

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

2:00 PM

MARCH 3, 2009

**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; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief, and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief;

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. 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 replace the existing coal loader located on the main dock, with related paving, utilities, lighting, 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 Still, Project Engineer for PSNH, presented to the Committee. They are looking to replace a very large piece of equipment on site. They have an existing coal unloader, as shown in their handout, located on the dock, adjacent to the main building. The existing unloader was built in 1984 and has reached the end of it's useful life and they would like to replace it with a new unloader. The existing unloader currently operates fairly infrequently as most ships have their own unloaders however it is an important function that they need to maintain in terms of establishing adequate field supplies at this facilities. The existing unloader will be disassembled piece by piece and further broken down at an off site facility and they will scrap the metal resell any of the pieces that may have some value tot hem. The work will be done by a vessel tied to the dock. There is also no intention to change the water use on site. Both existing and proposed unloaders have a spritzing system that allows for a little moisture to be applied to coal shipments which helps with dust. Fire protection on the new unloader will be a little better than the existing unloader. With regard to noise, a consultant did a study to evaluate the proposed unloader. The new unloader will not make any more noise then the existing unloader and the new unloader will meet the requirements of the City of Portsmouth. Regarding permitting, there is no shoreland permit or wetland dredge or fill permit required. The activities are only on the dock and nothing goes down into the water. They currently maintain a Title 5 permit for air quality and dust. They will apply for a temporary permit for the construction activities and upon the completion of the project, the temporary permit will be rolled into their ongoing permit. They plan to work with the City on a CMMP.

Mr. Holden asked if the predominate user of the coal the Shiller station? Dick Despins, Station Manager of the Schiller Station, presumed he means it is all PSNH coal and he confirmed that they are the primary user of it.

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 open.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

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

Ms. Finnigan requested that a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan be prepared by the applicant and submitted for review and approval by City Staff prior to a building permit being issued.

Mr. Cravens wanted to make sure that the water supply going to this site is isolated from the rest of the drinking water on the site with a reduced pressure backflow preventer.

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

1. That a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by the applicant and submitted for review and approval by City Staff prior to a building permit being issued;
2. That the water supply going this site shall be isolated from the rest of the drinking water on the site with a reduced pressure backflow preventer.

The Applicant requested that this application go before the April Planning Board meeting, rather than the March meeting.

.....

B. The application of **Ocean Properties, Ltd, Applicant**, for property located at **1 International Drive**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 72,000 s.f. 4-story office building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 303 as Lot 2 and lies within the Airport/Business Commercial district;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Gretchen Young , from Appledore Engineering, appeared on behalf of Ocean Properties. She pointed out where the proposed office building is being located on the same site as the Marriott Hotel/Residence Inn. It is a 10 acre site. This will be a 72, 000 s.f. 4-story office building with shared parking with the hotel with 310 parking spaces on the site. Access to the site will be the same as the existing condition from Corporate Drive and off of International Drive which will be the primary access to the site. They are moving the sidewalk as they felt it created a straighter path for pedestrian access. The utilities were part of the original design of the hotel and have been stubbed on site for this proposed use so they won't be going into the street. They have water, sewer, gas, electric and telephone. Drainage to the site is one of the largest portions of their design. They are proposing poreous pavement through out the site. They are proposing a sand filter for roof run off which will connect to the existing drainage on site which will discharge to an existing detention pond and it then will be picked back up as part of the municipal system. The proposed lighting is dark sky friendly and they are proposing a large amount of landscaping and will have Pease decide what is appropriate. They are also keeping with Pease designs by proposing berms to provide screening from the street.

As a result of comments from Pre-TAC this morning, the snow storage area is shown on the landscaping plan and any additional snow will be trucked off site. They will have someone address the quality of the existing detention pond and address any further maintenance that may be needed. They

will work with Pease to discuss if it is appropriate to reduce any proposed parking to reduce asphalt on the site. They are going to propose an area for an emergency generator and will decide later if that will be needed. They will also remove the future hotel expansion from this site plan.

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 open.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden assumed that all utilities are underground? Ms. Young confirmed that they are.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the existing driveway has a nice tree lined effect. Is there any way to save any of those trees? Ms. Young did not believe there was any way to save those trees. They have looked at saving as many as they can on the other end but because of proposed parking they cannot save any of those trees. They will be saving a number of the nice old trees along International Drive and Pease Boulevard.

Mr. Cravens noted that the existing irrigation system at the hotel should operate between 10:00 pm and 5:00 a.m. There have been several times where he has seen it operating during the day. The Landscaping Plan shows that there may be some trees proposed to be planted on top of the water line where it is stubbed off of the other existing water service so that needs to be looked at.

Mr. Allen asked if there will be any cooking facilities in the new building? Ms. Young stated at this time there are no cooking facilities proposed. Mr. Allen confirmed that if there are any plans for a cooking facility then they should have a plan for the external grease trap. Ms. Young confirmed they could add an external grease trap if required.

Mr. Britz referred to the road coming in from the south closest to the wetlands where it is a little less than 25' at one point, they don't show any landscaping on their plan and it shows a lawn so he asked for a herbacious native mix instead of the lawn.

Ms. Finnigan noted they showed snow storage on the new lot but where is the snow storage for the rest of their new parking lot next to the new building? Ms. Young pointed out a few spots for snow storage but she will work on that and whatever can't be accommodated on the site will have to be trucked off. Ms. Finnigan requested a note on the plan to that effect.

Ms. Finnigan noted there is not a stop bar on their detail sheets. Ms. Young stated they have one stop bar so they will add that in. Ms. Finnigan asked if the handicapped sign has changed to be blue, green and white or is that a typo? Ms. Young confirmed it was a typo.

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

Ms. Finnigan requested that a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan be prepared by the applicant and submitted for review and approval by City Staff prior to a building permit being issued.

That the applicant shall appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee on March 12th for approval, and they shall submit for that meeting an existing and proposed plan as well the one page traffic data sheet.

That the Landscaping Plan be reviewed prior to the Planning Board meeting by DPW & the Planning Department.

Ms. Finnigan noted that there are two lighting poles off the International driveway that are being relocated and she asked where they are being relocated? Ms. Young stated that was not decided yet. Ms. Finnigan requested that they be shown on the plan and they shall be subject to DPW approval.

Note 16 on C-2 reads that sediment deposits shall be removed after each storm event or more often if the fabric becomes clogged and Ms. Finnigan stated that it should read when the sacks are one third full instead.

There are a few notes on C-3 and C-4 that talk about as built plans and mylars and an electronic version of those plans should be sent to DPW for inclusion in their GIS system.

The plans talk about dust control on site but they must also include the surrounding streets.

She requested that they verify the typo of the handicapped sign colors on C-10. It should be blue lettering on a white sign.

She requested that they either change the detail to include a stop bar or add it to the plan.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa stipulated that the applicant shall be responsible to perform a radio-strength test with a Motorola Service Shop to ensure sufficient signal strength within any structure included in the project to support adequate radio coverage for emergency personnel. The expense for the test shall be the responsibility of the applicant, whether or not the test indicates that amplifiers are necessary to ensure this communication. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that cost, too, shall be the responsibility of the applicant. All testing and all installations shall be coordinated between the applicant and the police/fire communications supervisor.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold referred to C-5, Note 31, and asked that they modify it so that they coordinate with the Portsmouth Fire Department for the location of the knox box. They will use a private alarm company to provide automatic notification of emergency forces so his second stipulation is to add a note that they will provide automatic notification of emergency forces.

There was some question about whether the doorways on NW side of the building will be used as exits. If not used as exits then they need to stipulate that they are signed on the interior with life safety code compliant signs stating that the doors are not an exit. If they will be an exit then they need paved sidewalks that will be maintained year round leading to a public way or a parking lot. Mr. Holden indicated that they viewed the front of the building as being off of the principal streets and so those entrances would need sidewalks.

Tom Keene, Esq. representing Ocean Properites, stated that Jim Locke, from ProCon and their architect was present and they had previously discussed whether it was necessary that the front door be used as an exit and they felt it was not needed according to the plans. Mr. Holden felt that assuming there was a door, there will be a sidewalk that makes a connection out to International Drive or Pease Boulevard. Attorney Keene indicated it might just be a door to a patio and wasn't really being used for access on to the street. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold confirmed they would not need the sidewalk but they would need the no exit sign. Attorney Keene did not think they would be encouraging people to use that exit to go out to Pease Boulevard. Jim Locke, from ProCon, indicated that originally that was to be an amenity space, like a patio but they haven't decided whether they want to do that or not. It is not required to be an exit. Mr. Desfosses felt they should be encouraging people to get out and walk so a sidewalk to the corner of this lot would be appropriate. Mr. Locke felt they could make the case that they could come down the other side of the building and he thinks there is a controlled access issue too. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold didn't buy that. Mr. Holden felt they have a major building with no proposed entrance on the front of the building. Mr. Locke felt the front of the building was the back where the parking was. Mr. Holden asked about having a sidewalk that accesses the door that runs around the building to the parking lot? Site Review Regulations require a good connectivity from the building to the street. Attorney Keene did not think that was a big issue but they envision this as a little siting area and encourage everyone to go out the back. The front of that building at that corner is a pretty wide intersection. If the committee would prefer to see a sidewalk out in front abutting the

street, that would be fine with them, although that would take away from the sitting area concept. Mr. Desfosses didn't understand the sitting area on the front of the building that everyone will see as it's at the corner of the two biggest streets on Pease. The rear of the building is the private side.

Mr. Holden believed that some sidewalk is asphalt and they would be looking to have that be concrete. Maria Stowell, of the PDA, wanted to clarify that the Committee is trying to connect the front of the building. She indicated that there is a crosswalk at the front of the building so that would be the place to have a sidewalk. Mr. Holden suggested that they work out something for review by Mr. Desfosses and Ms. Finnigan prior to the Planning Board for recommendation. Ms. Stowell agreed with the stipulation that the asphalt should be replaced. Mr. Holden confirmed that the applicant is responsible for putting in sidewalks on the dominate side of the streets where they have sidewalks. He suggested including Ms. Stowell to the meeting as well.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that he and Ms. Finnigan went out and looked at the intersection and it is deficient on crosswalks, handicapped access, there are no push buttons on the corner and no walk lights anywhere. He would stipulate that the signal be brought up to compliance which would be a safe 4 way signal heads for pedestrians, whatever happens on the corner must be handicapped accessible which means truncated domes and re-stripped for crosswalks and stop bars.

Mr. Holden asked Ms. Stowell if this project is subject to the traffic impact fee? Ms. Stowell confirmed that it is. Mr. Holden wondered if some of these impacts they are talking about would be in kind contribution? Ms. Stowell indicated that the improvements they are talking about would have to be discussed and but they are part of the Pease program to use the impact fee for those type of improvements. Mr. Holden stipulated that the traffic impact assessment be made to see if this would be offset by offsite improvements for this project.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the pump house on the plan. There is no pump in that building and it is a meter building so the label should be corrected. He talked to Peter Britz and there is conflicting information on the town line and he would like them to have the Existing Features Plan stamped by a licensed surveyor stating the town line stated on their plan is correct. That town line is shown on a couple different plans but the City's GIS system says something different. Attorney Keene confirmed that there is a plan on record at RCRD and he provided a copy to the Committee. Mr. Desfosses feels that the original survey may be in error and he wants their survey to confirm that no part of that lot is in the Town of Newington.

Mr. Desfosses stipulated that the dumpster itself shall be in an area that is not part of the pervious pavement area. He also stipulated that a report done as to the existing detention area and as part of this project the existing drainage system shall be cleaned and any accumulated silt or debris shall be removed as part of the original detention system.

Ms. Desfosses stated that the Photometrix Plan does not show an existing light going down the driveway to Corporate. There are no new lights shown or any background light information so he would like information on the appropriateness of adding additional lights down that driveway to Corporate Drive.

Mr. Desfosses stipulated that an annual maintenance plan be submitted to DPW.

Mr. Cravens noted that the Landscaping Plan shows a conflict where the new water line is coming off the existing water line and the existing irrigation system shall be operated between 10:00 pm – 5:00 a.m. and if there is going to be irrigation on the new project it would also have to be set up to run between the hours of 10:00 pm – 5:00 a.m., all irrigated areas shall have 6" of loam and they shall use a SMART controller to determine when it needs to be watered so that it is not over-watered.

Mr. Allen requested a note on the plan designating the area for a potential future exterior grease trap. Also, a capacity use surcharge will be assessed for this property.

Mr. Allen wanted to clarify Mr. Desfosses' stipulation on cleaning out the existing drainage system would be post construction.

Mr. Britz asked to be included in the landscaping meeting to review the wetland buffer vegetation.

Mr. Holden understood that they are going to try and save some trees and there are some significant ones. He asked that they put a landscaping fence around the trees that are to be saved to prevent the soils from being compacted.

Ms. Stowell wanted to comment on the town line and the exact location of that. The only plan she has seen verify that the lot is entirely contained in Portsmouth. Some information came from the perambulation and they had a hand held GPS meter. She felt the Altus survey should be more accurate. Mr. Holden confirmed that the only concern is they want to put the issue to bed. If it were in a different location an adjacent community would be involved in the site plan review. If that is the case, then they will re-look at this action and absent that, there is no reason to.

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

- 1) That the existing irrigation system and a potential new irrigation system shall only be operated during the hours of 10:00 pm – 5:00 am and a note shall be added to the Site Plans;
- 2) That if a new irrigation system is installed for this project, it shall have 6" of loam and will use a SMART controller;
- 3) That the Landscaping Plan shall be reviewed to determine whether there are any conflicts with trees being planted on top of the water line where it is stubbed off of the existing water service;
- 4) If there are any plans for a cooking facility a plan shall be submitted for an external grease trap;
- 5) There shall be a note on the site plan designating the area for the potential future exterior grease trap;
- 6) That a capacity use surcharge shall be assessed for this property;
- 7) That a herbacious native mix shall be used, rather than lawn, in the section closest to the wetlands, where they are in the 25' buffer;
- 8) That the Landscaping Plan shall be reviewed and approved by DPW and Planning staff prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 9) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that any snow that cannot be stored in existing show storage areas shall be trucked off of the site;
- 10) That a stop bar detail shall be added to the Site Plans;
- 11) That the handicapped sign shall be corrected to be blue and white on the Site Plans;
- 12) That a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by City staff, prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 13) That the applicant shall appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee for approval;
- 14) That the Site Plans shall show where the "to be relocated" light poles are being relocated to and shall be subject to DPW approval;
- 15) That Note 16 on Sheet C-2 shall be revised to read "That sediment deposits shall be removed after each storm event or *when the sacks are one third full*;
- 16) That an electronic version of all as-built plans and mylars shall be provided to DPW for inclusion into their GIS system, and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 17) That the site plans shall address dust control on surrounding streets as well as on site;
- 18) That the applicant shall be responsible to perform a radio-strength test with a Motorola Service Shop to ensure sufficient signal strength within any structure included in the project

to support adequate radio coverage for emergency personnel. The expense for the test shall be the responsibility of the applicant, whether or not the test indicates that amplifiers are necessary to ensure this communication. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that cost, too, shall be the responsibility of the applicant. All testing and all installations shall be coordinated between the applicant and the police/fire communications supervisor;

- 19) That Note 31 on Sheet C-5 shall be revised to include that they shall coordinate with the Portsmouth Fire Department for the location of the Knox Box;
- 20) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that the applicant shall provide automatic notification of emergency services;
- 21) That the applicant shall meet with David Desfosses, Deborah Finnigan and Maria Stowell to agree on the configuration of sidewalks, prior to the Planning Board meeting, and said changes shall be reflected on the Site Plans;
- 22) That the intersection shall be brought up to compliance, (including safe 4-way signal heads for pedestrians, handicapped accessible with truncated domes and re-striping of crosswalks and stop bars);
- 23) That the Traffic Impact Assessment shall be made to see if it would be off-set by off-site improvements;
- 24) That the pump house shall be relabeled on the site plan as a meter building;
- 25) That the Existing Features Plans shall include a statement by the licensed land surveyor, stating that the town line shown on the plan is correct and no part of the lot is in the Town of Newington;
- 26) That a note shall be added to the site plans that the dumpster shall not be located in a porous pavement area;
- 27) That a report shall be completed as to the existing detention area and provided to DPW;
- 28) That the existing drainage system shall be cleaned, post construction, and any accumulated silt or debris shall be removed as part of the original detention system;
- 29) That a report shall be prepared on the appropriateness of adding lighting down the driveway to Corporate Drive as there are none shown on the Photometrix Plan;
- 30) That an annual maintenance report shall be submitted to DPW;
- 31) That a landscaping fence shall be placed around the trees that are being saved to prevent the soils from being compacted;

.....

C. The application of **RKDOLLA, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **198 Islington Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 3/4 story, 5,671 ± s.f. addition to an existing building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 137 as Lot 20 and lies within the Historic District A and Central Business B Districts;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Jeff Clifford, of Altus Engineering, was presented with Ron Zolla and the architect Carla Goodknight and the traffic engineer, Don Rhoades. The project is located at 198 Islington Street and is an 11,647 s.f. lot. The existing footprint of the building is 1,277 s.f., with 4 tenants which include 3 residential tenants and 1 commercial tenant which is a hair dressing salon and has 16 paved parking spaces. The proposed addition is 5,671 sf addition to the building with 14 residential units and no commercial component. It will be 4 stories with 12,000 sf of living space. The project was before the HDC and received approval in January.

The project is an addition to the existing building with 10 parking spaces below a portion of the building and 5 spaces outside the building. The driveway entrance and parking spaces have been

flipped from what the existing situation is so that when people come in their headlights will not be pointed at abutting properties. The driveway has a utility pole that was just replaced as it had been hit and they did a cut and kick. They want to make sure cars stay away from it so they made that entrance 18' so there would be sufficient radius to get around it. There is a porch entry point and there is a second access point into the garage and handicapped parking is inside the building. There area landscape planters around the building and two existing planters in the front. The required open space in CBB is 5% which works out to 500 s.f. The front section is 400' and the section in the rear brings it up to 13% open space. They discounted any overhang decks or roof overhang.

Mr. Clifford addressed stormwater to site. They had a discussion at Pre-Tac as well as two meetings with DPW. The site currently has sheet flow, including off site drainage that comes from the south and work its way across the site, it comes to the curb line on Islington Street, follows the curb lines, goes into a catch basin which is part of the City's combined system which goes down Brewster. They are proposing to capture the flow with a drainage system that goes around and through the building so that everything is subsurface and they have other roof drains that will come though the catch basin and then the flow will go out to the new structure solely to a storm water line and it would tie into the City system. They have a closed subsurface system consisting of 30" pipes. They talked about doing infiltration with DPW but there were several concerns about putting more water in the groundwater because of concerns about water getting into peoples basements and potential groundwater contamination. The catch basins will be hooded which traps the oils and greases and there will also be deep sumps.

There is a conduit that goes with all kinds of telephone cables and they can get underneath it. Based on Pre TAC they will replace the sidewalk in keeping with the Islington Street Corridor Study by putting in brick sidewalk and landscaping along the front. They provided a tree and ground covers so as to not interfere with site distance.

In consideration that there will be some improvements to the City's combined drainage system, they came to an agreement with DPW that the applicant would fund a study of the neighborhood and how this watershed would later have infrastructure improvements through sewer separation. Altus Engineering will do that study for the City.

Regarding the utilities on site, they will be extending a new water line into the site with separate fire and domestic. They will replace the existing sewer line with a larger line. The utilities are currently overhead and they will continue that until such time as there are improvements along Islington Street as part of the future upgrades. This will be a sprinklered building with a knox box and a third party monitoring. Solid waste will be an internal trash room. Snow storage was discussed at Pre-TAC and they are able to store up to a 7" year storm event in the front area. One parking space would temporarily store snow until it is trucked off.

Regarding landscaping they will provide a privacy fence along the edge of the property and will maintain the existing site lines. They will replace some fencing in the rear. They will have to remove a double row of trees in the back and they have pulled their landscaped planters back so as to not impact the abutter's tree.

Mr. Clifford discussed the garage spaces which they had a long discussion about at Pre-TAC about what they count as spaces towards their parking need. Their parking need for 14 residential units is 21, there are 16 at the site now. They feel internally that there are 16 available but they have put 15 as one spot would be difficult for a vehicle to get back out of. The wall to wall space they provide inside is 62' and the last four spaces are 64'. He used the example of Bull Moose where they have 60' and 61'. He went in with his Subaru wagon and was able to pull in and pull out and that space was 2' narrower than what they are proposing.

In terms of traffic, they are taking away the commercial component so they won't have the peak they had with the hairdresser with six stations. They showed there was not a higher peak resulting in traffic. They have adequate site distance.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application.

Jeanette Bonham, President of 72 Islington Street Condo Association. She stated that they are right in the middle of this project and the Kline project at 51 Islington Street. She will speak to both of them individually. Her biggest concern is the level of the water table as it stands in the Islington Street area as they have had a water problem on their street. She pointed out that the hair salon has never been very busy so the traffic for 14 new units would far exceed the existing traffic on the site. She also has concerns about the noise level, the construction truck and water pressure.

Mr. Clifford stated that the drainage flowing across the site comes from impervious surfaces on abutting properties. There is a drop off of 8' – 10' onto their site but that is vegetated. They go to a paved area that flows down the street to a catch basin. As they capture that water, they will infiltrate it. They have decided to go with a closed system with 30" pipes to store several 100 cubic feet of water, which will be done at a considerable expense to them. All water is not infiltrating now so with everything being a close system there is the potential of even less water going into the ground water table. Mr. Holden asked if their plan was to retain the water so there is about the same amount of run off or less than the current condition. Mr. Clifford confirmed that the peak run off would be less after they complete the project because they are detaining it. Mr. Britz asked what was the depth of the groundwater now? Mr. Clifford stated they don't have a test pit to demonstrate that. Mr. Britz asked if that could be installed if the ground water is 2' below the surface? Mr. Clifford stated that it could because there is enough cover on the pipe. And, because it was a closed system, it would still have the same capacity.

Mr. Holden requested that the Traffic Engineer give a summary of his study.

Don Rhoades, from Norway Plains Associates, was asked to assess the traffic impact of the proposed redevelopment of this site. He did a traffic count on Islington Street at the driveway intersection in early December to the existing site. They compared that data to traffic data they had collected at Brewster Street and Islington Street in the summer. The busiest one hour period on the site driveway was 8 cars either coming or going using the site driveway during the busiest 60 minute period. With the redevelopment with 13 condo units, using the Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation rate, the site would generate six to eight trips during the afternoon peak hours. The site, after the redevelopment, will not generate more traffic during the peak hour than what they actually had in December. They assessed the hair salon and included that information in their study. Ms. Finnigan asked whether there would be a hair salon after this project is completed? Mr. Rhoades confirmed that there would not be a hair salon. Mr. Holden asked what is peak hour? Mr. Rhoades stated in the summertime it is between 5:00 – 6:00 pm. In December, the peak hour of the traffic on Islington Street is 3:30 – 4:30 pm. The numbers are quite similar and the 5:00 –6:00 pm period in July is higher than the 3:30 – 4:30 pm period in December.

The Chair asked 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:

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if there are pillars at Bull Moose? Mr. Clifford indicated that there were and they looked like they were 8' x 8' to him. The architect has left an 8" space on the proposed plans.

Ms. Finnigan asked some questions about Bull Moose and further indicated that she has not seen any turning movements and she is uncomfortable with 17' between columns and cars will fill up that 8.5' of space. If there is a car parked between the columns and someone was trying to pull into the other space, she would have to see how that would work on a plan. She stated she will check out Bull Moose and compare it to this property. Mr. Holden asked them to provide a summation and the templates of the computer simulation to show that these two spaces work. Ms. Finnigan stated it is her intent to request that she see that data. She also needs to see that a car can get into the handicapped space with a car in the spot next to it. Mr. Desfosses thought it might even be necessary to back into that space as the loading zone is on the wrong side.

Mr. Desfosses had the same issues as Ms. Finnigan. He felt that the column cannot be there and there is no way to fix it except take the column out. Mr. Clifford talked about having a larger door and they would pull over into the lane to get in. He asked why is that different? Ms. Finnigan felt if you can't see a car coming out that is potentially an accident. Mr. Clifford indicated that these would be two residents with remotes. Ms. Finnigan understands what Mr. Clifford was saying but she respectfully disagreed with him and she wants to see it done correct with them coming in the "in" and not coming in the "out", which is the current proposal.

Mr. Desfosses questioned whether this site is overloaded. It is mind boggling how much is on this site. In concept he thinks the site might meet all of the requirements but he hardly knows what to say.

Mr. Cravens was all set with the plans.

Mr. Allen agreed with Mr. Desfosses and it really comes out when they look at the drainage system. At the back they have drop inlets with underdrains connecting in series and he sees problems with that. They have approximately 2 ½ feet between property line and the structure and they are putting 3' structures in for the drop inlets and then it is going into an underdrain system which is a fairly flat slope so there is no way for anyone to maintain the whole system. To him, that is reflective of too much building on this lot. They have a serious drainage system back there and the area already has a drainage issue and then they have this building tucked so tight there is no way to get back there to maintain the system. As soon as it gets blocked up, all of the water will go over to the neighboring properties. They have squeezed in a design that is too tight to work. It may work Day 1 but it will not work a year or two later. To properly access the system they would typically have some type of suction vehicle to go in and clean out the lines. There is only 2' available. He doesn't see the system being sustainable or functional.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa was concerned about parking. He has a feeling that his officers will take accident reports there a lot. It is like a sardine can. He can also see the parking spaces being problematic with the columns. He also stated that they are asking all new applicants to do a radio strength test to insure that police and fire can be heard inside that building, should they need. They should contact Gil Emery, 610-7411, to work out the details.

Ms. Finnigan requested that the Landscaping Plan be labeled for types and quantity of plants and should be reviewed by DPW and Planning prior to their next submission. This plan would not typically be accepted without those labels.

Mr. Holden noted that this plan shows curb cuts off Islington Street? Mr. Clifford was not sure one curbcut was accurate. Mr. Holden requested that he put both curb cuts on the plans. Mr. Allen suggested that they put a line across the end of curb to show that it is an end of curb.

Mr. Clifford indicated that there are a couple of things they can do regarding the drainage. They can have more cleanouts and they can also use another type of structure such as the ADS PVC type structures so that you can get a 2' structure in a 2 ½' area. They can also provide some sort of access from the inside of the building to flush that line. There are solutions to address their concern about

maintenance of that line. Mr. Holden felt that if this came to a vote it probably wouldn't have sufficient votes to pass. He asked Mr. Clifford if he wanted to go back and revisit the site? Mr. Clifford agreed.

Ms. Finnigan questioned the easterly side of the sidewalk where there is no labeled tipdown and she asked if they are planning to build one? Mr. Clifford felt that the grades are so subtle that they really don't have much grade transition. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that they only need a tip down at the driveway. Ms. Finnigan asked if the opposing driveway was in the exact same location as the existing driveway? Mr. Clifford indicated they are moving it over. Ms. Finnigan confirmed that from the Traffic Memo that she received from January 6th, she has corresponded with Mr. Rhoades and those comments needs to be incorporated into the Memo. That Memo should also include the site distance, both what is anticipated and what is needed.

Mr. Holden stated that they have heard concerns that this is overdevelopment on the lot and they have to apply all site review criteria to it. They will go back and work on this. Does he want to schedule a meeting with the TAC committee to meet with them prior to next regular meeting? Mr. Clifford confirmed that he will be in touch with them.

Mr. Desfosses asked, coming into the site, on the right hand side before the garage doors, there is a little jog in the property line and he asked what is what is going on the other side of the line. He wondered if they need the 3 s.f. there and whether they could move the fence so that people can get by? Mr. Clifford will look into it.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion t postpone to the April TAC meeting. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

Mr. Britz shares the same concern about the site being overdeveloped. He doesn't feel the open space is adequate. It looks like an afterthought and isn't anything they can really use and he asked them to look into that. Mr. Clifford indicated that some planters are designed to be similar to a raingarden as they store water and the water infiltrates through a filter media and there is a detail in the Site Plans so they are providing better stormwater treatment than a lawn. He felt those planters are pretty valuable. Mr. Holden asked if the 5% open space accessible by the tenants and useable open space? Mr. Clifford felt that % of the front is useable.

Mr. Allen felt that the maintenance information provided in the drainage analysis was pretty generic and he asked that they be more specific to the site, to include the retention storage system and how that is maintained. He did not see man hole accesses into that so he was unclear on how those are cleaned out over time.

The motion to postpone to the March 31st TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **51 Islington Street, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct one 4-story, 7,836 ± s.f. residential building and one 5-story 12,342 ± s.f. mixed use building, after demolition of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within the Historic District A and Central B

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagon, of Ambit Engineering, was present with Jen Ramsey, Project Architect, Don Rhoades, Traffic Engineer, Paul McEachern, Counsel, and Steve Kelm, Managing Partner. They are proposing two free standing buildings to replace one existing building.

Mr. Chagnon reviewed the Plan Set. The Cover Sheet shows the layout and the neighborhood. The Existing Conditions Plan shows the property survey results and what is on the site.

Sheet C-2 is the Layout Plan which shows the positioning of the proposed buildings on the property. They received HDC approval in early February and part of that approval was a site plan which they have modified that somewhat. They had 3' sidewalks surrounding the whole building however they wanted to get sidewalks that were more reasonably sized. The proposed sidewalks are brick and the front sidewalk is the same as the existing with added tipdowns. The building is set back from the property line at the lower level so additional sidewalk it proposed along the Islington Street side and the sidewalks to the three principal entrances of the proposed building. On Tanner Street they put in a 6' sidewalk from Islington Street to the intersection of Tanner and Tanner Court. Off of that sidewalk there is an entrance sidewalk going into the back of the front building and the back of the rear building to provide for pedestrian access. When they get to Tanner Court on the north side, they reduce the sidewalk to 4' sidewalk to maintain the existing width that is there for traffic flow. There is an arching section to the back building however at the first floor level there is a pass through. On the Parker Street side there is a 4' sidewalk and a tipdown to grade to get pedestrians well away from the intersection before they go into the street. Right now the building goes to the property line. The Parker Street side has the vehicular access with a ramp that comes down and passed to underground space that will provide on site parking.

There are four parking spaces out front and they have taken the liberty of showing those replaced with meters rather than signs.

The Landscaping Plan shows trees and bushes but they are not defined at this point. They have some trees along Islington Street and Tanner Court in the site pockets and some bushes. The site has an opportunity to present some landscaping. They have 20% open space on the site.

Sheets C-4 & C-5 are the Utility and Grading Plans. They need information on the sewer before doing final plans. There is a clean out without a cover on Tanner Street and they will need a sewer manhole with clean out. Most lighting will be façade lighting, facing downward. They don't have a spec yet because the architect hasn't gotten that far and they will have to go back to HDC for those fixtures. Mr. Chagnon pointed out the rest of the lighting on Tanner Street and bollard lighting along the walkway in the rear and lighting on the driveway ramp. They are proposing every other light will be a low voltage LED light on at nighttime. When a vehicle approaches a motion sensor would turn on the other lights. Cable and telephone service will come from a pole and will be fed underground. Gas will be coming from Tanner Street and will feed the front building and then proceed on to feed the Tanner Court building. Water service is proposed in three connections. They are planning to build in 3 phases. Electric will be provided with 3 phase power from Islington. They will tap down Tanner Street to an existing pole and then drop down to a transformer to service the buildings.

They are collecting a large majority of the site drainage and directing it out the back. They will collect all roof drainage and pipe to a point in the back to connect to some drainage shown going off site. They need to connect to the nearest city drainage system at Bridge and Hanover. They did a study of the drainage area that would be collected and they studied the entire drainage area. The pipe currently is a 12" needs to be upgraded at Bridge Street. Another problem, as shown on C-7, is that there is a catch basin at that corner that does not have a cover. They will correct that with their offsite drainage improvements.

Mr. Chagnon stated that they understand they haven't shown some things but they hope to move forward and get some feedback.

Mr. Holden asked if they were asking to have it reviewed as one project? Mr. Chagnon indicated they would like to look at the final project first and then they will come back and show how they are going to phase it. They want to review this as a phased project at the end. Mr. Holden indicated there was a strong feeling on the part of this Committee that if it is going to be phased, then the 5 story building should be first. Jen Ramsey stated that the HDC approval was for the whole project and they preferred that the back building be done first as a buffer to the Tanner Court neighborhood. Mr. Holden felt this might be a conflict and he would identify that as one major issue.

Mr. Allen felt, in general, he appreciated the work that Mr. Chagnon had done on the whole drainage plan and it will significantly improve one aspect of this area. On the water services, he reminded Mr. Chagnon that the City only allows one domestic water service per lot. They can have multiple fire services but only one domestic meter per lot.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stated that he was really concerned about parking issues. He looked at the traffic study and it talked about parking in the Bridge Street lot but the 40 Bridge Street project which was recently approved also talked about that. He is having real issues with the lack of parking that need to be addressed.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked whether the entry on Parker to the underground parking is two way? Mr. Chagnon confirmed it was two way and 18' wide. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if there would ever be a time when a car would have to back out of that space onto Parker? Mr. Chagnon indicated that a car that was in the wrong place might have to back out. They haven't discussed putting a gate at the top. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa had a real concern about cars backing out into a residential area with people walking around and felt that is an accident waiting to happen and needs to be addressed. Also, the traffic on Tanner that this project will generate gives him anxiety as well.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa stipulated that the applicant shall be responsible to perform a radio-strength test with a Motorola Service Shop to ensure sufficient signal strength within any structure included in the project to support adequate radio coverage for emergency personnel. The expense for the test shall be the responsibility of the applicant, whether or not the test indicates that amplifiers are necessary to ensure this communication. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that cost, too, shall be the responsibility of the applicant. All testing and all installations shall be coordinated between the applicant and the police/fire communications supervisor.

Mr. Holden asked if they are demolishing the building and the resulting sidewalks are less than 5' and street widths are 19', does that pose any concerns? They may need a pier review of this. Ms. Finnigan agreed. This is not a high generator but it generates traffic on streets that are narrow and intersections that can be dangerous with snow piled up. That was not addressed in the traffic study. She also has questions on the traffic study which she can forward directly to Mr. Rhoades. She does feel that this needs an additional reviewer.

Mr. Holden asked to review with Attorney McEachern the issues they did at the old Eagle photo building in terms of the entrance to the parking garage. They may not need a formal resolution now but they need a resolution. Paul McEachern believed the Eagle Building was 16' wide and there had been absolutely no problems having two way. That went to the BOA, under Mr. McEachern's protest and they got the variance. Mr. Holden indicated they will revisit that with the Legal Department.

Ms. Finnigan asked about a parking layout plan for underground parking? Attorney McEachern indicated that it was not completed yet.

Ms. Desfosses echoed some concerns. He has issues with the layout. The ramp down to the underground parking garage is an acute angle coming off of the street, making it more difficult to take that corner. The radius into the driveway needs to be looked at. Second concern is that right now the intersection of Parker/Tanner Court is wide open and there is no curbing or parking there now because it is primarily traveled by the public. Have the large radius of that corner allows the City to get a garbage truck to collect garbage on Tanner Court. It would never fit with these radii. He also doesn't agree with the curb line down to Tanner Court and should be pushed back so that the curbing is right on the property line because the street lines up now. He plows that area all the time and if they follow the property line down the street it is straight and it lines up with the pole at the other corner. A snow plow needs to get in that way as they can't get to Tanner Court the other way. He has the same reservations that Parker Street has never had this type of traffic and he worries about the intersection of Parker/Hanover and how that will play out. He is uncomfortable with the plan as shown and feels it has too much on the lot.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold also mentioned the turning radius and added that if a garbage truck can't make a radius then a fire truck can't make the radius either. Mr. Desfosses felt this was a significant issue and must be looked at. Mr. Holden asked what the purpose of the 4' brick sidewalk parallel to Tanner Court was? Mr. Chagnon responded that it was to bring people out to Islington. Mr. Holden asked why wouldn't they ring the project with a sidewalk? Mr. Chagnon reiterated that the applicant went through the HDC process and that took them a year and they are already seeing that there are conflicts. The HDC approved 3' sidewalks around the entire site however he doesn't think the site should be ringed with sidewalks or demands it. Mr. Allen felt it was a residential building and it made sense to have it ringed with a sidewalk because of the narrow streets in the neighborhood. Mr. Chagnon felt that they had the doors to all of their residential units leading to sidewalks. Mr. Allen felt they were sidewalks to nowhere.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application.

Jeannette Bohham, 72 Islington Street Condo Association President, handed out picture of her lot under water. She read a statement to the Committee. The City is responsible for looking at new projects to see if they may cause prospective issues if they are built. They have a water issue on their property and after their neighbor put a parking lot in their backyard, 72 Islington Street started retaining water. When they called the city for help, they were told that they were on private property and that they should have been at the public hearings to voice their concerns. They are the lowest area in the surrounding area, which they didn't know, and they now have an issue. That should have been noticed by the City and shared with them. The Telephone Company's run off goes right into their back yard. They now flood every time there is a rain storm. The Telephone Company came up with many viable options, all of which were denied by the City, stating cost issues. They are now putting the City on notice that they have real concerns with water drainage issues and the water table problems. They also have an issue with too much traffic on the street, the dirt and dust that this project will cause and noises.

Mr. Holden also read into the record a letter that had been received from Stephen Fowle, of Tanner Court, addressing parking on Tanner Court.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee what they wanted to do about the peer review? Ms. Finnigan felt this should this be presented to T& S now for their comments to start the peer review. Mr. Allen agreed that made sense. Mr. Holden indicated they need details on the underground parking and other comments made at this meeting. To keep it going they need to get before the T&S as their action would be helpful here.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden asked if there was any other advice for the applicant that has not been discussed?

Mr. Chagnon was not clear on how to handle the sidewalk. Do they want the total sidewalk around the whole site? Ms. Finnigan confirmed that 36" is the minimum ADA standard but that is not comfortable for a wheelchair and 5' is much better. Mr. Allen stated it was his recommendation to have sidewalks around the whole building. Mr. Holden added that they are charged to do a safe project, this is a restrained neighborhood and they don't have the proper balance. They need to see some proposals on his part based on today's comments.

Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. Kelm about Stephen Fowle's letter which says that Mr. Kelm said he could have 3-5 spaces on Tanner Court side. Mr. Kelm stated that he told him he wanted to go through this process (TAC) before making changes to a design that wasn't approved or completed. His suggestion was on the Tanner Street side there were some undulations in the building that went in and out and maybe a possibility of putting parking there and pulling the sidewalk closer to the building. It was their plan to add sidewalks around the building and green space, both of which don't currently exist. He told him he wasn't going to start changing plans until they were further along the process. Mr. Desfosses stated that he is hedging along this being a nuisance under the Site Review criteria but if the residents were able to park along the Tanner side that would make this much more reasonable in his mind. Residents are not parking on the right of way, they are parking right next to the building.

Mr. Chagnon was hearing that they should meet with T& S and come back next month with some different options.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone this application to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting on March 31st. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the March 31st TAC meeting passed unanimously.

Concerns of the committee were as follows:

- 1) Traffic & Safety Committee for comments;
- 2) Review of entrance to underground garage;
- 3) Require parking layout plan for underground garage;
- 4) Determination of which building will be built first;
- 5) Effect of project to currently restrained neighborhood;
- 6) Sidewalk surrounding project.

.....

II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:40 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant