

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

2:00 PM

MAY 5, 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 Public Works Director; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; Steve Parkinson, Public Works Director (for Deborah Finnigan); Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief;

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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 Business B Districts; (This application was postponed at the March 31, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

David Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Peter 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, indicated that this was tabled at the last TAC meeting to give them a chance to look at the layout and review with City Staff. They had a meeting with City staff and discussed the four alternatives that were given at the last meeting. The alternative which the City felt would be the best for this site was making Parker Street two-way from Islington Street to Tanner Court. Therefore, all they had before them today was Sheet C-2, and he highlighted how it was changed this month.

Starting on the west side and left side of Parker Street they brought the sidewalk in from the edge of the road so there is a 24' width to Parker Street, pulling sidewalk in onto their lot. On the other side, they shortened the sidewalk to 4' and the net result is that the building size shrunk. On the back side they did the same. They carried the 24', moving the sidewalk over and shrinking the building. They provided more turning area for the City. In the front, in talking to the City about the implication of having traffic exit Parker onto Islington, the issue was sight distance. They needed to get an acceptable sight distance without interfering with existing parking on Islington Street. Also, the Islington Street Master Plan has bumpouts so this design reflects the inclusion of bumpouts and the four parking spaces in front were reduced to three parking spaces.

He passed out a sight distance study to the Committee members which showed 300' of sight distance from Parker to the right and they do not have to take any existing parking spaces or relocate them in any fashion. To the left, there are two lines. One is a 300' sight distance which is obtained with the layout that they have currently on Sheet C-2. They put a second line on that is a 250' sight distance which they feel is adequate for stopping sight distance if they took the sidewalk in front of the building and make it 9' instead of 7' wide. That is something, if the committee is comfortable with, they would propose to make the sidewalk 2' wider. 7' wide meets the standards and it is at least as wide as the sidewalk that is there now. With the advent of the bumpouts it allows them to widen the sidewalk at the edge of the parking area to 8' through to the crosswalks at the intersection.

Mr. Chagnon stated that they are looking for approval of this layout which is the circulation and access. The sidewalk is all the way around as requested and Parker Street would be two way between Tanner Court and Islington. There is an issue about drainage with the bumpouts which they will address and come back with completed drawings next month.

Mr. Holden noted that the lights they show on the front of the building, he assumes those are overhanging the right of way? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they are overhanging the property as the sidewalk is coming onto their lot by 3 1/2'. Mr. Holden indicated that normally they are trying to get street vegetation in that area. Mr. Chagnon indicated that the two bulb areas are going to be planted streetside. The one on the right has a fire hydrant in it but beyond that it will not impede the hydrant. Adjacent to the building on the sides and adjacent to the building after the two doors they will have plantings areas. Mr. Holden asked why the traffic circulation isn't noted on the plan. Mr. Chagnon responded that had not been added to the plans.

Mr. Allen felt, procedurally, this is not coming forth for a vote as it is an incomplete submitted so they are just providing guidance. Mr. Holden was also puzzled about why it didn't have more information but the applicant meet with representations of DPW and the Planning Department but they are still expecting more information. Ms. Allen felt this moves towards postponing as you can't approve one piece at a time.

Mr. Allen referred to Mr. Chagnon's comment that they thought the sight distances were adequate but weren't they based on the posted speed on the street and it is fairly cut and dried. Mr. Chagnon agreed. If they look at the 300' site distance, that is at the intersection of Islington and Bridge. The fact that this is so close to the beginning of the street, they are not going to have speeds of 30 mph. They will go with 300' and look for their feedback.

Mr. Holden reviewed what was done at the March 4th meeting. They postponed with six principal concerns.

1st Concern: Traffic & Safety Committee for comments. Mr. Holden believed Traffic and Safety also postponed until this issue could be worked out further. He feels the applicant was encouraged to look at the different alternatives and they are proposing that Parker Street be 2 way through Tanner Court. They would look for additional traffic information to support that recommendation. Mr. Chagnon noted that at the last meeting they submitted four different traffic analysis scenarios and it showed the level of service was not impacted by any of the scenarios. Mr. Holden reminded Mr. Chagnon that was done at a staff meeting so he requested that he run through it for the record.

Mr. Chagnon thought this was discussed at the last TAC meeting. They should have received a Memorandum dated April 1st from Don Rhoades, their Traffic Engineer. It states that he evaluated the traffic impact of alternative vehicular circulation pattern and in each case the proposed driveway on Parker Street would remain unchanged. The traffic impact study was based on retaining the existing one way streets, Tanner and Parker, and that was their original proposal. The study showed that there were no change in level of service at the off site intersections. There were three alternative traffic

patterns considered in this Memorandum. The first two options could allow traffic to exit towards Hanover Street and the traffic analysis assumed all exiting traffic would be towards Islington Street and this would result in the worst case impact to the intersections on Islington Street but would not necessarily result in the preferable traffic flow pattern. The study went on to identify, based on these alternatives, the levels of service and in conclusion it states that the level of service calculations show that the alternative circulation patterns will have a negligible impact on the operation of nearby intersection. Each of the alternative circulation patterns would result in acceptable operating conditions and other factors will influence the choice. They are looking for some direction on the City's preferred choice. The consensus of the City representatives was to develop two way traffic onto Parker Street. They wanted to come back with the layout before they went ahead with the engineering and final grading.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee if they have any issues with this proposal? Mr. Parkinson felt it was acceptable.

2nd Concern: Entrance to the underground garage. Mr. Chagnon believed that the issue was turning movements. They provided turning movement drawings to the Board and Mr. Chagnon handed out drawings to the Committee for their review. By making Parker Street two way and making it wider, they changed the radius into the ramp and the turning movement drawing shows that it works.

3rd Concern: Require parking layout of the underground garage. Mr. Chagnon indicated that was submitted with turning movements in April. Mr. Holden stated that it was lacking dimensions so they don't know if they are conforming or non-conforming. Mr. Chagnon stated they are not going to count any of the spaces towards the impact parking fee. TAC wanted T&S to look at the layout and T&S referred it to the Parking Committee. Mr. Holden stated they also need to see it. If they are proposing a parking garage that may not be the best fit for the public, they need to know if it is a public hazard. He asked when are they going to see that data? Mr. Chagnon responded that it was submitted to the Parking Committee and they are scheduled for May 12th. Ms. Tillman added that it is still incomplete for a parking layout plan underneath the building.

4th Concern: The determination of which building will be built first. Mr. Holden confirmed that Attorney McEachern, City Attorney Sullivan and Mr. Holden had met and that will be clarified and is underway.

5th Concern: Effect of the project to currently constrained neighborhood. Mr. Holden felt that was more with the traffic so they probably have sufficient information on that.

6 Concern: Sidewalks surrounding the project. Mr. Holden indicated this is the first time they have seen the sidewalks with the widths and would look to DPW. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that 4' is the minimum width allowed.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee if they have enough information. When they have been on other parts of Islington Street where they have had a building that is largely torn down and rebuilt, they have tended to have more of a landscape presence along the corridor. He is a little troubled as he was not sure they were going to get any street trees due to visibility problems. He wondered if this lot was being over developed in light of its potential. Mr. Allen felt they are asking to approve this concept but they don't have the landscape and other plans that would address their questions. He is hesitant to approve anything without a whole set of plans. The sidewalk is an improvement. The turning movements don't have an edge of pavement and it looks like the vehicle is going to be crossing other people's property. Mr. Allen felt that they need more information. Mr. Holden asked if Mr. Allen shares his concern that the site might be overbuilt? Mr. Allen confirmed that he did.

Mr. Desfosses felt that they are getting close but he still has problems with the radius going down into the garage on Parker Street because it is a blind corner. There will be an opportunity for a street tree at

the bumpout as long as the tree canopy is high enough. Whenever they put bumpouts in they try to put verticles in. He doesn't know what utilities are underground because they don't have a full set of plans. The radius down the ramp and landscaping are his concerns. Mr. Holden asked if Mr. Desfosses concurred that a full set of plans is appropriate to continue this review? Mr. Desfosses confirmed that he agreed.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa stated his only issue is people backing out of the driveway to get out of the underground parking because sidewalks are so narrow. He sees a wall mounted mirror on the plan but he thought they discussed a gate? Mr. Chagnon stated that they did not feel a gate was appropriate as it will stop traffic in the road so they added a sign. The parking lot is not for the public so the ramp is 18' and wide enough to turn around. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa had a similar concern on Gate Street and it continues to be a concern. Ms. Tillman felt if they are not going to have it gated, she would think they would show an adequate turn around area in the garage to allow people to turn around and drive out. Mr. Britz asked to have the slope of the ramp shown on the plan and the lights should be shown as well? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that all lights are dark sky friendly. The heat is a slab underground that is turned on when it snows. Drainage for the garage is connected to the drainage system. Mr. Holden wondered if it would need to be cleaned before it connects in. Mr. Chagnon added there should be a sump. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that typically that should go in the sewer line. Mr. Chagnon indicated that Rick Hopley doesn't like parking garages going into the sewer system so it would go in the new drainage system. Mr. Allen confirmed it should be a floor drain connected to the sewer as floor drains by code are to go into the sanitary sewer. Mr. Chagnon pointed out that the garage has evaporators. Mr. Allen felt that they can deal with that separately and that it could be separated into the storm drain.

Mr. Parkinson agreed with Mr. Holden. The whole package needs to be brought forward. Today's presentation with 2-way traffic down Parker is a good step forward and keeping the traffic out of the little neighborhood streets is best. Mr. Holden asked if he needed further traffic information? Mr. Parkinson felt there is sufficient data.

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 had comments about traffic, safety and the over building of the whole area. She understands the Bridge Street project and 198 Islington Street project has been approved so that within 1/8 mile they are adding 77 condos, a lot of retail space but yet there are only 68 parking spaces provided. For 77 condos alone, each condo has less than one parking space. Recently there was a presentation to the Islington Corridor Project and the bumpouts were not well received. She also understands the Portwalk project parking will not be dealt with until Phase 3 of that project. She asked where is everybody going to park as a good portion of the buyers will have more than one vehicle? Also, where will the retail employees park? She is also concerned about traffic. She lives at 72 Islington Street and people drive very fast and stop at the lights quickly. She still has concerns of drainage and suppressed land in the area. She hopes they will consider all of these items before allowing them to continue to build in this area.

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 for purposes of this meeting.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone the application to the next regular TAC meeting on June 2nd. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the June 2nd TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **2422 Lafayette Road Associates, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **2454 Lafayette Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 25,500 ± s.f. retail addition, to construct a 27,350 ± s.f. stand alone retail building, and to demolish 155 ± s.f. of existing building to separate the buildings, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 273 as Lot 3 and lies within the General Business district; (This application was postponed at the January 15, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

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

Mr. Parkinson seconded the motion.

The motion to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Gregg Mikolaities, of Appledore Engineering, addressed the Committee. Also present was Doug Richardson of Waterstone. He displayed the existing conditions and the proposed site plan. They propose to install extensive landscaping, granite curbing, sidewalks, ADA accessible, building addition and expansion. There will be new site lighting replacing the existing features. There is an 8' ledge that needs to come out. They have created a pedestrian friendly site with sidewalks. They are adding benches, a Coast bus stop, bike racks, an extensive stormwater management system that includes 12 tree filters, porous pavement in the back and they are adding underground infiltration detention systems. There are 3 stormwater quality units. In discussion with David Desfosses, a geotechnical study was done by Teracon and they added infiltration throughout the site. They are not only reducing the peak rate but reducing the volume. They handed out a peak volume at Pre-TAC showing a significant improvement. They are completing the drainage study. They passed out the executive summary this morning and they will submit the full drainage study on Friday. They appeared before the BOA for a parking variance. Additionally, there are some façade improvements which they are working on now. They intend to continue with the façade improvements as tenants come on board. They added 105 new trees and 104 new shrubs. Also included in their package are renderings showing landscaping along Lafayette Road. The building coverage is 27% and open space is 21.7%. They were requested to loop the water line and that has been complied with. Steve Pernaw has completed a traffic study and they met with Traffic & Safety on May 14th. Mr. Mikolaities handed out the study findings and recommendations to the Committee.

Mr. Mikolaities stated that Mr. Pernaw analyzed the two intersections and secondary entrances. On a peak Saturday in the summer, the traffic is about 4% total coming out Lafayette and 2% coming out of Constitution, and that's additional traffic. The corridor works well with this signal and coordinates well with the Wal-Mart intersection so his recommendation is to keep that timing the same. This creates a little more delay on Constitution but he would make Lafayette the dominant movement. They operate at a high level of service and they have enough stacking distance. Mr. Holden asked if another way to say this is they are adding 3% to the traffic flow but no off site improvements are required as a result of this project. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that was Mr. Pernaw's conclusion.

Mr. Mikolaities indicated that last time they talked about granite curbing, wider sidewalks and tree plantings along the store fronts.

He discussed the TAC comments from the December, 2008 meeting.

- 1) That the dashed line going into the site shall stop before the stamped asphalt to avoid having two lanes competing to drive into the same driveway;

Added striping and adjusted it for two lanes all the way to the intersection. Sheet 3 and 3-A.

- 2) In anticipation of the State widening Route One, the applicant should consider keeping 60' – 70' back from the stop bar;

They have done that as Waterstone wants to create a landscaped center so they moved the stamped pavement back off the road and 70' from the stop bar. Sheet 3 and 3-A.

- 3) That the applicant may want to consider creating more snow storage areas;

They did that and added a note #24 on Sheet 3-A.

- 4) That the applicant may want to consider having more cart corrals;

They have shown 6 cart corrals on the Site Plan.

- 5) That easements shall be required for all gate valves and service shut offs to the individual units, for review and approval as to content and form by the City Legal Department;

They agree to a blanket water easement with the City's Legal Department. Some work is still required as they are not entirely sure where all the water lines and services are. They will work with DPW on that. Doug Richardson confirmed that with the fit up they are doing for the restaurant, they have already discovered issues with the water department and they are underway with those corrections.

- 6) That a copy of the as-builts in electronic format, compatible with the City's GIS format, shall be provided to DPW;

Added Note on Sheet 3-A and 3-B and 5-A and 5-B.

- 7) On Sheet C-5, Note 8 shall include "coordinate with DOT" as it is a State right of way;

They fixed that note.

- 8) That the water meter shall be relocated to where it is tapped off the fire service;

They revised domestic and fire services. They know they have to double back into the building but they don't know where yet so they have a note on the Utilities Plan to go with this building.

- 9) That any domestic service that is tapped off of fire service should be brought in from the main in front of the building to a separate domestic service and it should then have a meter;

Same as #8 above.

- 10) That a meeting shall be coordinated with DPW representatives from the Water Division and the applicant;

They met in January to talk about water lines and will continue to meet with them.

- 11) That a leakage survey of the water line shall be completed by the applicant and if the pipe is leaking more than AWWA standards then the applicant shall be required to repair the water line;

They added a note to Sheet 5-A and 5-B.

- 12) That the grease trap shall be coordinated with Peter Rice, Water/Sewer Engineer;
A grease trap detail has been added on Sheet 5-A and 5-B.
- 13) That on Sheet C-12, Utility Trench Detail, the town of Wakefield should be deleted and City of Portsmouth added;
They changed this wording.
- 14) That a fire hydrant shall be added to the back of the lot with the location to be determined by the Fire Department;
They added fire hydrant to the back of the lot. It came off the new tap, which was a requirement of the Fire Department. Shown on Sheet 5-B.
- 15) 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.
Note #32 added to Sheet 5-A and 5-B.
- 16) That the applicant shall make every effort to retain as much stormwater on the site as possible;
They have talked about that and they significantly reduced volume coming off the site.
- 17) That a Traffic Memorandum shall be prepared to show the traffic impacts with the additions, for review and approval by Deborah Finnigan;
They will be meeting with Traffic and Safety on May 14th to talk about that.
- 18) That the plans shall reflect that all loops shall be replaced as needed after grinding or removing pavement on the driveway to Route One;
They have done that on Sheet 3-A.
- 19) That the applicant shall verify with NHDOT that the 12' easement should be placed on the plan for Route One;
They have confirmed that the 12' easement should be shown on the plan and they have added that.
- 20) That the applicant shall be required to appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee for review;
They appeared on January 8th and they were asked to come back with a traffic study and they are now appearing next week.
- 21) That the applicant shall notify the City of all demolition and a note on Sheet C-2B should reflect that;

Note #27 was added to Sheet 2-B.

- 22) That Note 16 on Sheet C-2B shall include all catch basins on Route One and Constitution Avenue and Route One would be determined by DOT, as they have jurisdiction;

They added a note.

- 23) That Note 27 on Sheet C-2B shall include “and approval of the CMMP”;

That was added.

- 24) That the parking space count shall be broken down to show van parking spaces, handicapped parking spaces and motorcycle parking spaces;

They have broken out the parking spaces to show the different type of spaces on Sheet C-3.

- 25) That the applicant shall meet with Deborah Finnigan and Lucy Tillman to review and approve of the Landscaping Plan;

They met on January 8th and the landscape chart has been changed based on that meeting.

- 26) That the applicant review the stop condition for the right hand turn lane going into the bank as it may be unnecessary and it may possibly stop the other lanes coming into the main aisle;

They have taken that stop off so traffic can move right into that parcel.

- 27) That on Sheet C-3A, Note 20 should include NHDOT as it is their roadway and their standards are slightly different than the City of Portsmouth;

They have included that note on Sheet 3-A.

- 28) That a double yellow center line shall be added along the 99 Restaurant and Taco Bell driveway and the stop bar and stop sign shall be moved forward along the egress and access;

That was added to the plan.

- 29) That the truck turning radius shall show what size truck it was designed for;

They have provided truck turning plans to the Committee showing vehicles can get to the three loading areas.

- 30) That on Sheet C-4A, Note 3 shall include “and on City and State Maintained roadways”;

They revised that note.

- 31) That on Sheet C-4A, Note 4 shall include where the stabilized construction entrances will be;

They have shown that.

- 32) That a copy of the SWIFF shall be provided to DPW;

They agreed to that and will do that as part of the CMMP plan.

- 33) That on Sheet C-10 a note shall be added that there shall be a 6' minimum from ground to canopy for trees that are to be planted;
- Added note to Sheet C-10.
- 34) That the Site Plans shall address how the land for the outbuilding will be stabilized pending construction;
- Added note #16 on Sheet 4-A and 4-B.
- 35) That a heavy duty cross section on the pavement details shall be added for the entry drive, the stamped asphalt and the loops (and a 3' cross section is not sufficient for the loops);
- They have pavement delineation plan, Sheet C-15, showing the heavy duty pavement.
- 36) That the Site Plans shall show the adjacent intersections and driveway locations in case off site work is required;
- Everyone wanted a bigger view and that is what they have shown.
- 37) That the applicant shall contact Coast and Jon Fredericks to consider transit service at the site;
- There is currently a bus stop and they are making is am ore formal stop. They removed some parking spaces and are providing some sitting areas and a bike rack.
- 38) That should any trees on site die, they shall be replaced in kind by the applicant;
- Note 19 on the Landscape Plan.
- 39) That a fence, or other alternative, shall be proposed by the applicant to prohibit access from Water Country by the grass strip;
- That was regarding the back access the fence that was in disrepair. They said the existing chain link fence would be repaired and replaced as necessary and privacy slats can be provided.
- 40) That open space calculations, with percentages, shall be added to the site plans;
- Open space calculations are added to Sheet 3-C.
- 41) That the Site Plans shall show dumpster location(s);
- Shown on Sheet 3-A and 3-B.

Mr. Mikolaities felt they have made good progress. They went to the BOA and are trying to get this back on track. The time constraints are to beat the Water Country opening to take care of the knob. If they are not moving over 100 cubic yards of earth products they can get a blasting permit and start working on the site. He hoped to talk about getting that done. Mr. Holden asked if he was proposing to split the application? Mr. Mikolaities indicated he wanted to pull a blasting permit to take down the hump without removing 100 cubic yards on site. They would fence it off and submit plans to DPW. Mr. Holden felt it sounded like they would be splitting their application then. Mr. Mikolaities wasn't sure and he was asking for some guidance. Mr. Holden stated that if their products removal is part of this application then it is a part of the whole process and they would have to complete the same review. Mr. Mikolaities asked if they won't move the material off site, can they get a blasting permit? Mr.

Holden thought there may be a way to propose this and he suggested that he make a proposal to the City and ask what the process would be.

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 for purposes of this meeting.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses stated that he was very pleased with their work regarding drainage on site. He read the Terracota Study and the applicant is doing a great service with this plan. They are on the right track.

Mr. Cravens indicated that he needs to meet with the engineer so they can iron out water issues.

Mr. Allen agreed with Mr. Cravens. There are just a couple of details that need to be worked out.

Mr. Britz was pleased with the infiltration and tree box fixtures and looked forward to seeing the drainage study.

Mr. Allen confirmed they would have to meet before the Planning Board meeting.

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

Mr. Cravens stipulated that a meeting be held between DPW and the applicant regarding water issues.

Mr. Desfosses stipulated that he review the final drainage study with the engineer and he will submit a Memo back to the Planning Department.

Mr. Holden was looking for more discussion on the driveway at Constitution. A lot more traffic will be going through it. There will be more and more diversions through Constitution. How are they handling that increasead traffic flow as most traffic will not choose to go out Constitution and go north on Islington. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that Mr. Pernaw said 59 cars came through the site to go left on peak hours. Mr. Holden asked what have they done to the driveway? Mr. Mikolaities explained they removed the parking backed up to the building and it is now a Coast bus stop and they added a double yellow line and stop line. Travel width is over 30' and the whole section is heavy duty pavement. Mr. Holden asked if it is safe for someone to cross from The 99 to the other site? Mr. Parkinson indicated that there is currently traffic that cuts through that area and he doesn't see anything they can do to preclude that from happening and they have sufficiently addressed this concern. Mr. Pernaw points out that they are not going to take time away from the Route One By-Pass. The same condition is going to exist after this development is done but it will be a little safer.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there are sufficient right of ways for City sidewalk in the future? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that there are and they moved the oriental retaining wall back also.

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

Stipulations from the December 30, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1) That easements shall be required for all gate valves and service shut offs to the individual units, for review and approval as to content and form by the City Legal Department;
- 2) That a copy of the as-builts in electronic format, compatible with the City's GIS format, shall be provided to DPW;
- 3) That the water meter shall be relocated to where it is tapped off the fire service;
- 4) That any domestic service that is tapped off of fire service should be brought in from the main in front of the building to a separate domestic service and it should then have a meter;

- 5) That a Traffic Memorandum shall be prepared to show the traffic impacts with the additions, for review and approval by Deborah Finnigan;
- 6) That the applicant shall be required to appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee for review and approval;
- 7) That the applicant shall meet with Deborah Finnigan and Lucy Tillman to review and approval of the Landscaping Plan;
- 8) That a copy of the SWIFF shall be provided to DPW;

Stipulations from the May 5, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 9) That the applicant shall meet with representatives of DPW to resolve the water issues;
- 10) That the applicant shall review their final drainage report with representatives of DPW and a Memo shall be submitted to the Planning Board at their May 21st meeting;

II. NEW BUSINESS

C. The application of **The Hill Unit Owners Association, Owner**, for property located **off Deer Street and High Street, commonly known as "The Hill"**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct eleven new parking spaces with brick pavers, reconstruct the service road entrance at High Street and construct a new loading area, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 26 and lies within the Historic District A and Central Business B Districts;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Corey Colwell, of MSC Engineers, appeared on behalf of The Hill Homeowners Association. He indicated that this application was presented in October 2007 and after several suggestions and revisions, it was approved on January 2, 2008 by TAC and on January 17, 2008 by the Planning Board. As part of this project is being constructed by Parade Office LLC as part of the Portwalk project, they never went forward. They are now prepared to proceed with the project. The project consists of 11 new parking spaces with brick pavers. He referred to a colored drawing that he provided the Committee and indicated the spaces were shown in Blue. Dark blue spaces represent existing private deeded spaces and light blue spaces represent new association non-deeded spaces. Once constructed, 6 spaces will be removed. There will be a net loss of 6 spaces on the site. The second component is to construct new curbed service entrance from High Street. This makes it more difficult for traffic from High Street to enter into the service road. High Street is currently one way moving northbound. They propose curving the entrance to prohibit the traffic from entering in the wrong direction and they propose to make the service road a one way traffic flow towards the Hilton Garden Inn. There will be new tipdown sidewalk ramps with flush curbing at the intersection to facilitate handicapped access. The third component is to construct a new loading area to benefit The Hill Homeowners Association and the Hilton Garden Inn. In their packets there was a three-sheet of drawings showing these proposals. This is identical to what was approved in January 2008.

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 all prior stipulations. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden referred to Lot 27 which The Hill surrounds on three sides. It is owned by LBJ Properties. He wanted to confirm that they are not proposing any egress access from this property and no allowances to place a future driveway on the site? Mr. Colwell confirmed that was correct and that would require an easement from The Hill Homeowners Association and they have not been asked to provide any such easement.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the 11 parking spaces shown on the Site Plan shall be the only legally recognized parking spaces;
- 2) That the text "One Way" shall be removed from the service road, leaving only the arrows on the Site Plans;
- 3) That the handicapped tip down in front of the Fitch House shall be verified with David Desfosses, of DPW;
- 4) That the Site Plans shall indicate that the brick sidewalk and granite curb will be replaced with paving where the service road enters High Street;
- 5) That the parking easement shall be approved for content and form by the City's Legal Department.

.....

D. The application of **Dilorenzo Real Estate, LLC, Owner**, and **Poco's Bow Street Cantina, Applicant**, for property located at **33 and 37 Bow Street**, and the **City of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located **off Ceres Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested for the construction of a new 1,050 ± s.f. deck, after the demolition of an existing deck and patio, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lots 46, 48 and 49 and lies within the Historic District A and Central Business A Districts;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Appledore Engineering, represented the owner and applicant. He handed out colored plans to the Committee. John Golumb, the owner of Poco's, Bob Harborson, from DeStefano Architects and Gregg Mikolaties, of Appledore Engineering.

This project entails the demolition of the existing patio and deck located on the City's property. The project will entail the construction of new deck 1,050 s.f. deck on Map 106, Lots 48 and 49. The deck is 150 s.f. with associated utility improvements. It meets all setback and dimensional requirements. They anticipated to begin in the fall of 2009 and completed in the spring of 2010.

He went through the packet which was provided to the Committee. The blue dashed lines are the existing deck and patio that are being removed. Yellow represents the new 150 s.f. deck and the red cross hatch (300_ s.f.) is the proposed second story deck to be built on Lot 149 and the blue hatch on Lot 48 is a 205 s.f. flat roof. This project is the result of a land swap and this was approved through a subdivision in August 2007 and as per Stipulation number 1, the transfer will be complete when the existing deck on Lot 46 is demolished. Also shown on the plan is a 9' dimension. The next sheet is a truck turning exhibit, demonstrating that a standard pick up truck can make it down the alley. There is a note that a 9' right-of-way shall be maintained per the settlement agreement recorded in the RCRD in Book 3192, Page 701. The next sheet is a revised Site Plan, also showing the 9' dimension and he added Note 9 regarding the truck turning exhibit. They also clarified the proposed flat roof vs. the second story deck. The last plan is a revised utility plan. They have been closely coordinating with David Desfosses to show the utility locations on Lot 46. The project will require a minimum impact

expedited wetland permit which has already been submitted which has been signed off by the Conservation Commission Chairman and submitted to the State. That concluded his presentation.

Mr. Holden comments that it was helpful to have the template showing truck turning. On Exhibit 1, is it the intent that the truck would be orientated in that direction and will the truck be able to make that movement? Mr. Crimmins confirmed that is what the exhibit is showing. Mr. Holden asked if there was anything in the easement that indicates whether or now HVAC equipment can extend into it or is it just that it has to clear the height of a standard sized pick up? Ms. Mikolaities read the language of the agreement and it does not mention height. Mr. Harborson of Destefano Architects indicated that he represents the tenant in this property and he confirmed that they are considering relocating two condensing units but they would be well above any pick up height. Mr. Holden felt there was the representation that it will be over the height of the truck and they are maintaining that the way the easement is written, it doesn't preclude that? Mr. Harborson confirmed that was correct. Mr. Holden asked if, upon Planning Board approval, the deeds will be transferred? Mr. Crimmins stated they have final subdivision approval from 2007 and when the building is demolished the plan can be recorded.

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. Mr. Parkinson seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden stipulated that the form and language of the easement be approved as to content and form by the Planning and Legal Department.

Mr. Mikolaities pointed out that the legal document does not state 9'. Mr. Holden wants to make sure everyone agrees with the agreement. Mr. Mikolaities pointed out that the document is signed and recorded. For the record, he was concerned the Mr. Holden kept saying 9' when the agreement does not say 9'. He wants to make sure this record does not say 9'. Mr. Holden did not feel it was open to interpretation so before the final agreement is signed to let this project go forward, everyone needs to see that agreement to make sure everyone is comfortable with the agreement and how it is represented on the Site Plan. Mr. Mikolaities agreed but reiterated that the agreement say "sufficient width for a pick up truck" and what they are showing and conveying is that a pick up truck can do it but he doesn't want the record doesn't say 9'. Mr. Holden agreed that the Agreement does not say 9' but the Site Plan says 9' which is why everyone should review it.

Mr. Allen felt, rather than putting 9' on the Site Plan, they should reference the easement deed on Note 9. Mr. Mikolaities agreed. The document is called "Settlement Agreement between Hodgden, Ricci, Labrie, McDonald, Fleet Bank", 95-E-233, recorded at Book3192, Page 0701.

As the Chair had not yet called for public speakers, 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.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the applicant shall prepare an easement for a right-of-way as referenced in Agreement recorded in the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds at Book 3192, Page 0701, for review and approval as to content and form by the City Legal Department;

.....

E. The application of **The Edgewood Centre, Owner**, for property located at **928 South Street**, wherein Amended Site Review approval is requested to construct a new 10' x 24' vestibule with airlock entrance and concrete slabs with roof overhang on either side of the entrance, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 221 Lot 87 and lies within the Single Residence B District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Daryl Kent, was present with Pat Ramsey, owner. They did not have a visual display but their packets included a site plan with the addition of the vestibule and entrance canopy. They also have a floor plan with an elevation on it. They are adding on to a commercial building and he wanted them to know they are not influencing any traffic patterns on South Street. It is an improvement to the building and makes access cleaner and more presentable. Currently the access to the building is under a canvas awning with clear plastic on the sides. Their proposal is 8' wide. It is less of an obstacle and they are adding accessible railings. This will be much easier for people with a disability. Lighting will be better as there is only one exterior light now. It will also provide more maneuverability and better protection from the weather for an ambulance or people coming in and out of the building.

Mr. Holden asked if this is before TAC because of the use of ambulatory patients and that there are no changes in traffic pattern?

Pat Ramsey, Owner, indicated that the proposed improvements would provide automatic doors and the height of the canopy would be higher so the ambulance can back in and patients can be brought in under the canopy. It will also be more efficient for heating with the airlock.

Mr. Britz asked if the locus plant shown near the new ramp is new and if the dormer is new? Mr. Kent confirmed they are both currently there.

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.

Mr. Parkinson made a motion to approve. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Cravens noted that the plan doesn't show any underground utilities and he would like to have them shown before they start work.

Mr. Allen asked that they "X" out on the plans what is not going to be done as part of this application on the plans submitted to the Planning Board meeting.

They will also need a Waiver of Site Review regulations to allow this to go forward.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That underground utilities shall be shown on the Site Plan;
- 2) That the applicant shall X out on the Site Plan the areas that are not part of this approval;
- 3) That a waiver of Site Review Regulations shall be required at the Planning Board Meeting;

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:55 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant