

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

2:00 PM

JULY 3, 2012

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Director, Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Carl Roediger, Deputy Fire Chief; Steve Dubois, Deputy Police Chief;

.....
I. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Richard P. Fecteau, Owner**, for property located at **120 Spaulding Turnpike, Two Way Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **100 Spaulding Turnpike**, and **Five Way Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **80 Spaulding Turnpike**, (to be consolidated into one lot), requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an existing building, retrofitting of an existing building for auto reconditioning, expanding the dealership parking and display area, and reconstructing the right-in/right-out access from the turnpike, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 236 as Lots 33, 37 and 38 and lie within the General Business (GB) District and Single Residence B (SRB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Erik Saari, of Altus Engineering, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Saari pointed out that the three lots have just recently been consolidated into one lot. One lot is where the Old Madeline's dress shop was located and the other is the former book store. He also pointed out the 300' wide PSNH easement which crosses and encumbers the majority of the property. The front 150' is the General Business District and the remainder is Single Residence A. They are looking to expand the dealership, knock down the old dress shop building and retrofitting the old bookstore building for auto reconditioning and detailing. The majority of the lots are paved. They are also reconstructing the access off of the Spaulding with a new right-in/right-out access which essentially is the same location as it is now. Mr. Saari reached out to the NHDOT Bureau of Turnpikes who informed him that the access cannot be move without "an act of Congress" so for the foreseeable future they will leave the entrance where it is.

Mr. Saari stated that drainage is the primary feature of the project. The site currently has no stormwater treatment or detention except grass. Everything drains to a large wetland area in the rear which crosses via culvert to a detention facility along the highway and over into Hodgson Brook by a large pipe under the turnpike. To retrofit the existing dealership, they would like to install a rain garden which would be a treatment and detention facility with a sediment forebay which would

overflow into the existing treatment system. Upstream they have a rain garden that collects the majority of the new parking lot, including two depressed landscaped islands. That will overflow into the next downstream rain garden which also goes into the existing structure and across the Spaulding to the Hodgson Brook. There is another smaller rain garden to the right of the bookstore building which will collect a small amount of area along the side of the property. Essentially, they are treating the new pavement and trying to treat as much of the existing site as possible. This complies with a lot of the Hodgson Brook management plan which is looking to retrofit the older sites that have no infrastructure.

Mr. Saari moved on to discuss utilities. They believe the bookstore and the dress shop are on individual septic systems and the removal of those systems is part of the Hodgson plan. They will remove those two fields and the tanks. They will be relocating one existing utility pole, keeping the existing water service and capping the water service to the dress shop building that is to be razed.

Regarding the Conditional Use Permit, in response to Peter Britz's request for more clarity, he explained that he had four different colors on his plans. The greens are what will be green at the conclusion of the project. The darker green is current impervious which will become green. The two oranges are pavement after completion. Within the 100' wetland buffer they add 5,500 s.f. of pavement for over an acre of overall disturbance.

Mr. Saari stated they are waiting for their revised lighting design. The first design came in really hot with very high levels of illumination throughout the proposed parking field. They sent it back and they are still working on it. They are looking to cut the light levels in half from the original proposal. Most light will be along the Spaulding. The idea is to illuminate what people can see in the front and the back is not as critical. There will also be some wall packs on the existing bookstore building. That building will be completely refitted, inside and out.

Mr. Taintor asked Mr. Saari to review the green in front of the existing buildings. Mr. Saari explained that was existing gravel to allow them to park cars for display. It is 2-3 cars deep and it will be pulled out and will either become rain garden with side slopes or they will remove the gravel and replace it with loam and seed.

Mr. Allen mentioned that in the TAC Work Session they talked about the issue relating to the TMDL for Hodgson Brook and he wondered if they had had a chance to look into that and if there was anything they could do to move towards what they are looking for. Mr. Saari stated that they contacted Mr. Fecteau and asked him about his snow and ice management practice. He says they do their own snow plowing and do their own salting in a very limited area by the front door of the existing building. He expects to continue that practice on the expansion so they will have a very low salt load.

Mr. Allen assumed that when they would be capping the water line that would be in accordance with City standards and it is not just a cut and cap. Mr. Saari confirmed that the line that serves the dress shop as well as the bookstore come from Rockingham Avenue so they would find the valves and cut them 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 for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen noted that Peter Britz has expressed a lot of concerns about the Conditional Use Permit application getting through the Conservation Commission this month and he asked when that was scheduled. Mr. Taintor stated the Conservation Commission would review their application on July 11th. Mr. Taintor added that the lighting plan is still outstanding and he was unsure what they wanted to do about the driveway question.

Mr. Allen felt there was also the issue of the whether an area is going to be grass or a rain garden and he would want to have that answered. Mr. Desfosses agreed.

Mr. Saari asked for clarification on that issue. Mr. Allen indicated that it sounded like he said it was either going to be grass or a rain garden. Mr. Saari confirmed that the area includes the ends of both rain gardens and the middle will be a large grassy portion.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone to the next TAC meeting. He felt that lighting is a huge issue. He also had concerns about access. They are creating another entrance which didn't exist before. This entrance has been under-utilized for sometime. He does not have a big issue with the new driveway going in however his particular concern is the existing "in" from the Turnpike from the Peter Brown Living Trust site which is basically a U turn coming in off the Spaulding. They just shot down a fairly substantial site plan which was doing huge benefits because they had multiple driveways and this site will now have three driveways under this plan. He is concerned that Farm Lane is a residential area and he is not sure it is even appropriate to have this amount of traffic on it. He felt they will need to look at access and egress. He also felt there should be some attempt to determine where the snow storage will be on this site and it should not be near to the wetland areas that basically surround the site. He would like to see a snow storage plan or some thought about where the snow storage will be going for this large area.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion.

Mr. Taintor made an observation that they would need a waiver for the driveway. He asked if there are easements for the driveway on the Peter Brown site. Mr. Saari confirmed the main parcel has an easement across two parcels. Mr. Taintor asked if they have easement plans. Mr. Saari was not sure but he will research that. Mr. Taintor asked if all three parcels are the same ownership at the corner of Farm Lane and the Spaulding Turnpike. Mr. Saari stated that the strip and the piece along the back with the two houses are the same but he is not sure about the front one. Mr. Taintor confirmed they are using the property for egress so it needs to be researched. Mr. Saari felt that this layout would help to alleviate problems because it gives them a new way in and out, especially trucks because it gets them off Farm Lane where they are currently off loading. Mr. Taintor confirmed that the existing dealership parcel has two access points and they are adding a third by merging the lots together.

Mr. Allen asked if they have the size of the oil/water separator and a detail for that. Mr. Saari pointed it out on Sheet C-14.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they had looked to see if there was any record of US Deeds on either site. Mr. Saari stated that was a good question because it was formally a gas station. He understands the site is clean but he will look into that.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger stated he has had a problem with the way trucks are proposed to exit the site. He felt it would be in their interest to have another plan in mind of how a delivery truck would leave the site without jumping in front of the ticket store and cutting across Farm Lane. Mr. Saari explained they set the site up so that you could go in circles around the site both ways. He believes it will be self-restricting as they will get stuck at the queue at the stop sign on Farm Lane. He will add an auto turn plan showing the actual motions to show how it functions. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger felt there were better ways to leave the site and they will need to show that.

The motion to postpone to the next TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Parade Office, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street** (Portwalk, Phase III), requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to revise the hotel from 124 rooms to 120 rooms, first floor from 12,030 s.f. to 12,050 s.f. and upper hotel floors from 76,000 s.f. to 59,040 s.f.; to revise the residential building from 92 dwelling units to 112 dwelling units, first floor lobby from 1,670 s.f. to 2,860 s.f. and upper floors from 102,500 s.f. to 128,080 s.f.; to revise retail from 12,030 s.f. to 16,260 s.f.; to revise restaurants from 8,375 s.f. to 3,070 s.f.; and to revise total parking spaces from 268 to 240, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD), and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe & Bond, was present with Jeff Johnston and Tim Levine. Mr. Crimmins indicated that they are before the Committee for amended Site Plan review. This site is the temporary City parking lot. They received Site Plan approval in January of 2012. They are back for amended review. The building program has changed a little bit, resulting in site amendments. Many square footages and the layout have changed. He walked through the amendments.

- On June 18th they submitted a letter from Waste Management which summarized the trash management inside the building and that trash would be loaded and unloaded at the three loading spaces along Hanover Street at the roll up door at the garage entrance.
- They included a Memorandum from VHB of an updated traffic analysis based on the amendments.
- They provided a status report of the Planning Board stipulations from their prior approval.

On July 3rd they provided revised plans based on comments received at the TAC Work Session last week. Also included were the exhibit and an amended VHB Memo which corrected a misspelling.

Mr. Crimmins read the conclusion of the Traffic Memorandum into the record which indicated that little or no change in site generated traffic is expected as a result of the proposed. It was concluded that the findings from the October 2011 Traffic Impact Study remain valid with negligible change in the overall site generated traffic.

Mr. Crimmins reviewed the status of the stipulations from their prior approval which have all either been completed or are agreed to.

Mr. Crimmins next reviewed the proposed amendments to the site plan.

The hotel building:

- The hotel rooms were revised from 124 to 120 rooms;
- The first floor was revised from 12,030 s.f. to 12,050 s.f.
- The upper floors were revised from 76,000 s.f. to 59,040 s.f.

The residential building:

- The dwelling units were revised from 92 to 112 dwelling units;
- The first floor lobby was revised from 1,670 s.f. to 2,860 s.f.; t
- There was a question raised about the percentage of floor area for the residential lobby. They have always viewed this building as one principal building and have calculated based on that assumption and the total floor area for the lobby and stairwell is 9.8%. Mr. Crimmins pointed out that even if the building was considered two they would still comply as it would only be 16.8%.
- The previously approved retail space was increased from 9,860 s.f. to 16,260 s.f.
- The previously approved restaurant space was reduced from 8,375 s.f. to 3,070 s.f.
- The previously approved retail at the corner of Maplewood Avenue was increased from 5,350 s.f. to 10,050 s.f.
- The previously approved retail at the corner of Portwalk Place and Deer Street was increased to 2,060 s.f. to 2,150 s.f.
- The previously approved restaurant on Portwalk Place was reduced from 4,300 s.f. to 4,060 s.f.
- The previously approved restaurant at the corner of Portwalk Place and Hanover street was reduced to 4,075 s.f. to 3,070 s.f.
- They removed the previously approved 1,860 s.f. of retail adjacent to the hotel along Maplewood Avenue.

Parking:

- Total parking spaces have been reduced from 268 parking spaces to 240 spaces.
- The ground level parking deck was reduced from 80 parking spaces to 69 spaces, due to the first floor building modifications.
- The six parking spaces on Portwalk Place will remain.
- That brings the ground level parking from 86 spaces to 75 spaces and is noted on the parking calculation table.
- The basement parking was reduced from 182 spaces to 165 spaces to account for columns for the structural design of the building.

Minor Site amendments:

- They added a second story roof deck above the ground level parking deck as an amenity for the residential building.
- They revised the previously approved landscape bed along Maplewood Avenue by shifting it 54' to the north. The overall length of the bed was reduced by 8'. That change resulted in the removal of two hydrangeas.

- The screen wall material has been changed to brick to a metal panel in-fill, which will require HDC approval.
- They revised the previously approved crosswalk configuration at Hanover Street and are now showing the standard 8' wide thermo plastic City crosswalks
- They added a 3rd grease trap. Mr. Crimmins pointed out that two grease traps are being provided for a potential future connection should there ever be a change of use. They will be capped at the present time.
- They revised the previously approved gas line connection from Hanover Street to come off Deer Street as a result of their coordination with Unitel.
- They added 2 "Valet Only, No Parking Here to Hanover Street" signs to Portwalk Place. The intent is to have those reserved for Valet when the meters aren't running.
- They revised the previously approved generator and transformer locations due to the building modifications. They shifted into a different painted island.
- They added seven valet parking spaces to the ground level deck which are not included in the parking calculation as they are not conforming spaces.
- They revised the previously approved bike rack locations. They now include 2 bikes along Hanover Street, 2 along Deer Street, 3 near the hotel entrance and 3 near the residential entrance. They will also provide additional bike storage in the room label "Maintenance".
- They revised the previously approved primary electric service to include a loop to the existing vault on Maplewood Avenue, per coordination efforts with PSNH.
- They added another easement for the earth retention tie backs for the sheeting. The sheeting will need tiebacks that will extend into the right of way for when they dig down for the garage. They have shown that designated with a line although that is not the exact location because the sheeting design is still in the works. The final location needs to be approved by the City Council.
- They revised the previously approved loading zone sign to read "No Parking 6:00 a.m ... between signs" rather than "from here to corner"
- They did do some clean up of the easement plans a little bit. All easements have been recorded so they changed from proposed to existing.

Mr. Allen asked which drain the basement sump will be pumping into. Mr. Crimmins indicated it would drain into the sanitary. Mr. Allen asked if they are they pumping ground water on a routine basis or is it intended to take run-off from the garage. Mr. Crimmins stated the sump would be for the garage groundwater and it will have a solid bottom to it so that it will not infiltrate. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they will have groundwater pumping but would not be that sump. The groundwater would have to go into the stormwater. This sump will not be open to external ground water. Mr. Desfosses asked how much ground water they were talking about. Mr. Crimmins felt it was an estimate of 200 gallons per minute which is consistent with what was previously approved.

Mr. Allen felt they did a good job adding the bike racks. He asked about the bicycle storage in the maintenance room because he assumed that room would be controlled by the maintenance people. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that the storage would be located on the first floor deck. Tim Levine added that the property manager will be controlling that space and the thought is that off season they can store their bikes. It is a controlled space and not publically accessible. It is not a parking space.

Mr. Taintor asked about the bicycle parking and the striped area near the hotel entrance. He felt the striped area was about 7' wide and if a car parks there they will not be able to reach the third space. Mr. Crimmins stated he will look at it. Mr. Taintor asked them to look at some other locations also.

The sidewalk locations were supposed to be parallel to the street and he felt they will have bicycle wheels sticking out into the parking lot with this design. They don't really care about the bicycle storage and they can take that off the plan.

Mr. Taintor felt that it appeared that the biggest issue is the tie backs. The City of Portsmouth has not done this before and there is some concern about having these going in the street. Mr. Allen spoke to the Public Works Director and they both have concerns. At this point, based on somebody saying they are going to put these into the street, without further detail and a better understanding, they would not go forward with it. Understanding there is an installation issue of going into an existing utility and he understands the intent is to hold the piling in place during construction. He is concerned about them pulling things up that go to other utilities and about other long term impacts. He felt there were other means or methods they could use and they need to work this out between now and when the construction takes place. Mr. Crimmins indicated they would be open to a stipulation that they meet with DPW and come up with a plan that they can approve prior to the applicant going to the City Council to request those easements. Mr. Allen felt they need to be prepared that the answer might be NO and they would have to be prepared to build things differently.

Tim Levine assured them there will be a very detailed plan which will be reviewed and approved by DPW before going to the City Council. This is something that he is familiar with from working in the City of Boston as it is commonly done there. It may be new to Portsmouth but it is not an experimental concept. It is a well established practice and he is confident they be able to satisfy the City's concerns.

Mr. Taintor felt that the process of reviewing and approving that might be more extensive than they want. If they had an alternative that the City might be more comfortable with, they might be under construction much sooner. Mr. Levine stated there are always other ways to do everything but there are significant cost issues associated with other approaches. Mr. Taintor agreed that cost issues are important for them but the City has different issues.

Mr. Taintor asked about the valet spaces that they are not counting as parking spaces. Mr. Crimmins stated they are the spaces behind. The spaces behind are valet spaces also but they would count because they have access to the aisle and conform in size.

Mr. Taintor brought up the crosswalk and understood that there were differing opinions. It appears they revised the plan in accordance with what they heard from the City but would be happy in going back to the original design. Mr. Crimmins responded that the crosswalks that are noted on the plans are to City standard but were to address their concern about traffic turning in and out of the Portwalk.

Mr. Taintor summarized that the tie backs need to be addressed, they need to look again at the bike rack situation. Mr. Allen agreed that if they turn them 90 degrees they would be fine but they still want them in the City street.

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 this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

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

Mr. Allen stated he would prefer that the crosswalk remain as originally designed and approved on the previous plan on Hanover Street. Also, that the applicant prepare a report regarding the geo tie backs prior to the Planning Board meeting so that DPW can prepare a recommendation.

Jeff Johnston felt that would be tough for them. He suggested that their team could come in and educate them but they won't have their tie back plan yet because they are still doing the foundation plan. Mr. Allen would at least like an informational meeting with Public Works and their team and he understands that they won't have a full design.

Mr. Taintor understood that the meeting would be to describe the general methodology. Mr. Allen stated they would also want some references.

Tim Levine stated they can bring in the designer and the geo technical team that have done a lot of these to show them how it works. Mr. Taintor asked that they give them the approximate depth and length so they know what they are talking about.

Mr. Taintor asked that they revise the bike rack design and look at passing space and sidewalks to make sure they work.

Mr. Allen mentioned Deputy Fire Chief Roedigers comment about using the deck area for residential use and restrictions and he wondered if there should be something warning potential buyers about the possible restrictions. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger was not quite sure how to put that in place. There are standards and the National Fire Code would address a lot of that. They can't have a grill above ground level in a multi family multi use building. As long as the developer has a clear understanding, they could simply say no gas piping to the exterior deck. However, he was comfortable addressing that later.

The motion to recommend Amended Site Plan Approval with the following stipulations passed unanimously:

- 1) The crosswalk shall remain as originally designed and approved by the Planning Board.
- 2) The applicant shall schedule a meeting with their geotechnical consultants and the Department of Public Works so that a recommendation can be prepared for the Planning Board prior to the July 19th meeting.
- 3) The bike racks shall be redesigned to allow better pedestrian access along the sidewalk.

.....

C. The application of **Service Credit Union, Owner**, for property located at **2295 Lafayette Road**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to extend the proposed sidewalk, relocate the project sign and provide additional landscaping as a result of the merger of the corner parcel at the intersection of Lafayette Road and Longmeadow Road, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 291 as Lot 1 and lies within the Gateway District,

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe and Bond, addressed the Committee. He confirmed that the new address for the entire lot will now be 3003 Lafayette Road.

Mr. Crimmins stated they were asking for Amended Site Plan approval. Since their original approval, Service Credit Union has purchased the small corner parcel at Lafayette Road and Longmeadow Road and those two lots have now been merged into one lot. As a result, the amendments they are requesting deal with site improvements to the corner lot. He provided three handouts to the Committee members.

Mr. Crimmins stated that the previously approved sign has now been shifted down to the recently merged corner lot.

Their original amendment plan had noted three existing trees to remain however after recent discussions the landscape architect and the owner would like to remove two of those existing trees and leave one. They are adding two additional trees to the corner parcel so they are not actually losing any trees on the site.

Also shown on the plan was the closure of the existing curb cuts and the extension of the sidewalk which is along Route 1 and tying it back in with the previously approved sidewalk on the lot.

The second sheet shows how the site will be graded. They will have the sign bermed up about 2'.

Lastly they provided a landscaping plan for the corner lot. They received comments last week that it needs to match what was shown on the Site Plan so they revised it to include the sidewalk, the signal, the controller box and the proposed landscaping.

Mr. Taintor asked if the new sidewalk on the corner lot is just proposed and has not been constructed. Mr. Crimmins stated that it was proposed. Mr. Desfosses stated that it had all been constructed. Mr. Crimmins indicated he was not aware of that.

Eric Svahn, of Gund Partnership, stated that the sidewalk was poured about 1-2 weeks ago. There was some confusion and discussion with DOT in getting their driveway permit and extending the sidewalk. Mr. Desfosses stated that the only thing that was not constructed was the little connection at the corner of Route 1. Mr. Desfosses was concerned as they rushed ahead with approving this project but they haven't even looked at the intersection geometry of Longmeadow Road. They went ahead and put in all of the curb on Longmeadow yet no one really looked at the road width, and the other side of Longmeadow Road doesn't even show up on the plan so he doesn't even know how wide it is now. He has concerns as they may be directing a lot of the Lang Road traffic in this direction at some point. Mr. Svahn stated the curb was existing. Mr. Desfosses understands that they put it back where it was but Longmeadow Road was a dead-end with one little business on it and now they are potentially looking to put thousands of cars a day on it. The small corner parcel was not originally part of the original plan and things have changed. Mr. Desfosses felt, at the very least, they need to plan for future road widening in case that happens and he felt today is the day to do that.

Mr. Taintor asked if they have designed the sign yet. Mr. Svahn confirmed it is in progress and should be done soon. Mr. Taintor explained that they have not applied for a sign permit yet so there is no

approval at this point and he wants to make sure they are berming up the base of sign and not increasing the height of the sign above the pre-existing grade.

Mr. Allen asked about the “tadpoles” shown on the plan. Mr. Crimmins explained those are flags.

Mr. Taintor asked why there was a 7’ dimension shown. Mr. Crimmins explained that is a DOT standard and they wanted him to confirm the central signal pole was 7’ from the curb. Mr. Taintor asked if the standard sidewalk in the public right of way is 4’. Mr. Crimmins did not know if they have a standard but that is the width that they were previously approved to construct so they are just extending it. Mr. Allen stated the City would have done a 5’ sidewalk.

Mr. Desfosses was confused about the sidewalk and thought it was originally approved on Service Credit Union property. Mr. Taintor responded that it moved back and forth. It started in the public right-of-way, moved to their property, and then back to the public right-of-way. Mr. Crimmins believed there is a sidewalk agreement in place between the City and the State to maintain it. Mr. Desfosses asked how the City would maintain the sidewalk when they have a 5’ plow and a 4’ sidewalk. Mr. Crimmins stated it has been 4’ since the previous approval and they haven’t changed 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 for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen felt that what seemed like a minor approval appears to have some significant issues. Mr. Desfosses brought up a good point that they have the likelihood of potential roadway changes that are completely unaccounted for and he could not believe they have a 4’ sidewalk. He is at a quandary on how to proceed with this. Normally they would reserve a strip for a future right of way in the event that road gets modified but they don’t even have the full lane width. Maybe there is enough room but there isn’t enough information to make that decision. From that perspective, he would move to postpone. They have right of way issues, they have a sidewalk built prior to being approved and he would like to see the existing plan to review the 4’ sidewalk. He is surprised a 4’ sidewalk got through this entire process. He saw a note where it talks about the sidewalk but he doesn’t see anything that mentions the width. The City standard is 5’ sidewalks. Mr. Crimmins provided a copy of the original plan to Mr. Allen for review and it appeared that it was a 4’ sidewalk. Mr. Desfosses stated that the last time he saw this plan the sidewalk wasn’t even in the right-of-way and he doesn’t know how it ended up there.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone to July 31st for review of the road geometry and sidewalk issues. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the July 31, 2012 TAC meeting to allow the parties to review the road geometry and sidewalk issues passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **30 Maplewood Avenue, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to add a full basement to the building, add a patio on the Bridge Street side, relocate entrances and add an additional grease trap, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD), and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, appeared before the Committee and indicated that they were seeking amendments to the Site Plan approval which they received last August. Originally the project was to remodel the existing building. In August they came and received approval to add an addition to the structure and they now wish to make amendments to that approval as they are getting closer to finalizing the interior space leases.

- They added an additional grease trap on the Bridge Street side.
- They did some minor realignment of doors and entry points.
- A door connection on the back side of the parking lot was moved over with the associated sidewalk.
- There was a slight change to make the patio larger on the Maplewood side.
- An entrance on the southeast side of the building was eliminated and moved to an entrance to the patio.
- An exit to the patio will be closed off.
- In the southwest corner of the building they have added a patio;
- They reconfigured some air conditioning space.
- At the southwest corner of the addition they eliminated a connection in favor of a doorway with a pad and steps on the south side of the addition.
- Further up Bridge Street they eliminated a connection to the building.
- The building previously had two floor elevations and it is now only has one floor elevation.
- On the Bridge Street side they had an electric service manhole and at the last approval they talked about whether it made sense to come down Bridge Street with that equipment and that is the design they are going forward with. They moved the manhole to a position on the Bridge Street side, northwest of the building, between the building and the parking lot, feeding it from the existing manhole with a connection to an existing circuit to provide for a redundant circuit connection, putting in a manhole and running a line to a switching station, stubbing out future expansion and that will serve the transformers for the project.
- They have added some exterior air conditioning on this side of the building and plan to move it parallel with the north end of the addition.
- There are minor changes to parking notes and things of that nature.
- The lighting was revised to conform to the exit doors.

Mr. Allen could see where Mr. Chagnon prepared a plan that attempted to highlight the changes between the previous approval and this proposed plan but it was still not clear to him what is being requested for changes. In good conscious he cannot send this along to the Planning Board. There is a lot of confusion. Mr. Chagnon indicated that he would be happy to make a three-color exhibit for the

Planning Board. What happened with this plan is that the first approval wasn't acted on so when they came for the first amendment they were asked to create an existing conditions plan and call it C-1-A and then do a second approved site plan C-1-B which shows what was supposed to be there if the first approval had been constructed and then they went to the actual plan. Mr. Taintor agreed with Mr. Allen and understands his confusion because Mr. Chagnon was using an out-dated Site Plan and there was a more recent approved plan. He needs to use the second approved plan.

Mr. Taintor's interpretation was that anything in red are items that were on the old plan but weren't on the new plan, with the exception of two places where it says "no walk" and "wall". Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. Mr. Taintor felt it was confusing because you can't see what is underneath the shading. Mr. Chagnon pointed out they could see it on C-2. Mr. Chagnon agreed the exhibit could have more labels on it but the only thing that would change is it would say "proposed" in front of the new items. Mr. Taintor felt it would be easier if they were looking at the plan that this was compared to.

Mr. Desfosses referred to where it says "Fire Department Sprinkler connection to be abandoned." And felt it should say "to be removed" instead. Mr. Chagnon agreed and will revise it.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there were any bike racks at all on this site. Mr. Chagnon indicated that did not come up at all but they can add them.

Mr. Taintor noted where the handicapped spaces are located it leads into a wider entrance. He asked if that was the main entrance to the building. Mr. Chagnon stated that the interior of that space has not been designed yet but it will definitely be the main entrance to the second floor residential. The original design was based on a Faneille Hall type food court design but he is not sure that is still being considered. Mr. Taintor asked if that would change the floor area calculations. Mr. Chagnon explained that he based the floor area use numbers on what was proposed now. The bakery stayed the same, the retail will be the back end of the building but the restaurant space grew as it will be one bigger space. The individual units are not going to be there any longer. It will just be three major tenants. Mr. Taintor was trying to figure out if there was a major entrance to all ground floor uses. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that the front is the major entrance and the back is the major entrance for the second floor uses. Mr. Taintor was thinking about where the bike racks should be located and he felt there should be some on the street side of the building and some on the parking lot side of the building. He felt near the corner of Hanover and Maplewood by the entrance would be a good place.

Mr. Allen asked about the entrance off of the addition. Mr. Chagnon stated that was just a service entrance. Mr. Allen felt they could put a couple of bike racks along Hanover Street.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the entrances to the restaurants will be through their patios. Mr. Chagnon clarified they will be interior entrances. Mr. Desfosses noted that in the wintertime, if they were entrances, the patios would need to be maintained and they would have to shovel the snow, move the tables and do de-icing. Mr. Chagnon confirmed those will not be primary entrances and the entrances will be interior of the building. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger stated that the patios may be secondary emergency egress which would mean they would have to be maintained. Mr. Chagnon stated that the code review would determine that.

Mr. Taintor noted that the patio at the corner of Hanover and Bridge has two steps down and asked if that was of any concern. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger stated it was not. For ADA compliance there may have to be a ramp but he wasn't absolutely sure.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger had another concern regarding multiple assembly occupancies inside the building as there aren't a lot of other doors to get to the exterior and he foresees some questions. Mr. Chagnon stated there were three doors as there was a double door midway up the Maplewood side. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger stated they would have to show a sidewalk or pathway that leads them from the door to the public way. Mr. Chagnon responded that whole area is a sidewalk connection and patio. Sheet C-2 shows the patio connection to the sidewalk. They are not showing any fencing now and it is not their intention to serve alcohol. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger was concerned that more doors may be required in their final building code review.

Mr. Taintor referred to the utility area in the upper left part of plan with the transformer and the switch enclosure and he asked if they were on the sidewalk. Mr. Chagnon stated the switch enclosure is on private property and on the edge of the private sidewalk. What is shown are the actual pads and the switching area is a subsurface vault. Mr. Taintor was concerned about a tripping hazard and asked if it was either a flush pad or fenced in. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that the pad will be flush to the sidewalk.

Mr. Taintor asked for clarification on the air conditioner units where he thought Mr. Chagnon said "parallel to the north wall of the addition". Mr. Chagnon explained that they were trying to save a tree but he doesn't think they are going to be able to so he felt the units would be better if they were parallel to the north side. Therefore, that item may change on the plan

Mr. Allen asked if the air conditioning units were required to be screened. Mr. Taintor did not believe they were. Mr. Allen liked the idea of having them flipped 90 degrees to what they have. Mr. Chagnon stated they will show something on their HDC Application to screen it. They will probably screen the whole area.

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 this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve. Deputy Police Chief Dubois seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen requested a copy of their submittal with the requested changes highlighted in draft form and he further requested a meeting to review that document prior to the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Allen felt their exhibit was very confusing and it was difficult to see exactly what they are doing.

Mr. Allen requested that they add bike racks on both sides of the building, as close as possible to the main entrances. He would like one on Hanover Street and one on the parking lot side. That would be a standard U. Mr. Desfosses felt it would be nice if they match what is going in across the street at Porkwalk. Mr. Taintor will get the detail to them

Mr. Desfosses asked if the street lights were shown on the detail plan as he didn't see a detail plan. Mr. Chagnon stated that was not included. Mr. Desfosses made a stipulation that the street lights are a city standard street light and they are to be ductal iron and not cast iron as they changed the standard. They get a 25 year warranty and they are not that much more expensive.

Mr. Chagnon asked if he still wants the septic circuit board. Mr. Desfosses asked them to coordinate that with PSNH.

Mr. Taintor was comparing C-2 and C-3, and on C-3 they have the air conditioners by the parking lot and on C-2 they have an arrow pointing to the other side to a concrete pad. Mr. Chagnon responded that was an error of omission on C-2 as the air conditioner pads will show there as well. They should be consistent on the two plans.

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

- 1) The applicant shall prepare a revised Site Plan with proposed amendments highlighted, for review by Public Works prior to the Planning Board meeting on July 19, 2012.
- 2) That bike racks shall be added on the Hanover Street side and the parking lot side of the building, as close to the entries as possible. The racks shall be the same as those being used at 195 Hanover Street.
- 3) A note shall be added to the plan set that the street lights are a city standard street light and they are to be ductile iron and not cast iron.
- 4) The location of the air conditioners shall be consistent on Sheet C-2 and C-3.

.....
IV. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:50 pm.

.....
Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant