

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

2:00 PM

JULY 2, 2013

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner (Acting Chair); Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner; Peter Rice, Director, Public Works; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner (for Rick Taintor)

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Maplewood & Vaughan Holding Company, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 4-story 27,000 ± (footprint) mixed use building with commercial use on the 1st floor, 70 residential units on the 2nd – 4th floors and parking spaces on the ground floor level, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 124 as Lot 8 and lies within the Central Business A (CBA) District, the Historic District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). (This application was postponed at the June 4, 2013 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz stated the applicant requested a postponement to the July 30th TAC meeting.

Mr. Cracknell made a motion to postpone to July. Mr. Sheehan seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the July 30, 2013 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of **Eport Properties 1, LLC** and **The Aland Realty Group, Owners**, for property located at **173 & 175 Market Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 5-story 3,981 s.f. (footprint) addition to an existing building which will include three new dwelling units, office and commercial space and 10 parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 118 as Lots 3 & 4 and lies within the Central Business A (CBA) District, the Historic District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). (This application was postponed at the June 4, 2013 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Jeffrey Clifford, of Altus Engineering, appeared on behalf of the owner. Mr. Clifford stated they have had several TAC Work Sessions and have worked through some issues with the relocation of the utilities and access for fire apparatus. Much of today's discussion revolves around how utilities will get relocated at the site. There currently is a powerline that extends across the site. Their plan is slightly different than what they presented at the TAC Work Session because they have not been able to come to an agreement with the abutting property owner. The existing 3-phase Y-delta connection will go to a new pole underground to the "shark" building and that eliminates two overhead lines to the benefit of the abutter but the one overhead line will remain as they have not come to an agreement with them to bury it.

Since their last set of plans, they relocated a line underground so that it wasn't crossing the 14" forcemain. They are removing a wooden pole on Market Street. The steel pole cannot be moved per the utility company as it has the 3-phase special connection that goes to the "Shark Building". The reason that the pole with the Y-delta connection must stay is that when the ships come in from foreign countries they need the line to power their ships. The owner has signed an agreement with the Oar House to allow the line to go through that will go underground to their building. The sewer line currently goes underneath where the new building will go. They will put the clean out outside the building and sidewalk.

They made some changes on the Landscape Plan. There are more brick pavers to allow and unobstructed 18' which is the narrowest point for a vehicle to get through. He reminded the Committee that Ceres Street is a private right-of-way and is only 15' wide. He pointed out the garage entrance at the lower level to service the six parking spots in the basement of the building. Those parking spots are based on the six units which they have times 1.5 spaces which works out to 9 spaces. However there is an allowance to have four less parking lots in the ordinance so their actual requirement is five spaces and they are providing six spaces. They provided landscaping along the edge of the brick work and added a bike rack.

As part of the agreement with the Oar House, they recognized that there were issues with drainage and that they didn't have any drainage at all from their site. They are showing a series of roof drains to come down and go underground. Right now some of their roof drains went onto abutting properties. There is a small drain that comes into the catch basin. It's hard to see the outlet as it's only 4" but there is a 12" PVC pipe that goes through the headwall as someone had the foresight to put in a more modern connection. Mr. Clifford discussed this with David Desfosses and asked about the origin of the pipe and he stated it does come over right to the structure and there is a connection of some sort. Therefore the water that goes into the catch basin goes into the 12" line. They didn't know whether the property owner would allow them to tie into that but per the agreement they signed yesterday they are going to allow them to tie into it. They will therefore be putting in a structure and they will talk about the location because they are crossing over two sewer lines. They can bring a header along the face of the building and collect the various roof drains that will avoid any ice build up in the winter from water coming off the roof.

Mr. Clifford displayed a detail of the section of where the sewer line will go through the basement of the building. This is the same detail they used at the Cross Roads building. He also showed the clean out detail which will be used for the sewer line at the sidewalk spot that David Desfosses asked for.

Elevations of the building were displayed from all four sides. Mr. Clifford stated they went to great efforts to relocate a utility pole so that views would not be obstructed.

He acknowledges there are concerns with procedural issues regarding their submission for design review and Attorney Phoenix was present to address those.

Mr. Rice asked what the material was on the trench sewer frame set up as they don't call that out. Mr. Clifford stated it was stainless steel hardware. Mr. Rice did not feel that SCH 80 PVC was designed to be supported intermittently, especially when carrying liquid. He asked if there was any discussion about using ductile iron or something that can span without deflection. Mr. Clifford felt that the schedule 80 was what was used at the Cross Roads House and he did not feel there were any real loads on it and it is a very rigid pipe. He would be happy to work with Mr. Rice on that.

Mr. Rice requested that the clean out cap in the sidewalk needs to have "sewer" stamped on the cap.

Mr. Rice referred to the width of the access easement out back and he felt that the reality is, if the empty lot to the salt pile side gets filled in, they will have a long narrow corridor with very little access for emergency vehicles to get their ladders up. The Fire Department has made a statement that 24' minimum is what is desired. Has there been consideration to widening this area for emergency vehicles to properly access the back side. Mr. Clifford stated there was a lot of discussion from Day One about what would be allowed. There is the 15' right-of-way and they have provided 18'. All of the discussions they have had with the Fire Department is that they wouldn't go back in there with the aerial truck because of all of the overhead lines. Mr. Rice stated that all of the recent experiences they have had in the past month and a half has caused them to revisit this. This would create a situation where it would be very difficult to control a fire. Mr. Clifford felt the fire department would set up their trucks further back and if they got rid of their curb completely it would be open to drive through. The owner is not interested in pulling the building back another 6'. Mr. Rice understood that but he was just expressing concern and as they are recommending something going forward and given the recent experiences they have had in the City, he is just pointing this out for the record. –Ms. Walker noted that the constraint is the overhead wires. In some foreseeable future those wires may not be there and if they are building out to a dangerous situation the committee needs to consider that when making their recommendation. Mr. Cracknell asked how many overhead wires will be left. Mr. Clifford pointed out which were staying and which were being removed. There will be wires at both ends but not behind the building. Mr. Cracknell got the impression from Deputy Fire Chief Roediger that with the consolidation and removal of the overhead wires in the vicinity of the project that he might actually go down there. However, more is better, as Mr. Rice said, so the Committee will have to decide what language to use for the Planning Board so they know whether to revisit this issue or not.

Mr. Rice stated that it was his understanding the first time they discussed it that Deputy Fire Chief Roediger did not have an issue accessing from Market Street but since then he has made it clear that Market Street is not an option for them. He felt it was worth revisiting and making sure everyone was comfortable.

Mr. Cracknell asked about the purpose of the brick apron and whether it was to identify that there is a garage door there and why did they go out into the private section of Ceres Street with that large brick area. Chris Erickson, the owner, stated that element has always been part of the design and it is to indicate that there is a garage door and vehicles will be entering and exiting. Mr. Cracknell felt it creates a visual distraction. It's just a little passage way and it seems odd to have a brick section in the middle going right into the "shark wall". He likes the idea of bricks being used versus the planter

behind the building. If they are going to use bricks, and it functions like a sidewalk, he thought it would be better to use a granite curb on the edge of that brick walkway, lift it a little so that it is still mountable for fire apparatus or a delivery truck. Mr. Rice did not disagree and asked if it was intended to be flush. Mr. Erickson confirmed it was. Mr. Rice likes the idea of a granite edge to hold it in place and he would also recommend that they do a radius at the end instead of a square as it would be odd to have a square point. He would encourage them to make the walkway a 4' minimum and maybe 5' to visually make it look like a walkway. Mr. Clifford was not sure they could raise it with the 15' but they could put flush curbing the whole way across. Mr. Cracknell didn't think it made a difference however it would provide less benefit to the pedestrian. The granite edge is good to define it and to hold the bricks against the asphalt and he felt the idea of, at least temporarily until something else happens in that area, that it be curved on the corners. They will need the City spec for the brick to be used.

Mr. Clifford indicated that they are using granite cobbles for the street. Both Mr. Rice and Mr. Cracknell indicated that would not be appropriate and they would not hold up with the plows. Mr. Britz wanted to clarify that they are using bricks for their brick pavers. They will make it a condition that they use the City specs on the brick pavers. Mr. Cracknell felt they were in agreement that the apron should be removed. Mr. Clifford understands that they don't like the apron as it makes it look different but that is what he likes about it. It actually defines that something is happening there. Mr. Erickson stated it was their intent to give a visual cue that traffic would be entering and exiting. Ms. Walker wasn't convinced that the traffic volume would be enough to warrant it as it is mostly a pedestrian street. Mr. Erickson felt it might look nice from a visual perspective.

Mr. Erickson wanted to briefly revisit the discussion of the width along the back for fire safety. They have had this discussion over several TAC Work Sessions and the plan has shifted and evolved as they have worked with PSNH and their neighbors. At the last TAC Work Session discussion they were still exploring the idea of the overhead lines being removed. They have had extensive discussions with their neighbors and have offered to pay but they have refused. That was the Fire Department's window of opportunity to give them some additional access. They wanted those lines removed not only for view purposes but also so that a fire truck could park there. The width behind the building is no small width. It is wider than both of the entry points onto Ceres Street. Mr. Rice felt it was unfortunate that Deputy Fire Chief Roediger was not present to speak to this issue personally but based on his single vote he still felt it was an issue that needs to be looked at more seriously and thinking about the long term as that block builds out. Mr. Cracknell agreed and would be more comfortable with a suggestion to the Planning Board that more is better. If the applicant can get something from the Fire Department that 18' was okay that would take care of the issue. Mr. Erickson responded that they discussed this at length at the TAC Work Sessions when he was present and they had all but resolved this issue but at the last session this issue was revisited. Nothing has changed in the back of the building since he gave his general approval at a TAC Work Session. Mr. Cracknell was not 100% sure that was the only issue Deputy Fire Chief Roediger had. If Mr. Erickson is right then he would expect he would have no problem getting letter from the Fire Department for the Planning Board. He would be more comfortable keeping it out there and letting them resolve it with the Fire Department.

Mr. Walker requested details for the bike rack. They need to make sure it will fit in the space and that it will not interfere with pedestrians flowing in and out of that door. There is a City standard for that.

Mr. Cracknell asked for clarification on the building height from Bill Bartell of CJ Architects. He asked him to clarify for the record his impressions of whether this building meets the current zoning requirements regarding the first 10' off of Market Street and, if not, how he intends to revolve that.

Mr. Bartell stated that it does meet the zoning as written. In Section 10.535.10 it specifies that a 10' setback of the building may not exceed 40' in height. Mr. Cracknell understood from the cross section he was given earlier today that he is saying that the mean of the slope of the front roof is higher than the height of the roof 10' back off of Market Street because the mean is about 60" which is 40' and a little bit higher at the midpoint of the building. That the midpoint of the slope is actually the 485 but the first 10' is under 485 and miraculously is at 480, which is the maximum building height. Mr. Bartell confirmed it was at 480 because that was the maximum. On Sheet A.0 the numbers are the average height in inches of the building as they understood they had to be calculated for the building height assessment. The actual measured building height at those positions as shown on Sheet A.1, the building elements at 10' back from the property line are all below the 40' maximum. Mr. Cracknell asked if it was also his thought that those elevated parapet walls, or fire walls, are exempt even though they are 2' in height. Mr. Bartell stated those are an existing element on the existing building so they felt those were except. On the new building they will be designed to be below building height. Mr. Cracknell indicated that it troubles him that it appears somewhere around 50% of this building has a flat roof and it is not entirely clear to him that they can take the slope of the mean for the height of the building because so much of the middle of the building is a flat roof. When he looks at the definition of even mansard roofs in zoning, a flat top mansard roof goes to the highest point of the roof and not the mid point of the mansard versus a hip roof mansard, which has the second plane, you go to the mid point of the mansard. Mr. Erickson felt this was open to interpretation so they will have to continue to resolve that as they move forward. Mr. Cracknell was just suggesting that they continue to talk and work on that issue.

Mr. Cracknell indicated their homework assignment will be to understand how the current building height definitions work with this roof type and whether the building height regulations apply to the proposed project. He has a suggested stipulation to allow them to continue to move this forward and revolve this issue in the days ahead. There are too many good questions being raised on all sides as to whether this is vested or not from the proposed zoning amendments which are before the City Council. This project clearly would not meet the proposed zoning as it is a 5-story building and 3-stories is the suggested height limit with a Conditional Use Permit available to the applicant, should it pass. The applicant believes that they have vested the project by filing for design review in advance of the notice being posted for the zoning amendment and are under the belief that the new zoning will not apply even if it is adopted but that has been resolved from our side.

Mr. Cracknell suggested that the apron in front of the garage door should have a granite edge. Mr. Rice had heartburn with that because it implies a pass-through or some sort of esplanade. He felt they could do things a little differently without creating a visual walk area. If they feel very strongly about it he would agree that a granite edging would help hold it in place when the plows transition from the asphalt to the brick. Mr. Erickson stated they were open to the Committee's suggestions and if it is a sticking point they can eliminate it. Mr. Rice felt it would be a maintenance nightmare for them. Mr. Cracknell felt it detracted from the working waterfront and he would feel much differently about a cobble strip. Mr. Rice felt that would still create an issue with the plows. Mr. Erickson confirmed the reason they steered away from the cobble was because of the plows.

Mr. Britz agreed and felt there might be some pedestrian protection out of it in terms of cars pulling out but they may lose that protection with pedestrians crossing to look at the Shark Wall.

Mr. Britz asked how they left it regarding the back sidewalk. Mr. Cracknell suggested if they are going to have it flush with the granite edge they should have it at least 4' in width. That was fine with the applicant.

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. Rice made a motion to recommend Site Plan approval with stipulations.

Mr. Cracknell stipulated that the City specs should be used for the brick sidewalk along the rear of the building which should be at least 4' in width with flush granite curbing.

He asked them to show all modifications to the drainage improvements along the rear of the property including easement areas and provide a copy of the easement to the Planning Board.

He requested that the Applicant should use best efforts to widen the Ceres Street driveway further for safe access of emergency vehicles and delivery vehicles along the private portion of Ceres Street, and communicate and coordinate with the Fire Department on their recommendation.

The Applicant should continue to work with the Planning Department to determine whether the proposed building height calculations are consistent with the requirements under the Zoning Ordinance and further the applicant should continue to work with the Planning Department and Legal Department to determine whether the pending zoning amendment relating to building height applies to this project. If so, in either of those two accounts, the plan should be revised to comply with either the existing or the pending zoning amendments.

Mr. Rice requested that all hardware on the sewer trench shall be stainless steel. A sump shall be provided in the trench to allow water to be pumped out.

Mr. Britz asked if he still wanted to change the schedule 80 to ductile iron. Mr. Rice felt the ductal iron was problematic as well. He's disappointed that he did not stand his ground about having a public sewer line through a building as he sees a potential environmental issue. The schedule 80 is acceptable because the plumbing code says that is the material to use inside a building. However, technically, this is not an inside plumbing system and that is the quandary. He would encourage them to come up with a better support system to consider what it would take to make sure they do not get deflection and issues associated with potential separation of chemicals while the joints on a Schedule 80 PVC pipe. In the future, he will not let this happen.

Ms. Walker requested the sewer labeling on the sewer clean out cap. She also requested detail on the bike rack location and type.

Mr. Cracknell seconded the motion.

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

1. The brick sidewalk along the rear of the building should be a minimum of 4’ in width, with flush granite curbing and built to City standards.
2. All modifications to the drainage improvements along the rear of the property, including the easement areas, shall be shown on the Site Plans; and a copy of the easements shall be provided to the Planning Department.
3. The applicant shall use best efforts to widen the Ceres Street driveway further for safe access of emergency vehicles and delivery vehicles along the private section of Ceres Street, and the Applicant shall communicate and coordinate with the Fire Department to determine their recommendation.
4. All hardware on the sewer trench shall be stainless steel.
5. A sump shall be provided in the sewer trench to allow water to be pumped out as necessary.
6. The Applicant is encouraged to research a better support system for the sewer line running through the building to avoid deflection and issues associated with potential separation of chemicals with the joints of the SCH 80 PVC pipe.
7. The sewer clean out cap shall be labeled “Sewer”.
8. Details shall be added to the bike rack location and type.
9. The Applicant shall continue to work with the Planning Department to determine whether the proposed building height calculations are consistent with the requirements under the Zoning Ordinance; and, further, the Applicant shall continue to work with the Planning Department and the Legal Department to determine whether the pending zoning amendment relating to building height applies to this project.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Portsmouth Ford Lincoln Mercury and SLF Realty Group, LLC, Owners**, for property located at **400 & 450 Spaulding Turnpike**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to construct a 4,400 s.f. addition to an existing sales & service building and vehicles display areas along the Spaulding Turnpike and Arthur Brady Drive, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 238 as Lots 1A and 2 and lie within the General Business (GB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Lorden, of MSC Engineers, appeared with John Sawyer, owner, Attorney Peter Loughlin and Corey Colwell, also of MSC engineers. Mr. Lorden stated this is an 4,400 s.f. addition to an existing building which will be used for customer services. There will be two bays and two overhead doors for courtesy drop offs in bad weather. There will be an approved waiting area and a new car delivery and additional show room area. They are providing a landscaped area on the side of the building. There are additional improvements to the front façade. To balance with the new front of the building there will be a tower element that is the focal point of the front. There are currently two lots which they are proposing to merge. That would allow them to get rid of six easements on the site. They are providing 107 lined spaces and approximately 100,000 s.f. display area for vehicles. All of the lined spaces on

site meet code for size and aisle width. The goal is to sealcoat and restripe the pavement in the area. They are maintaining circulation around the building. The entry and exit along Echo as well as on Arthur Brady will all stay the same with no changes. They are decreasing impervious by 280 s.f. All utilities will come from the addition.

Mr. Lorden stated they went to the TAC Work Session on June 25th. There was a question about parking for sales and service. Their plan shows 107 lined spaces. They have a new calculation which breaks it down to four areas which include the sales and service areas and two large storage areas. They now have 119 parking spaces and they will revise their plans accordingly.

There were also some questions about the illumination of signage. Their Attorney worked with Rick Hopley, Building Inspector, and that has been approved. The sign is internally lit. There is nothing external, nothing bright, and the tower itself is not lit.

The question that came up today was parking in the wetland setback. A site walk was conducted today and there was parking in the gravel area and Mr. Sawyer stated that is where his employees park. They have always parked there and they will show that as 13 employee parking spaces. There were also some vans on the Home Depot side by the retaining wall. If they haven't been already, they will be relocated up to the vehicle display area. In order to take advantage of some area that was not in the wetland buffer, they are going to extend the display area.

Mr. Rice asked whether it matters if the wetland buffer matter is vehicle display or employee parking. Mr. Britz confirmed it does not. It was the grandfather status that he wants to look at. The concern on the site is the wetland buffer parking but it is also the vehicle storage parking off of the pavement and off of a prepared surface for parking. That has been an ongoing issue with this site and they saw a bunch of areas where that was a problem. There is the wetland buffer parking and vehicle storage parking on areas that no vehicles are supposed to be parked on and aren't shown on any plans. Those are concerns that are not clear with him on the plan.

Mr. Cracknell displayed some plans and photos. He went out to the site for the first time yesterday with Mr. Britz to understand what was going on in the corner with display parking. At last week's work session he had asked the question about the area where the existing conditions plan showed nothing and the proposed plan shows a whole lot of different things going on. Mr. Lorden explained at that time that was an existing condition. Mr. Cracknell then noticed there was a Site Plan approval from last year showing a building that used to be in the middle that is now gone and a lot of improvements that have not happened. He was unclear on what was going on with this application as this looks like a new site plan for the whole site and not just for the corner which is what the 2011 file seems to indicate. The 2011 file shows extensive site planning, drainage and landscaping and a new building on the front. It does not look like that today and actually looks more like what they are asking for today. His first issue was, had he known that it looks like what they are asking for without authorization, this is actually a proposal to amend that application to come up with what they now want, which does not include a new building but rather one added on to the existing building. Also, removal of the landscaping and changes to 450. It is very confusing and he would not have recommended bringing it to today's public hearing if he had gone out to the site earlier.

Mr. Lorden stated that was a separate application for 450 and the building was taken down. They found ledge so they explored different options. The plan then changed. They are not proposing any other additional changes to the 450 lot other than possibly paving the gravel area where the building was located. Mr. Cracknell understood that but stated that was not made clear to him at the TAC Work

Session. He did not feel that they have given this enough time on their side to make sure this is being done appropriately, especially with stormwater. In terms of answering the question of where it looked like things may not be consistent with what they have shown on paper, Mr. Cracknell had marked in orange on their existing condition plan where vehicles were parking in areas that were not designated or designed for vehicle parking, regardless of whether it is for employees or display parking. His understanding is that the Zoning Enforcement Officer went out to the site today and some of the vehicles, not surprisingly, have moved out of those areas, but there are still at least 5 areas that do not appear to be supportive of vehicle parking until this plan is approved. Some vehicles are parked on the grass, some are in a no parking zone and there were a dozen trucks on the grass that have since been removed. There are still issues that need to be resolved from a zoning compliance standpoint and if there are this many apparent violations of where vehicles are being parked then maybe there need to be design changes to prevent them from creeping back into those areas. There are way too many vehicles on the site than the site can support. The primary issue is to allow them to determine exactly what they are asking for versus what was approved in the past. Therefore, his vote would be to postpone to the next meeting to allow them to do their homework.

Mr. Lorden stated that the amendment part is for the 400 lot and they are only bringing in the 450 lot as a possibility to merge the two lots. If they look at this for 400 only, he felt it was pretty fair. The work that was proposed and approved for 450 is not going to go through and they removed the building and replaced it with gravel. Mr. Cracknell noted that on 450 that the building is gone, there is gravel now and there are travel lanes where there were none before.

Mr. Britz shared Mr. Cracknell's concerns after being on site and he wanted to take it a step further regarding the wetlands. There was quite a bit of discussion and planning on the last approval to keep things out of the wetland buffer and they did a nice job. It is really confusing to now be seeing a plan that is partially completed as an existing condition. They need to be very clear with what they are doing with 450 as well as 400. They need to come in with 400 and 450 either separately or together but they need to pay attention to the fact that there is quite a bit of wetland buffer where they are parking now. They could possibly make a statement about grandfathered parking but they would need conditional use permits for parking in the buffer where they do not have it grandfathered. He agreed with Mr. Cracknell when he mentioned design ideas to protect areas from having cars parking on them. They could possibly consider bollards or curbing to keep the display cars or employees out of parking in the wetland buffer areas and under the power lines. If they had a plan that showed that, they could then go out in the field and see what is going on.

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

Attorney Peter Loughlin wanted to point out that about a month ago, Attorney Loughlin and Mr. Colwell Corey met with Rick Taintor and discussed that they had two properties and they were coming in on just the 400 lot which is the existing Ford garage. They got into the fact that the building had not been built and was not going to be built and they discussed the merger. Regarding 450, the building is gone but the rest of the improvements have not been done. They understand those improvements are going to have to be done although they may modify the plan. This won't make them feel a lot better, and they do understand the parking issues, but it is much better than it used to be and with the volume of the dealership it is a constant task of moving cars around. They want to work with the City to keep this moving forward. They had an issue with the signage which they are working on. He was not sure how to leave this today. Several issues have been brought to their attention and they feel they are all resolvable.

Mr. Britz wanted a clear plan of how they are moving forward and they will then be happy to work with them on a design that works for the site.

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 this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Cracknell noted that the prior approvals did include both properties. He felt all they need to do is come back with their comprehensive set of improvements for 450 and 400 and it would be helpful to know how they are handling any of the other approvals they received before beyond the demolition of the building. It would be helpful if they could highlight what they have implemented versus what they have not from the prior approval.

Mr. Britz added that they should consider whether they need a Conditional Use Permit going forward as they have a lot of wetland buffer and a lot of changes.

Mr. Cracknell made a motion to postpone this matter to the July 30, 2013 TAC meeting. Mr. Rice seconded the meeting.

The motion to postpone this matter to the July 30, 2013 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **LJP Properties, LLC, Owner and Jay Prewitt, Applicant**, for property located at **428 Pleasant Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to convert a 4 unit building to a 3 unit residential building, demolish rear additions, and construct a new two-story 450 s.f. rear addition, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 102 as Lot 55 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) District and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz indicated that the Applicant has requested a postponement to the next meeting.

Mr. Rice made a motion to postpone to the July 30, 2013 TAC meeting. Mr. Cracknell seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone this matter to the July 30, 2013 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Parade Residence Hotel, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **100 Deer Street, Portwalk Residential, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **99 Hanover Street**, and **Parade Office, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street** (aka Portwalk I, II & III), requesting Amended Site Plan Approval for streetscape improvements along Portwalk Place, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lots 1, 22 & 23 and lie 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, with Tighe & Bond, was present along with Tim Levine. Mr. Crimmins advised the Committee that they are seeking Site Plan Amendments for streetscape improvements to their previously approved projects. These amendments include all three lots. He numbered the changes to each individual lot accordingly. The purpose of these amendments is to activate and enhance the street and to make it feel more like a City Street.

Mr. Crimmins reviewed the items individually to get them into the record.

Amendments to Lot 1:

1.1 They took the previously approved paver crosswalk to the width of the proposed tip down ramps to reduce it. Previously, it was a wider apron. It did not make sense and directed pedestrians into the landscaped area.

1.2 They revised the previously approved concrete ramp to a brick tip down ramp with flush triangular tree planters to match Lot 3. They changed the concrete dustpan and are not mirroring what is approved on Lot 3 with the triangular planters and brick tip down.

1.3 They revised the previously approved brick sidewalk to add four 6' diameter flush tree planters with grates and guards.

1.4 They revised four previously approved light fixtures to a historic style fixture on Portwalk Place. That fixture will match the city standard. The two changes to the fixture is that it will have a shield so that is dark sky compliant and it will have an energy efficient LED light bulb in it.

1.5 They revised the previously approved thermoplastic crosswalk to a brick paver crosswalk as you enter Portwalk Place.

Amendments to Lot 2:

2.1 They revised the previously approved brick sidewalk to add flush triangle tree planter to add more landscaping.

2.2 They revised the previously approved sidewalk to add four outdoor seating areas, totaling 670 s.f.. It is really one large seating area but it is divided up between the planters.

2.3 They revised the three previously approved light fixtures and poles, similar to lot 1, with the City Standard and a shield for dark sky and LED light bulbs.

2.4 They revised the previously approved concrete tip down ramp to a brick tip down ramp with flush triangle planters to match Lot 3.

2.5 They revised the previously approved paver crosswalk to the width of the proposed tip down ramp. They are making the width match the width of the ramps rather than the entire width where the landscaped islands were.

Amendments to Lot 3:

- 3.1 They are again revising the light fixtures to be the City standard with shields and LED light bulbs.
- 3.2 They revised the previously approved brick sidewalk to add one circular 6' diameter flush tree planter with grate and guard, as recommended by TAC last week.
- 3.3 They revised the previously approved 365 s.f. seating area which was shown up against the building and they have moved it out along the edge of the street.
- 3.4 They revised the brick sidewalk at the residential entrance to match the granite paver detail at the hotel entrance on Lot 1.
- 3.5 They revised the paver crosswalk to the width of the of the proposed tip down ramp which is the same as Lot 1 and 2.
- 3.6 They revised the paved and striped parking deck entrance/exit to stamped concrete parking deck entrance/exit. This is to enhance the entrance into the hotel.
- 3.7 They revised the brick sidewalk to add 310 s.f of outdoor seating area.
- 3.8 They revised the brick sidewalk to add 165 s.f. of outdoor seating area.
- 3.9 They revised the thermoplastic crosswalk to a brick paver crosswalk.

Mr. Crimmins stated there were a few items noted at TAC last week and he believes they addressed all of those comments. Those included the flush planters which they will add guards and grates to. They are going with the historic fixtures. They had proposed to remove the pavement below the sidewalk section however at the strong recommendation of TAC they have put that pavement back in below the brick. Lastly, they had proposed to have a single crosswalk from the ramp to the Vaughan Mall and they have now put it back to the previously approved wide crosswalk design that does result in the loss of one parking space. They acknowledge that will need to be coordinated with the City prior to construction.

Mr. Rice believed the outside dining area was in conflict with what had been submitted to the Liquor Committee. Tim Levine confirmed that the plans were the same. The BBC application was prepared by Robby Woodburn who also prepared this plan and he was quite certain that they were identical. Mr. Rice was able to pull up the BBC plan and acknowledged that they were the same.

Ms. Walker asked about the stamped concrete pavement markings (3.6). and whether that was for pedestrian crossings. Mr. Crimmins stated that was correct. Mr. Cracknell asked if the sidewalk goes through the driveway out at the street. Mr. Crimmins stated that was just a different pattern.

Mr. Cracknell asked if they were replacing the period lights which they currently have on the east side. Mr. Levine confirmed they were replacing all of them.

Mr. Cracknell felt that these changes are excellent and it will make this an even better place. He wondered why they didn't put the four trees in to begin with as it was an obvious gap. His last question was about the material for the crosswalk to the Vaughan Mall. It does not make sense to him to have a thermal plastic trampoline from one corner to the next. He remembers the Planning Board leaving it opened ended and they talked about a raised crosswalk and a speed table in TAC at one point and he would like to think that DPW could contemplate a more durable surface than thermal plastic or stamped concrete. He would rather see if the Public Works Director would support bricks and granite or something that would elevate it, create traffic calming and hopefully help in the process of reactivating the Vaughan Mall. Mr. Rice was more than happy to revisit some of the decisions in terms of traffic calming. Traffic tables are appropriate in many situations however there are some design considerations that need to be taken into consideration. As for crosswalk materials, they all

have their challenges and he is not sold on any particular material at the moment. Keeping a consistent material all along is the most durable approach. He felt it was appropriate to have the developer work with DPW to come up with an approach that will service well. He agrees that the idea of the Vaughan Mall entry way is great and there may be visions of the Vaughan Mall that may have a different need at some point in the future. Therefore, he would defer making a decision and would like to work with the developer. Mr. Cracknell was concerned the geothermal plastic was the default setting. Mr. Rice assured him that it was not. He can see the Vaughan Mall revitalized to be a mini-Market Square with this development on the other side of the street. Mr. Rice stated they need to come up with a new City standard with something that is more durable. Mr. Crimmins was agreeable with this and there is a note #24 on site plan addressing this.

Mr. Rice asked them to call out the dimension from the seating to the wall on the outdoor seating for the pedestrian walk-through span. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was 6' and he will add it to the plan. Mr. Rice felt even 6' is problematic for a double wide stroller so 6.5' would be even better.

Mr. Rice agreed with Mr. Cracknell that this streetscape is a vast improvement.

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. Rice made a motion to recommend Site Plan approval with stipulations. Mr. Sheehan seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker asked if the lighting still needs to be discussed. Mr. Rice stated that the shields and LED bulbs were consistent and he was fine with it. Mr. Cracknell added that they are replacing all fixtures with the City downtown standard.

Mr. Cracknell requested that the construction details for the proposed crosswalk to the Vaughan Mall shall be determined by the DPW.

The motion to recommend Site Plan approval passed unanimously with the following stipulation:

1. The construction details for the proposed crosswalk to the Vaughan Mall shall be determined by the DPW.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:45 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant

