

MINUTES

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2:00 PM

JUNE 2, 2015

**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; Raymond Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking & Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Portsmouth Fire Department; and Chris Roth, Portsmouth Police Department

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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 May 5, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

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

The motion to postpone to the June 30, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Loyal Order of Moose, Lodge 444, Owner**, and **Chinburg Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **1163 Sagamore Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of existing building and the construction of 11 single family dwellings and a private roadway, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 224 as Lot 17 and lies within the Mixed

Residential Office (MRO) District. (This application was postponed at the May 5, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, was present along with Colin Densmore, also from Ambit Engineering, who did the drainage analysis work. Mr. Chagnon first noted for future notices that the property is now owned by Chinburg Development and they will also change the plans. This project is a reuse of the Moose Lodge property and will consist of a private roadway with 11 private dwelling units. The site currently has a driveway between two homes leading to the Moose Lodge in the back which has some private utilities and the property is zoned MRO. There is a property survey in the plan set.

The Existing Conditions Plan shows a large paved area and some ledge outcrops, walkways, a septic system on the west side of the building and some topography from the building down to Sagamore Creek, to the east of the site.

The Demolition Plan shows what they will do prior to construction. They are removing the existing building and pavement and making utility changes to prep for the development.

Sheet C-3 shows what they are proposing which includes a private road coming in with a sidewalk on the west side. They are designating limited common areas where a single residence will be built. The proposed buildings are on the plan for the purpose of approval. The actual buildings will be very similar but picked by the buyers so they can customize them.

Regarding utilities, they will tap the water main in Sagamore Avenue and bring the water line along and in the private roadway with a hydrant at the end. Electric will be served off the existing overhead lines in Sagamore Avenue and fed underground throughout the project to the homes. There will be propane tanks for each individual unit. Sewer will be a common force main, run in the road out to Sagamore Avenue and connected to the existing sewer in a new extension of sewer down Sagamore Avenue.

The Grading Plan shows a number of stormwater facilities on both the east and west sides of the site to handle stormwater run-off. There is an Erosion Control Plan Roadway Profile showing the proposed road slope coming off of Sagamore to a central low point in the middle of the site and continuing to the end of the site. That will allow them to collect all of the drainage from the road and associated areas and bring it to their drainage collection and treatment system. There is a profile of Sagamore Avenue showing the connection to an existing sewer manhole. They will bring the forcemain out to Sagamore Avenue to a point where they will construct a gravity extension and put the force main into the gravity extension.

Landscaping plans, lighting plans showing street lights along the street. Decorative. Street tree plantings. Individual unit planting to highlight the landscaping around the units. Details on the stormwater treatment and detention facilities.

Appeared at WS on 4/28. Notes were added to the plans about the water line being private. It will be a 3" force main. Moved hydrant and also added some width to the turnout for the fire trucks at the end of the proposed driveway. Did not drainage design that took structures out of 100' freshwater wetland buffer. Grading associated with outfall that will require a CUP. That application has been filed. There is a detail showing extended sidewalk down Sagamore Avenue connecting to the sidewalk installed as part of the bridge project.

Colins Densmore – stormwater drainage system. Existing system had one large pond and they are now splitting it up to one exposed detention basin and two smaller bio retention raingarden systems. Function of the stormwater detention pond is to provide detention capacity and treatment. That will take care of the drainage from center line of proposed road to the east. To the west they have the two smaller bio detention units that will provide stormwater treatment to all of the new construction services. They have managed to make stormwater design flows less than ????. They have an application that will be submitted for Alteration of Terrain as well.

Chagnon – Unless there are any other items they wish to have him present, they look forward to receiving their approval and moving forward to the PB>

JW – clarification on access on private road. There was a question about access other than public safety. Is there any reason for other access and what about trash? Chagnon – they would anticipate that the City may want an easement to access certain items such as water meters, hydrant, etc. Their understanding is that it will be a private water line but the City will put in meters at the individual units. The hydrants will be private and there will be a requirement to test it and they might ask the City to take that over for a fee is possible. Solid waste will be sub-let out to a private company and no plans for dumpster. There would be a private collector that would come at certain intervals.

JW – Snow plowing would also be done and are there concerns about access for the City (hydrants, water units). RT – all maintenance will be the responsibility of the Association and it will have to be clear.

Britz – thanks for moving the storm water out of the buffer. On the detention basin it looks like there is a rip rap basin and where does that go? Colin – that is a riprap rundown and the purpose is to manage the run off from the road. RT – it appears they have work and drainage in three separate places on City property so they will need easements for all three locations from the City Council. Are they working on that? Chagnon n- they identified in the initial submission the deed that was made to their predecessors in title. The property line denotes the line between the City and Moose property. At one point in time the property went down to the creek and back around and the Moose entered into a lot line agreement with Shaines before developing Tucker's Cover to move the lot line. There was a reservation in the deed that allows for drainage from the Moose property onto that parcel. Part of April submittal packet, and refers to parcels that were shown on the attached plan that were created back in 1985. They are at the point of needed to meet with City and work through this being the location for the drainage as they develop. He was not aware of any other subsequent locations worked on by anyone.

RT – should the City be a co-applicant on the CUP permit? JC – they can amend the application to include that.

Ray – easement requirements. There is currently a drainage pipe discharging onto this property that eventually goes to City property. Changing the characteristics of the drainage so they definitely need to look at that for easement requirements. The other one is more of a sheet flow drainage from that property onto City property. That is sure needs to be looked at.

DD – not unreasonable request but at the same time, there are two piped outfalls in an emergency spill way. Outfall behind #3 & #4 is a 24” pipe and it should not be outfalling onto a slope. They show riprap coming out for a way and the water running down the slope. He thinks the entire banking should be riprapped to avoid erosions. The roads plan to have underdrains and the plans show that the foundation drains from the homes show that they connect under the road. No under design for that. At least 10 houses tie into that. They will need a design for that drain. Also not shown on the profile where that underdrain is. Due to nature of soils and blasting that will occur, the pipe should be at the same elevation as the force main so they are not under water all of the time. That needs to be detailed better. They should also make sure cleanouts have cast iron or ductile covers on them. Its okay but needs to be detailed well to work.

DD definitely not crazy about the due sude details on the road. He thinks the entire road will flood and crust over the sidewalk. Need some overflow design. Need treatment but looking positive drain under the roadway.

Demolition Plan on C-2, Pole 5912 over 1 is specified to remain although on private property. Owner of 1171 must have allowed PSNH to put in a pole. If that pole were to remain it would do nothing. That pole doesn't go anywhere else and the wire should also be removed. Telephone building shown on the parcel only shows some utilities going to it whereas everything needs to be labels. Note to cut and cap should be on Sagamore Avenue, not where it is shown. JC indicated there is another note of Sagamore. The other note is for utilities that they didn't want to mess with. 59L/1 doesn't have anything on it. Telephone and power for the Moose.

Mailbox pull off on Sagamore is very close and traffic will be coming around the corner. Request pull out is bigger and soften turns in and out. It is very tight for a car to pull in and try to get out with car coming around the corner. Granite should be labeled as sloped granite curb. Sidewalk doesn't need to follow the curvature in. Straighten out the sidewalk.

Plan calls for sloped concrete curb which doesn't work in this climate. The same price as sloped granite curb. JC – can show them an installation in Rye where this has help up very well. They are mountable and not curbcuts per se. DD – okay. Bring pictures to next meeting.

What is grading intention behind #6 - #8? Are those walk-outs and back yards are elevation 22+. Should show limited clearing in the back yard so that doesn't get clear cut. Some sort of designation ..? 3L pole into City property drainage system, overflow for detention area. Limit amount of penetration onto City property. JC – it is like that because of the existing culvert.

Lighting – seems to be overdone considering the use of the site currently. Adding that much light to the backyard might be problematic. Would like to have a discussion.

Didn't specify pavement type. Expect 1 ½" binder and 1 ½" of top.

DD done>

Ray: reiterate about sidewalk chase details. He does not believe they will work either. It's even difficult getting drainage back up in the street and these are right at the curb. The slope – past the opening. Again, no catch basin in the road to receive the water.

Pumping system – standar City low pressure pumping system. They aren't compatible with the new one they have. The ones submitted are high flow. Positive displacement pumps. Complications arise when you deal with those two different pipes and flows> He did not see the design calcs for that system. JC pointed out the pump information was in their submission. Ray said utimately the pump system is not compatible. JC – can the City provide them with a pump spec. Ray – these are more high flow pumps and it gets tricky. They can talk about it later.

Ray – servicing the existing home on Sagamore. Sent out noticed to homeowners to see if they could be served with gravity. JC – Notices when out yesterday. They are looking to see if the two off site homes, lowing it a little would allow them to go gravity.

Ray – the details provided fo the manholes and pumping system are quite different from what the City would normally require. They can also talk about that.

DD – what size force main are they running? JC – the final design they got back form Barnes from a 3". They are running 3" but there was a 2" note left over. If they switch pump systems, they may go back to a 2" system.

Eric – traffic coners. Agreed mailbox pull out was too tight. Maybe they should shift it to the other side of the road and they wouldn't have to get out of their car. They have also increased the size of the hammerhead for the firetruck access. Any thought to doing a cul de sac rather htan large section of pavement. JC – they would take out more real estate with a cul de sac. Nick – they would have to move the houses but it would fit. He would support them taking another look at that. Worse case, if they can't do it, it would be etter to cobble on both sides to make it look better.

Carl – D-4 hydrant detail. Indicator post – talk to water department. City is now starting to use a different type of indicator. They can be seen on the rebuild on Sagamore.

RT – Utility Plan C-4, they carried over the existing LP tank form the Moose Lodge. Mistake. But he mentioned propane tanks and he doesn't see them on the plan. Tey shold be shown. This is a Site Plan and not a Subdivision Plan so the building cannot change. That also relates to a concern he has had that it is still a lot more like a subdiv ision than a condo plan. They are really subdivising land with all of the land they are setting aside. They almost have to get rid of the limited common area on the plan. The majority of the land is set aside for the individual units. They will have to work out with the Legal Dept. Looking at the whole driveway issue, he shares the thoughts about a cul-de-sac but they would

have to change the limited common area. He has recommended several times that this be a cluster of townhouses and it was indicated there were some financial issues with that. He would recommend that they listen to what he is saying and try to make it more of a condo plan and less of a subdivision plan.

The road will have a continuous sloped granite curb. Driveways crossing the sloped concrete curb. JC – correct. It is 3”. RT – units at the end of the driveway, Unit #9, they have a wide expanse of pavement. Driveway for #9 is on a curve of sloped concrete curb. It is an odd plan. Explain details regarding sidewalk. Sheet D-2, Detail F and M. John – they are incorrect and need to be revised. JC – there was a concern with the last design at TAC about the design line so they came up with this as the solution. DD doesn’t have a problem with it but has a problem with the concrete and the 6”. He has used Cape Cod curb and it doesn’t have to be 6” to be effective. They should take a look at it.

Britz – back of lots and looking for something to delineate the ..??

Eric Chinburg, turn around and limited common area. Turn around large for firetrucks but any flexibility in turn around area so it doesn’t look so massive. DD – it is also going to be for the trash pick up every week. They should build it robustly. Eric – they have done projects before where trash pick up comes in a much smaller truck. This is controlled by the fire dept. Carl – they provided the turning template to the designer for their largest vehicle. DD – chances are they are not going to bring their largest truck into the development and it should not dictate the size of the pavement. Carl – the ladder is comparable to the larger truck. They don’t want to pave the world but they need to get their trucks in. Nick – a cul de sac breaks the pavement up with landscaping but the down side is they have to move the houses. He thinks they actually moved units which makes it difficult. If turning radius doesn’t have to be for the largest truck, they could make it smaller. They could try the cul de sac and see if it is feasible. Carl – they may want to look at whether there are other means to protect the development. Eric – what is the sprinkler? DD they will still need a turn around. Carl – they would look at that. Eric – would be happy to look at sprinkling the building to avoid all of the pavement.

Eric – understand the limited common area concern. They can make a note that the units have a 10’ band around the buildings. RT – this is something that their attorney will have to discuss. Eric – if they drew these building footprints as rectangles rather than jogs, could they avoid going back for Planning Board approval? RT – it will be a complete plan set everything they do that. That is the difference between a subdivision plan and a site review plan.

Called for public speakers:

John Hebert, direct abutter, 1169 Sagamore Avenue. That telephone pole has to stay as it services the house in the back. It is a cottage with power running to it. He needs electrical power to it. That pole can’t stay 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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

3:05 pm.

JW – missing some zoning verification of open space, etc., on plan set. JC – they will add that.

DD – motion to postpone to the next meeting to revise plans more in accordance with stipulations they have presented today and the case of the sewer design being more in line with the City standard.

Britz – 2nd.

Motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Lonza Biologics, Applicant**, for property located at **101 International Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the expansion of the existing facility including exterior improvements that include a mezzanine with cooling towers; concrete pads for four transformers, one generator and one future generator, one control house, one nitrogen tank; one compactor pad, electric duct bank and two electric manholes, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lot 6 and lies within the Pease Airport Business & Commercial (ABC) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe & Bond, presented on behalf of the Applicant. Paul Plummer from Lonza and Michael Mates from PDA. They are present for site improvements for a fit up expansion to an approval from 2006. Those improvements include a mezzanine for cooling towers, ..(tape)...

Rec'd comments at last week's Work Session and provided revised plans today. This project is unique as they are looking at extension expansions but it also ties into previous approvals.

Site Construction Logistics Plan for construction management. Shows lot they will be leasing from the PDA during construction. Shows silt fence and erosion control. They removed the sheet showing off site signage but were told they could not have any signage off site.

They combined existing approvals for the Site Plan and shows the details for Corporate Drive> They added all utilities, existing drainage in the road and extends down to culvert that was discussed at TAC WS.

Demo plan was blown up with details. Shows demo work relative to CT expansion and temporary fence removal to construct duct tanks. It is a more effective stormwater detention unit

Overall Site Plan – was not in the previous package. Added to show site data, parking and ADA spaces. With respect to Board’s question, they proposed to remove ADA spaces on side. There are 11 spaces on site currently so those on the side are not required.

Site Plan blow up detail show CT Expansion work and deferred improvements from 2006 & 2007 approvals. They made an attempt to add labels that show work to be done as part of this expansion. On completion in 2017, the prior work that had been deferred will be completed. Work that Lonza would like to further defer they noted. For Site Plan in rear, they have the two generator pad locations, control house, transformers..... grading and utility plan. They have meshed the two plans. Lonza is committed to doing this work at end of 2017. There had been a question about sidewalk extension from the existing driveway. It was previously noted as temporary but is not permanent. Work would be done concurrently with 2017 work. Prior landscaping approved would be done by 2017. The sidewalk construction and revised driveway will all be part of 2017. What they are looking at is deferment of work adjacent to building – the reason being future construction projects as it will have to be torn out to get into the building for future projects. That touches on the question of what is being built now and what will be done in the future.

Some work will take 2 years to do and they would like to do it before the off site work. They will do temporary patching in the street on the short term and in 2017 they would go out and complete Corporate Drive reconstruction, sidewalk and landscaping.

Michael Mates from PDA. Patrick was leading them down the correct path. He pointed out the work they are looking for approval today and is the work necessary to complete the fit up. Once that has been completed, they will finish up the work that has previously been approved by the City but has been deferred by the PDA. The City does not deal with deferrals and they understand the hoops that Lonza has to jump through so they do not have a problem with this plan. They currently have over a \$1 million bond from Lonza for this project.

PC – they are requesting a waiver for over 18 spaces without a landscaped island. Where this is on the industrial side of the building and already heavily screened, they are requesting a waiver for the island. The project will also require a variance as they do not allow above ground storage tanks over 2000 gallons related to hazardous materials. In this case diesel tanks for generators. They are requesting a variance for two existing generators that exceed 2000 gallons and the proposed which also exceed 2,000 gallons.

PC – Carl had a question about the radio testing and they added Note 11 to the Site Plan.

Grading and Drainage Plan – shows the regrading of the loading area, duct bank, etc. ... previously approved drainage improvements for Goosebay Drive. There is stormwater collected from the site, fed into the system treatment unit. Also proposed site plan new drainage ties in as well. First inch of runoff is treated and outlets into the existing pipe that runs down. Three culverts come across the street and then there is this one drain pipe. Goosebury Drive will also be going into this drain pipe? PC – yes. DD – acute angle on drain pipe – can it come off of PCP3 instead? PC – yes. He would be happy to review the drainage with DD. Requested more arrows and labels.

C3-B Note 14 that upon completion of Goosebay Drive in 2017 ... DD – two things are missing. One is that the City will agree with the design prior to the permit being applied for and that Lonza will actually construct the improvement as well as obtain the permit for them. Britz, one more thing, it seems to make sense to get the sediment out now prior to the new construction. It is pretty maxed out and it will be a bigger job than if they clean it out now and give it the capacity it needs. DD – a massive dredging operation needs to be done on the swale so it has more capacity and is wider. DD – Britz is saying they need to do something immediately and a clean up project can fall under the construction project. The sponge pool should be cleaned out now and Britz doesn't believe they even need a permit and won't disturb anything. If they need a permit then they should get one. It is a storm drain mix. DD – they need to look at how much flow goes through that swale to determine how wide that needs to be to handle that volume. That did not get done last time.

Ray – on the additional tanks being constructed, diesel and nitrogen tank. Does that trigger anything for stormwater drainage/catch basin. They are required to file the tanks with DES. Being so close to the catch basin, does that propose any challenges? It is a double walled tank. Anything they do will have to meet DES standards.

Eric – handicapped spaces? Patrick – four spaces in the garage, right next to the elevator.

RT – Sheet 3-B, there are two sets of notes inside the building with one blocked out? PC – the full note is on 3CA. Clean it up.

RT – Note 12 about requesting the driveway be granted permanent approval. Was that part of this request? PC – it is. The prior driveway was approved at temporary. PDA requested that they add that note. RT - assume PDA has looked at this plan and waivers and variances are the only ones required

JW – driveway indicator is previously approved. Green is what will be constructed in 2017. Blue is previously approved. PC – the note should be clarified as to what needs to be constructed.

DD – catch basin empties into that structure from Goosebay Drive and the pipe is full of material. Looks like they're removing the structure? PC – yes. DD – add note so structure gets removed.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval with the conditions discussed at today's hearing. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses indicated the stipulation deal with stormwater. The first was from Mr. Britz about cleaning the plunge pool immediately and they might also want to add erosion control at that point so they don't have sediment going into the system any further. The second was 2017, as part of the finishing of this round of permits, the swale on the side of Goosebay Drive will be engineered to be an appropriate width based on all of the different flow that goes into it. That the permit will be applied

for and Lonza will construct the improvements to the satisfaction of the City of Portsmouth. All plan modifications shall be submitted to DPW for review prior to the Planning Board meeting.

The motion to recommend Site Plan approval passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of **One Way Realty, LLC, Owner, and 406 Highway 1 ByPass, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **406 Route 1 By-Pass**, requesting Site Plan Approval to demolish the existing building and construct a new 3-story building (brewery, pub and office) with a footprint of 5,857 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 20,033 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 172 as Lot 2 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this application to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the June 30, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....
III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:40 pm was seconded and passed unanimously.
.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M Shouse
Acting Secretary