, his wetland has 50' buffer that is being maintained and they should show that.

Mr. Holden asked about the comment that the pavement was chewed up? Mr. Mates corrected himself and indicated that the edge has just settled in time. They are putting down a 4" base and a 4" subbase and they will re-work the existing asphalt area so that it will last longer. Mr. Holden asked if the new traffic islands comply with PDA requirements for breaking up large areas of asphalt? Mr. Mates indicated they did not exactly but it has been discussed with the PDA and it would look odd if this island was different than the other two. Ms. Stowell confirmed that they agreed with that.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked about lighting and security as this lot is being extended and people will have further to walk. Mr. Unger stated that they have ample lighting. Mr. Holden asked for a Dark Sky Friendly stipulation.

Mr. Cravens stated that if this is within the Wellhead Protection area they would like a note indicating they will follow the Aquifer Protection Guidelines.

The motion to recommend approval with stipulations passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant shall provide the PDA with the growth they experienced since the last building was constructed and provide some explanation of why they need more parking spaces;
2. That the applicant shall meet with the TMA provider and confer with the PDA regarding their parking needs and any concurrent fees that would be appropriate;
3. That the open space calculations that are on the Site Plans are old and the applicant should revise the plan to show the new standard;
4. That this lot has a 50' buffer that is being maintained and that should be shown on the Site Plans;
5. That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that all new lighting shall be Dark Sky Friendly;
6. That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that if this lot is within the Wellhead Protection area they will follow the Aquifer Protection Guidelines.

.....

C. The application of **The Hill Unit Owners Association, Owners**, for property located **off Deer Street, commonly known as "The Hill"**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to add a loading area to be used in common with abutting property owned by Parade Office, LLC, and to add 16 on site 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 the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District A; (This application was postponed from the July 31, 2007 TAC meeting).

The Chair confirmed that no one was present to present so he asked for a motion to postpone this matter to the October 2nd.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to postpone to the October 2, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the October 2, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee meeting passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:00 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant
Planning Department