

MINUTES

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2:00 PM

DECEMBER 30, 2014

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner; Brian Goetz, Deputy Director Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Deputy Fire Chief; and Michael Schwartz, Captain, Portsmouth Police Department; Ray Pazzullo, Assistant City Engineer

.....
Mr. Taintor introduced and welcomed new members Eric Eby, Ray Pazzullo, and also Brian Goetz who was sitting in for Peter Rice.

Mr. Taintor announced that there are many items on the agenda today. He would like to stay within ½ hour for each project to keep the meeting within 2 hours. If that does not happen, another meeting will need to be scheduled next Tuesday or Wednesday to finish business.

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **The Aphrodite Georgopolous Revocable Trust of 1999, Owner, and Seacoast Trust, LLP, Applicant**, for property located at **1900 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct two medical office buildings: (1) a 2-story building with a footprint of 12,150 s.f. and gross floor area of 21,000 s.f. plus a 10' x 60' MRI coach, and a proposed 2,050 s.f. future MRI addition to the building; and (2) a 2-story building with a footprint of 10,000 s.f. and gross floor area of 20,000 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 267 as Lot 8 and lies within the Office Research (OR) District. (This application was postponed at the December 2, 2014 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Peter Weeks, Real Estate Consultant for the project, was present on behalf of Seacoast Trust, LLC. Also present were Dennis Moulton and John Lorden, of MSC Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors, Inc., to answer technical questions. Mr. Weeks provided a summary of how the suggestions from TAC provided since last January have been addressed. TAC originally suggested somewhere in the vicinity of 23 changes. They will be making sufficient repairs and improvements to the drainage system on West Road. Seacoast Trust had originally asked for both a right and left turn out of Lafayette Road; NH DOT and the traffic engineer had given their blessing on this, however Mr. Weeks felt that TAC would not approve it so a revision has been made so that there is no left hand turn out of the property onto Lafayette Road. The applicant changed the configuration so that it is nearly impossible for anyone to make a left hand turn coming out of the lot onto Lafayette Road. The correct bike racks are now listed in the plan. The design of the remainder of the service road is now to City standards. The architect is in the process of working on the water pressure so that there will be enough pressure to operate the sprinkler systems in both buildings. Another drainage study has been conducted; however the engineers have not had a chance to respond prior to this meeting. There were some concerns regarding the phasing. That will be addressed; however separate plans will need to be submitted under new site review regulations so that the Planning Board is happy with the plans. It has been determined by the City Attorney that the applicant has the right to complete the service road as well as the utilities (sewage and water). They did excavate the gate valve to be viewed by DPW. There is also a concern on the height of the entrance canopy for safe clearance and the dumpster has been moved to address that. They have shown pedestrian access between the buildings. There is no longer a need to provide a sewer pump station design. He feels that all questions that have been asked over the last few months have been addressed. They would be happy to come back next Wednesday to address any unfinished business as they would like to be able to go to the Planning Board in January.

Mr. Desfosses made the following comments regarding revisions: Page C2 revisions to signage near the entrance road (Sign E -- "no left turn" should be placed there instead of Sign B which is "right turn only"), Also add "Sign F" (to Route 1 North) on a couple islands and also on the access road. The Site Plan shows preliminary location of a free standing sign. There are 4 trees directly in front of the signs and he asked if these trees are to be saved or will they be removed in order to see the sign as you move down Route 1.

Comments on Notes: Note 5- Remove the word "town" and change the text to "city and state". Note 8 – Temporary fencing shall be provided "*and covered*" with fabric material to control dust. Note 9B – Submit to engineer permanent electronic records as is required in Site Review permits. Plan C3 – Right turn onto Route 1 shown as 21.8'; this is too wide. Please reduce that to 14' wide. Most vehicles can make that turn without any problem (it is a 70ft radius). Add to the island "Do Not Enter" signs to be seen by plow operators. For the sidewalk coming in off the main driveway an esplanade should be put between the sidewalk and the driveway due to this location being directly next to Route 1 (there will be a lot of snow and it must be kept clean). The bike rack should be on a regular concrete pad

Sheet C4 Note 6 – Regarding sidewalk tolerances for handicapped ramps, curb reveals of 0” as stated in the plan typically do not work. This should state ¼” with a tolerance of + or – 1/8”. Note 2 under erosion control, add “any wetland areas not to be disturbed”. The Rain Garden should have river stone rather than mulch (which tends to float away and clog the system). Sheet C6, the Utility Plan, the way the sewer water mains are laid out is awkward. Mr. Desfosses would like to meet with engineering (next week, Mon or Tues) on this and/or send PDF’s back and forth. He explained a note from Terry Desmarais, City Engineer, that the sewer line coming out of the main building should go into sewer manhole 1 and then straight out to Lafayette Road. It should not go into the sewer manhole as shown. Currently under review is the sewer lay out for the back road, which is currently 12”. There is not enough flow to use a 12” pipe. It should be 8” and extend out to the back driveway area. The applicant should ensure that a 1/10’ pitch inside manholes is provided. The water main is parallel to Lafayette not perpendicular; the different connections should be shown. Mr. Desfosses asked that one more light be added so that the back driveway is better illuminated. No profile was given for the back access road. There should be a profile (to determine the proper road alignment for the back road and also to show drainage, etc.). The way the road is currently graded is not the way they would like to see it graded so a profile cut sheet would be very helpful. Mr. Desfosses is in complete agreement with the Altus letter on all points.

Mr. Eby – Requested that truck turning movements be shown (on the right turn out driveway)

Ms. Walker – Noted that pavement markings (going through the parking lot) for pedestrians are not distinguishable from what would be striped for a loading zone or handicap access. Also, they are not inviting for pedestrian access. She asked that they be striped differently to indicate the difference.

Mr. Taintor - Sent an email stating that the applicant would have to lose 4 parking spaces in order to get the regulation sidewalk wide enough. To address this, the building can be reduced; there are also other options. Also, clarification is needed with what is happening with the sidewalks between the parking islands near the first building and the sidewalk that goes along the 4 ADA spaces.

Mr. Taintor – Regarding the island to the left he asked if that is a concrete sidewalk that is flush with the sidewalk.

Mr. Lorden clarified that the intent is that the entire area will remain flush.

Mr. Taintor –Has a concern about the Phasing Plan in that he cannot tell from the plan what is going to be there after Phase 1 and before Phase 2. He asked whether the intent should be specified in the plan regarding what happens to the water, sewer, etc.

Mr. Weeks – The applicant will show (after receiving Mr. Taintor’s email this morning) exactly what will happen in Phase 1 and Phase 2. On Monday, they will come up with solutions for what has come up today and will be back for the meeting next Wednesday.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this matter to the January 7th, 2015 TAC meeting. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion. This application will be in the legal notice for the Planning Board meeting on January 15th, 2015.

The motion to postpone to the January 7, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Harborcorp, LLC, Owner**, for property located on **Russell Street, Deer Street and Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 5-story mixed use development with a footprint of 63,000 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 327,900 ± s.f., including a hotel/event center with 103,700 s.f. of event center space and 96 hotel rooms, 14 residential condominiums, a 40,000 s.f. retail supermarket, and 540 parking spaces (390 spaces in a garage structure and 150 below-grade spaces serving the retail use); with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 21, Assessor Map 118 as Lot 28 and Assessor Map 124 as Lot 126 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the December 2, 2014 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Chris Thompson with Harborcorp was present to speak to the application. The entire team working on the project is present today. Mr. Thompson provided a brief update. The current submittal is much more detailed, yet a number of things remain in progress. They have met with the Trees & Public Greenery Committee. They will meet with them again once they have finalized the Landscape Plan. The Traffic, Parking, Safety and Circulation Plans are also coming together.

Cliff Greim, of Harriman Architects and Engineers, summarized the submission data provided to the Planning Board. They tried to capture all comments from the Planning Board (around 200 comments). They have made some substantive changes. Where the biggest changes have occurred is site related and not as much building related. They have met with the Parking, Traffic & Safety Committee. Greenery has added comments and they have tried to address all of them on their submission. Steve Bushey with FST, addressed specific site related changes requested by the Planning Board. There is still some work to do on the Russell Street configuration in order to meet all objectives, but there will be the addition of a couple 5' wide bike lanes on either side. The Sheraton Street exit and entry have been modified. There is work to be done in regard to the (vertical) alignment of the crosswalk configuration and how it matches up with sidewalk. This also applies to the entrance off Deer Street. With regard to the below grade parking entrance off

Deer Street, it will be a one way entrance (below Whole Foods). There is interest in putting in time restricted parking. They will be working to remedy any issues for peak traffic hours (a.m. and p.m.) when cars will be queuing up at the traffic signal as well as working on bike areas at the signals. This will be corrected on the drawings. Regarding the Utility Plan, one of the key elements is the extension of underground power. They will continue to work with PSNH for relocating (underground manhole system) their facilities. A water main will also be realigned, but will still be within the right of way. They've updated a few of the service locations. They've also updated the plan to show new sewer.

Mr. Desfosses – Pointed out that on sheet C3.0, the main site layout plan adjacent to Map 119, Lot 1-1a, the handicap ramp must be relocated. There is also a driveway that must be relocated; it may need to be extended or modified to ensure it remains. In addition, regarding utilities, it will be necessary to tie in and add a manhole near the loading area of Russell and Sheraton to provide more pitch (for drainage) behind the building. He also inquired as to whether there is yet a lighting plan.

Mr. Thompson stated that they have all the photometrics and it is contained in the Planning Board packet (C10.0 – Photometric Plan and C10.1 – Electric Plan).

Mr. Taintor stated that on C10.0 the photometric light levels do not take into account the free standing lights.

Mr. Thompson stated that they are CFL and are not contributing much to the lighting level.

Mr. Desfosses– The P1 Lighting Plan is depicted as 277 volt. This is incorrect (too much voltage) or is a typo. The applicant could put the lights on the Sheraton side of the street as the Planning Board had requested. There is a City standard pole for lighting intersections. It is an LED. They will need to put up at least 2 of those at the intersection of Russell and Deer Streets and possibly one at Green Street. Sheet C10.1 shows the lighting control cabinet behind the building on Green Street which will be too far to go to bring in conduit lighting. It should be somewhere in the vicinity of the entrance to the parking garage (either side). It could also go on the grass strip on the Sheraton side. It must be centrally located (60' -65' spacing on the lights).

Mr. Goetz – Regarding the Stormwater Management Plan, the plan refers to a capture of 30,000 gallons for gray water and 2,500 gallon/day for flushing demand. He asked how will that be metered and have they approached the Plumbing/Inspection Department. It is advisable to do so as it is new ground.

Mr. Thompson – There will be two meters. They will discuss this with the Plumbing/Inspection Department.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger – He is assuming there will be some type of CO and air quality monitoring?

Ms. Walker – Expects that they will cover every area in the matrix provided to the Planning Board. Some areas were missed and there was missing information as well. She also advised to

make certain that the plan references are updated. Detail references should be numbered. In addition, DPW and the Planning Department discussed appropriate lane widths; they are comfortable with 11' travel lanes and 10' turning lanes. It appears there are areas where the applicant has not followed this specification.

Mr. Cracknell – Commended the applicant on responding to the comments raised. A cross section for the retaining wall is needed. On the plan, the wall is 6' x 8' behind Whole Foods. The landscaping needs considerable work. The grades and hazards within the right-of-way must be dealt with. A 40' opening is a little wide. Mr. Cracknell likes the fact that the round-about was shown on the submission. The park on Russell and Green Streets was shown as landscaped but has a note on it that it is going to be improved by others. Mr. Cracknell would like to know who the “others” are. Lastly, please consider putting solar panels on top of the building for sustainability.

Mr. Thompson – There are things they are doing towards sustainability that are innovative and integrative. Solar has not been a part of this to date, but the applicant is willing to look at that possibility.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger – Regarding the retaining wall; there is a detail on C8.3 that depicts 3 ½ feet above grade as the total height of the retaining wall.

Mr. Thompson – The retaining wall tapers from zero up to 4' – 5'. At Maplewood and Green Streets, there is no height, and behind Whole Foods, the height will be 5ft. There will be some physical structure on top of the retaining wall such as fencing or wall (which will be varied) to block traffic, as a safety barrier and to augment the aesthetics.

Mr. Taintor – On C9.1, it seems as though there is a wall that is at its highest point 8' above the existing grade. At 2.00, the existing grade is 14 ½ and the future grade is 22.5. This has to be in the site plan; it cannot be saved for HDC. The applicant indicated that he will have an answer at the meeting next Wednesday. The key thing that needs to be taken care of is the radius at Russell and Deer Streets. Some things seem to contradict the Site Plan Regulations. Due to the fact that the Sheraton is involved in this, they will need to be a co-applicant on this plan (to the extent that it affects their property). There is also confusion around the parking report. The plan talks about zoning for the Sheraton as part of this applicants parking report. It is unclear as to whether they are sharing parking with the Sheraton.

Mr. Thompson would like to clarify the wall issue. As he sees it, there are 2 components: the retaining wall and the screening. There is a 4' high retaining wall and then a screening element on top of that. That can look seamless so that it doesn't look like an 8' wall.

Mr. Taintor – Requested that the applicant clarify sheet 9.1 to accomplish this.

The Chair opened the public hearing and asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition.

Jerry Zelin of 70 Kensington Road,spoke to the application. He stated that he is not for or against the project. He feels that it is fine to have a conference center and supermarket as well as parking to accommodate the parking needs. However, it is important to do it right. He has two concerns; parking and traffic. He inquired as to whether the independent traffic study had been completed. Mr. Taintor stated that a traffic study from the applicant and a peer reviewer has been done. Mr. Zelin stated that there is zero *dedicated* parking for the general public. The parking relies heavily on managed parking. He asked if that intervention will be done properly which would rely less on physical structure than on human intervention. There must be strict conditions on the use of this lot due to this (human managed) factor. There are 198 spaces for Whole Foods and the Conference center combined. The prior plans that the developer had submitted reserved 125 spaces for Whole Foods which is on the low end for a 40,000 s.f. building. The conference center capacity will seat 750 people theater style and will have 73 spaces. This will not accommodate 750 people unless there is a very diligently managed parking area. It is essential to establish maximum capacity for the conference center and then work backwards to determine an adequate parking plan.

The Chair asked if anyone else was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Cracknell made a motion to postpone this matter for additional materials and changes to the plan to be presented at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

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

.....
C. The application of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue** (previously 30 Maplewood Avenue), requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 5-story mixed-use building with a footprint of 17,410 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 53,245 ± s.f., including 22 dwelling units and 13,745 ± s.f. of retail use, 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 Character District 4 (CD4), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the December 2, 2014 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering, was present to speak to the application. This project was presented at the December 2nd Planning Board meeting for Design Review. They have since addressed comments made at that meeting. On sheet C1, they have added tables and have changed Note 5 to correct the Character Based Zoning reference. They have updated the note on

parking meter removal so that there will be parking meter removal and this will be coordinated with DPW.

The drain line note was updated to better describe what they would do to abandon the drain line that goes out to Bridge Street. On Sheet C3, they've widened the sidewalks to 12' on Maplewood Avenue. They would still prefer greenery against the building. Tree wells (3) have been put at the curb line. They have expanded brick up to the building in the middle section and also up to the building on the Deer Street side. The street lighting has been moved as Mr. Desfosses requested; they are spaced at 60'. On Sheet C4, there have been minor adjustments to the underground parking area; they are going with standard spaces so the condo owners will have some storage space. On Sheet C5, the landscape schedule has been re-done. The Landscape Architect has advised on that design. The Trees and Greenery Committee would in all likelihood approve of the trees (non-fruit bearing trees). They have put the trees at the curb line. On Sheet C6, Note 10 has been updated to comply with the gas service that will come off Deer Street as requested. Sheet D1, the bike rack has been changed to a more ornamental fixture. Mr. Chagnon called attention to sheet D2, detail HH, which is the raised tree planters along Maplewood Avenue. Hopefully that is in accordance with what is required and desired. Tree guards will be coordinated with DPW. The architectural plan has been double checked against the Site Plan and archways are now labeled as such. There is also a revised lighting plan that has been distributed to the Planning Board.

Mr. Taintor – Mr. Chagnon had stated the Architectural Plan had been matched with the Site Plan. However, the Architectural Plan shows the building as 98' in depth from the (pedestrian way between Phase 1 and 2) front and the site plan shows that as 116' in depth from the front (along the Pedestrian pathway). He asked that Mr. Chagnon check on that.

Mr. Desfosses – In Phase 1, there is still a light pole 20' to the south (to the left of the one story addition for Phase 1) of where it should be. That light needs to be removed and shown as it is on the existing plan. Lights need to be spaced so that they are where the parking space is going to be and there is enough space for car doors to open. In addition, the applicant should list the model number (LED on the mast arms). The 3 added planters are 3' on the inside. They need to be 4' wide on the inside and 5' wide on the outside to provide ample space for street trees. Seven feet of sidewalk is acceptable. The corners on the planters that are up against the building should be rounded.

Mr. Eby – For each parking lot, there should be one handicap accessible van space. For this application, there should be one (van accessible spot) in the garage and one in the other parking lot due to the fact that the two parking areas are not interconnected.

Mr. Desfosses - Sewer manhole number 1493, just north of 238 Deer St. left corner, from the center of that manhole, 99' to the east, down the sewer line that is labeled 6" on the plan, that line is an 8" AC line in good shape, but 99' for that manhole is where the sewer lateral exists that was put in for this building. Please reuse that area if possible so there are no extraneous stubs in the sewer. Mr. Desmarais requested that the hookup for that sewer remain in the same manner as 111 Maplewood Avenue. On Maplewood Avenue, there is a 15" labeled VC drain for the sewer line. This is a sewer so the word "drain" should be crossed out on the plan. There are a total of 6

of the old aluminum light standards that need to come down. He could only identify 2 -3 in the demolition area. Please label all to be removed. D3 detail 0/C6 – for sewer service, in lieu of the observation, Terry Desmarais would like a TY with an extension up to the surface with a cast iron cleanout (sidewalk). He asked where the concrete encasement for the water crossing was located and is the water service for the Phase 2 building the same size as Phase 1? What size line would be going to the Phase 1 building? Mr. Chagnon stated that it would be 6”. If they cannot reuse that 6”, they will have to go back and cap the main, retap 2-3 feet away and run new lines. There should be a note to that affect.

Mr. Taintor – Regarding the trees that will be put in on Maplewood Avenue, they should be shifted up a little away from the drain.

Mr. Desfosses – Stated that 10’ from the street lights for the trees would be helpful and they should not be over the drain. The applicant will move it to the north. Mr. Desfosses requested that the applicant make a note for coordination with the Parking Division for parking device layout. There could be parking meters on Deer Street.

Mr. Taintor stated that the Site Plan Review Regulations were just changed. There is a requirement to record site, layout and landscaping plans so there are specific notes that should be added to the plan. Those notes can be found in Section 2.13 of the Site Plan Review Regulations (now on the City website). Since there is modification to the VFW site they must be co-applicants in this process and the site plan must be recorded for both properties. Regarding the open space calculation on C3, he asked what is included in that open space (26.6%) and if the sidewalks included?

Mr. Chagnon - The applicant is counting sidewalks as “open space”.

Mr. Taintor– Sidewalks cannot be included as “open space” An area that is primarily impervious cannot be “open space”.

The Chair opened the public hearing and asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Taintor stated that the Architectural Plans have to be redone.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this application (in order for the relatively minor changes to be made.) until the TAC meeting on January 7th, 2015. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the January 7, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....
D. The application of **Moray, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **235 Commerce Way**, and **215 Commerce Way, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **215 Commerce Way**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 4-story office building with a footprint of 28,125 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 112,500 ± s.f., and 640 parking spaces serving the proposed building and an adjacent existing office building (including a parking deck with 161 spaces below grade), with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 216 as Lot 1-8A and Lot 1-8B and lie within the Office Research (OR) District. (This application was postponed at the December 2, 2014 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Greg Halsey, with Tighe and Bond, was present to speak to the application. This project previously received Site Plan and Subdivision approvals for a proposed office building. The approval sought today is the same as it was in 2009. The plan is to merge and subdivide 235 Commerce Way (largely undeveloped with overgrown vegetation) with 215 Commerce Way by removing the middle property line and also including a lot line revision. Mr. Halsey provided a brief overview of the plans which are to build a 4-story office (235 Commerce Way) building and deck. They will be providing a parking deck with 634 parking spaces. The office entrance will be on Commerce Way. They have made some changes based on feedback they received from TAC in early December. They will provide 4 additional bike racks (4 more than originally planned). They have moved 6 parking spaces (to prevent traffic congestion). In addition, the applicant is also providing a continuous walkway from Commerce Way across to the first entrance off Portsmouth Boulevard and vertical granite curbing. In addition, they will also repave Portsmouth Boulevard from the intersection of Commerce Way and Portsmouth Boulevard up to 30 feet past the last entrance to the hotel (to be coordinated with DPW).

Mr. Desfosses- One issue is the sewer connection. The applicant will show an alternate way of hooking up to the sanitary sewer. Storm drainage for the site currently ties into the catch basin, which is not preferable. The drainage pipes along Commerce Way need to be upgraded. This plan proposed that this is already done. So there needs to be stipulations that if Commerce Way is not completed, the applicant will take measures to ensure this upgrade, or alternatively wait until the Commerce Way project is completed. This needs to be finalized. They are also optimizing the signal at Portsmouth Boulevard and Market Street. DPW requests an upgrade to the signal due to the changes in standards. All signals along the Woodbury Ave corridor will need to be changed so they all match. Portsmouth would like a contribution from the applicant for the Portsmouth Boulevard signal to be upgraded to Optical Detection (fish eye style cameras). The City would also like a contribution from the applicant to rebuild the handicap ramps and upgrade the current pedestrian signals. Where Commerce Way has only one sidewalk and is on the other side of the street, and whereas the Portsmouth Boulevard sidewalk is asphalt (not city standard) and is new, the sidewalk constructed 12 years ago has settled and is in bad

shape. The City could use a sidewalk there rather than constructing a second sidewalk along Commerce Way.

Mr. Halsey - This plan was approved in May of 2013. There has been at least one extension. If there has been no further extension, the plans have expired. Whether it is bonded is uncertain.

Mr. Desfosses – The status of the Commerce Way Project has been approved, but funding for the landscaping is still up in the air.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger – Driving into the site from Portsmouth Boulevard, looking straight ahead, the parking deck is at the same level as the underground parking level. He asked what the load capability was

Mr. Halsey – It can accommodate fire trucks and a WB62 tractor trailer.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger– He would like to see a pound number (needs to be at least 80,00 lbs in capacity).

Greg Halsey – There is no intent to phase the project. The intent is to build the complete project all at once.

Mr. Taintor – Requested that the applicant remove the words “phasing” from the plan.

Mr. Taintor asked the applicant to look at the new revised Site Review Regulations, Section 2.13, for recording site plans. The Traffic Study that was done was for this plan.

The Chair opened the public hearing and asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition

Martin Torres, of 2 Osprey Drive, has several concerns about the project. There are 640 spaces, all of which will empty out onto one intersection. He is concerned that there will be a backup of traffic and feels that 2 exits on Portsmouth Boulevard may be needed. The lighting for the project is objectionable. He asked if the lighting is going to be amber or white. Another concern is the amount of green space; the planting that is currently planned (Honey Locust trees) will not provide adequate screening particularly for an area that allows 640 parking spaces. He requests solid screening such as arborvitae. The parking lot with the lighting and cars will be very obtrusive.

Mr. Taintor- The Site Plan Regulations limit driveways to one per lot so this project would require a waiver as 3 parking lots are proposed. The only screening is along Portsmouth Boulevard. Screening should be enhanced along the edge of the parking lot and on the interior.

The Chair opened the public hearing and asked if anyone else was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Ms. Walker moved to postpone to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting in order to review a Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Cracknell seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Walker stated that there is some guidance needed. Ms. Walker and Mr. Eby will look at the Traffic Impact Study and get back to Mr. Pezzullo. Sidewalk guidance and straightening out the driveway is also needed. Regarding open space calculations; Ms. Walker feels that the property extends further than is shown on the site plan. Do not include parts of the property less than 5'.

Mr. Defosses requested a review of the drainage study and inquired as to what color the LED lights would be.

Mr. Halsey– The LED’s will be (bright) white 4,000 Kelvins (this is the type of lighting Mr. Torres finds obtrusive). This may need to be reconsidered. They have requested a waiver from the requirement for the trees along Commerce Way.

.....

E. The application of **Merton Alan Investments, LLC, Owner** and **Robert Graham, Applicant**, for property located on **Bartlett Street and Cate Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 3-story office building with a footprint of 10,000 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 30,000 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 165 as Lot 1 and lies within the Industrial (I) District. (This application was postponed at the December 2, 2014 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this matter to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting. Mr. Cracknell seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone this matter to the next regularly scheduled TAC hearing passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

[None]

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn at 4:40pm was made and seconded and passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully Submitted,

Toni McLellan
Acting Secretary for the Planning Board