

MINUTES

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2:00 PM

JANUARY 5, 2016

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 Edy, Parking & Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Portsmouth Fire Department; Acting Deputy Police Chief Frank Warchol

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Amba Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **806 Route 1 By-Pass**, requesting Site Plan Approval to expand the first floor of an existing building by 5,150 ± s.f. (footprint and gross floor area) for proposed retail use and add a new second floor with 4,450 ± s.f. (footprint and gross floor area for proposed office use, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 161 as Lot 43 and lies within the Business (B) District. (This application was postponed at the December 1, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application until the February 2nd TAC meeting.
Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone discussion of this application until the February 6, 2016 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Borthwick Forest, LLC, KS Borthwick, LLC, Atlantic Star Communications, HCA Realty, Inc., and Jackson Gray Condominium Association, Owners**, for property located **off Islington Street and Borthwick Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval as follows:

1. To consolidate the following four lots:
 - a. Lot 25 as shown on Assessor Map 241 having an area of 22.807 ± acres,
 - b. Lot 26 as shown on Assessor Map 241 having an area of 4.927 ± acres,
 - c. Lot 113 as shown on Assessor Map 233 having an area of 13.815 ± acres,
 - d. Lot 112 as shown on Assessor Map 233 having an area of 0.732 ± acre;and to re-subdivide the consolidated lot into two new lots and a public right-of-way as follows:

- a. Proposed Lot “25/26” having an area of 25.523 ± acres and 979.37 ± feet of continuous frontage on a proposed street,
 - b. Proposed Lot “112/113” having an area of 15.404 ± acres and 981.09 ± feet of continuous frontage on a proposed street,
 - c. Proposed City right-of-way having an area of 1.354 ± acres.
2. For a Lot Line Revision, to create a public right-of-way, as follows:
 - a. Lot 2-2 as shown on Assessor Map 240 decreasing in area from 4.978 ± acres to 4.584± acres with 571.58 feet of continuous frontage on Borthwick Avenue,
 - b. Lot 7-4A as shown on Assessor Map 234 decreasing in area from 9.085 ± acres to 8.639 ± acres with 1,127.14 ± feet of continuous frontage on Borthwick Avenue,
 - c. Proposed City right-of-way having an area of 0.840 ± acre.
 3. For a Lot Line Revision, to create a public right-of-way, as follows:
 - a. Lot 114 as shown on Assessor Map 233 decreasing in area from .404 ± acres to 0.261 ± acre, with 116.54 feet of continuous frontage on Islington Street,
 - b. Proposed City right-of-way having an area of 0.143 ± acre.

The application also proposes to relocate and dedicate to the City as public rights-of-way two separate 60-foot rights-of-way across land owned by the Boston & Maine Railroad, which in conjunction with the above subdivision and lot line revisions will result in a new City street between Borthwick Avenue and Islington Street with a total length of 1,830 ± lf and a total right-of-way area of 2.642 ± acres. Said properties are located in the Office Research (OR) District which requires a minimum lot size of 3 acres and 300’ of continuous street frontage and Lot 114 as shown on Assessor Map 233 is in the Single Residence B (SRB) District which requires a minimum lot size of 15,000 s.f. and 100’ of continuous street frontage. (This application was postponed at the December 1, 2015 TAC meeting.)

C. The application of **HCA Realty, Inc., Owner**, for property located **off Borthwick Avenue**, and **Jackson Gray Condominium Association**, for property located at **330 Borthwick Avenue**,, requesting Site Plan Approval for the reconfiguration of an existing parking area and construction of a roadway, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 234 as Lot 7-4-A and Assessor Map 240 as Lot 2-2 and lie within the Office Research (OR) District(This application was postponed at the December 1, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair asked for a motion to consider the two applications 1-B and 1-C under Old Business together.

Mr. Britz moved to consider the two applications together, and it was seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion to consider the two applications together passed unanimously.

The Chair read the two notices into the record and asked who was present to speak to the applications.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Sharon Somers, with the firm of Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella, was present to represent the Applicant. Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe & Bond, was also present.

Ms. Somers stated she would report on road design and issues and would present a brief report indicating they have made submittals to the City regarding traffic issues. She said that Jason Plourd of

Tighe & Bond was not present but he would explain the conclusions on the traffic analysis at the February 2nd TAC meeting.

She stated they would provide a review of the gravel, wetlands and drainage issues. Additionally, there were two other items requested by the City. They were working with Mr. Taintor on the peer review relative to easements and a bridge rendering would be presented at the February 2nd TAC meeting.

She commented that following the January TAC meeting, they would continue with the resolution of the issues, particularly regarding drainage and the bridge rendering, and revisit and describe how this would benefit the City, both in terms of traffic, and conformance to the Master Plan. Ms. Somers stated that their goal was to resolve all engineering issues and then look for a favorable recommendation from TAC at the February meeting.

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe & Bond provided a status update of outstanding engineering issues. He began with the Site Plan revisions, referring to the plan that was displayed. He stated they had revised the site plans to address City comments regarding road alignment and the multi-use paths. The latest plan still included a 28 foot wide road width with two 11 foot lanes and 3 foot shoulders on each side. There would be a 12 foot wide multi-use path. A landscape buffer would be provided in the area where there was no retaining wall.

Mr. Crimmins described the intersections and how the multi-use paths would tie in. At the intersection with Borthwick Avenue, the crossing would allow for safe passage of pedestrians and bicyclists. They have changed from a single lane to two turning lanes for cars turning, based on comments they had received.

Mr. Crimmins stated they were working on the bridge rendering requested by the City and looked forward to presenting that at the February TAC meeting. They planned to show the retaining wall design in connection with the bridge rendering. They also planned to provide additional detail in the coming months regarding the bridge design and the retaining walls. Mr. Crimmins showed where the retaining walls would terminate.

He stated that another revision was based on questions regarding how the multi-use path would integrate with the Rail to Trail. A raised speed table would slow down vehicles and provide more safety, there was a perpendicular stop on the other side of the road, and they continued the pedestrian sidewalk. This design would provide residents coming from the Vine Street neighborhood access from either side of Islington Street.

Mr. Crimmins stated that with these revisions to the multi-use path layout, they believed they had addressed the primary concerns and looked forward to finalizing the details in January, so they could get a recommendation at the February TAC meeting.

Mr. Crimmins discussed revisions to the gravel wetlands and drainage, beginning with the Borthwick Avenue side of bridge. The revisions were based on concerns regarding an existing sewer easement. They have moved that gravel wetland closer to Borthwick Avenue, and now it was away from the tie in to the new sewer main. Regarding the next gravel wetland, there had been concerns regarding a public and a private combined runoff system. They were re-engineering that, working with staff, and would be resolving that issue in the next month.

Mr. Crimmins stated that not much had changed in the utility plan aside from the sewer, which he had spoken about. They have pulled the wetland away from the sewer line. There was a 70 foot railroad easement they would relocate to allow for the road to cross the railroad without entering into the wetland buffer. Essentially, they had realigned the easement and pulled it to the east. The sewer line would now be 14 feet away from the base of the retaining wall.

That concluded Mr. Crimmins summary of the changes with respect to the site plans. They did receive the peer review response from the City, dated December 15, 2015. The applicant team had reviewed it, and they prepared a response letter to the City on December 22, 2015. They looked forward to making sure all concerns were addressed.

The Chair said that the team had done a good job addressing the concerns regarding the intersections and the other revisions as well. He stated that they have had some internal conversation about the multi-use path, and they would communicate directly to Mr. Crimmins on those details, mainly with respect to how the path interfaces with the major road.

The Chair asked the Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Pezzullo asked for clarification on the sewer where it crosses the proposed road and if they would provide more detail on that with respect to how it would be constructed and any related requirements.

Ms. Walker asked if the black dots on the site plan were lighting. If so, she asked if they were all the same and if they had provided details on the lighting.

Mr. Crimmins answered that the dots were lighting, and that he believed they did provide details on lighting on Sheet C-11.

Mr. Taintor inquired about Islington Street where the Rail Trail crosses the proposed road. He said there were four places with stops where bikes cross the road; one of the four was shown going partway across the road. He asked if that was intentional.

Mr. Crimmins answered that it might be an error on their part.

Mr. Taintor asked for a clarification on the plan, possibly with a dashed line, regarding that correction with more detail to specify the distinction between the paths.

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

Rick Beckstead, of 1395 Islington Street, stated he still has concerns regarding the runoff. Concerns were addressed and presented for the Borthwick side, but nothing was presented regarding the Islington side. There was no sewer at that end of Islington Street. He stated that he still had concerns regarding the connector road and how this would benefit the City. This area was zoned for office research, but a road connecting neighborhoods went against the Master Plan. He requested that TAC please look at the City as a whole.

Paul Mannle, of 1490 Islington Street, stated that he was against this project and that it violated the Master Plan, specifically Land Use 7-6, which called for a comprehensive study, which had not been done. He then cited Transportation 2.5 which was about making a more walkable Portsmouth. He said

this proposed road would make traffic volumes higher on the cut-throughs to get to Islington Street. They would be approving this road without knowing what the proposed development would be. Mr. Mannle stated that the Conservation Commission had previously rejected a similar road for the reason of not knowing what the development would be. He would ask TAC to consider that any future development would always be required to go through the Conservation Commission, as this project was designed so that it does not have to go through the Conservation Commission. He said there was no communication from the City prior to the Abutters Notice.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Ms. Walker made a motion to postpone Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval of the applications until the February 2, 2016 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Cracknell asked what the purpose of Map 233, Lot 114 was.

Mr. Taintor said that was the lot they have to get the easement across, and one of the issues was a water line that cut across it. He referred to Sheet 6-B and said this was a good point because they did not have an updated subdivision plan.

Mr. Taintor said that when the next plan comes and they received an updated road plan, that they would also receive an updated subdivision plan.

Mr. Cracknell proposed a passive use park with a buffer to the neighborhood.

The motion to postpone Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval until the February 2, 2016 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

Ms. Walker made a motion to postpone Site Plan approval of the applications until the February 2, 2016 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone Site Plan approval until the February 2, 2016 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

D. The application of **Two International Construction, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **100 International Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval for an 80 space expansion of the northwest parking lot, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 306 as Lot 2 and lies within the Pease Industrial (I) District. (This application was postponed at the December 1, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Sean Tobey, with Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, indicated that Dan Plummer and Ryan Plummer with Two International Group, and Michael Mates, with Pease Development Authority, were also in attendance.

Mr. Tobey briefly reviewed the project details as presented at the December 1, 2015 TAC meeting. He said the existing site had 379 parking spaces, and they were seeking to add 80 additional spaces based on a calculation of the total projected employee count. He referred to Sheet C-4.

Based on comments they received at the December 1, 2015 TAC meeting, he stated that the two abandoned pipes were just abandoned culverts, approximately 10 feet long. They would be left in place and were out of their project limits.

They had conducted two additional test pits, one in the north corner and one in the center of the parking, so in total, they had completed four pits. They did not find any standing water, having dug down 8.5-9 feet, and the seasonal high was 4 feet.

Based on comments they had received, they chose to go with standard drainage pipes and have removed the two infiltration pipes coming from the catch basins before they entered into the pond. The groundwater recharge will come in the retention pond and raise the orifice. They have taken the entire parking area and raised it 6 inches to reduce the cut into the hillside. They have graded a new swale around the parking area to direct water coming off the hill so that it would not enter the pond. They would add underdrains so that discharge would not go into the pond.

They would remove any phragmites in accordance with the New Hampshire Guide to Upland Invasive Species.

In response to comments they received, they would remove the portion of the sidewalk that was asphalt along International Drive, and they would upgrade the tip-down ramp at that intersection with new concrete sidewalks. He said they chose against providing a connection from the parking to the sidewalk to prevent people from using the parking to visit other businesses.

They provided a new revised trip generation based upon all four possible methods: am peak hour; pm peak hour; employee count and building square footage, and they came up with the highest number that they could, which was 290 average vehicle trips. They have provided that number to Pease, and they were okay with that number.

Mr. Pezzullo asked if on Sheet C-5 a couple of benchmarks that were listed as rim elevation were possibly typos.

Mr. Tobey confirmed that was a typo and that he would revise it.

Mr. Pezzullo noted that a square structure shown on the detail was listed as having a diameter.

Mr. Tobey responded that it should be a 48" x 48" square inside measurement.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that they had indicated erosion control on the plan set, however he was not able to determine what the type and specifications of those materials were. He asked that they include that information and include what product would be used.

Mr. Tobey said he believed they were using Mirafi® 140N or the equivalent, and that they would include that information.

Mr. Pezzullo referred to Sheet C-9 on which they show a line where the estimated seasonal high groundwater table was. They didn't show what it was or what the distance separation was between that and the micro pool. He asked that they indicate that on the plan.

Mr. Tobey said the estimated seasonal high was 62, and that the micro pool was designed to have permanent water in it.

Mr. Pezzullo asked if there was an elevation that they could identify there as well.

Mr. Tobey said the separation difference would be 1 foot, where the bottom of the pond would be 63, and the seasonal high would be 62.

Mr. Desfosses suggested that they should always show pavement thicknesses, and he asked them to take a look at the layers they represented because they seem out of step. He said he appreciated the changes that have been made and that it looked like they did a good job.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment and seeing no one rise, he closed public hearing.

The Chair opened the public hearing and called for speakers to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, he closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend the Site Plan Approval application to the Planning Board with the following stipulations: Regarding the drainage details, include the fabric specifications and implement the benchmark specification corrections; and include detail for the pavement thicknesses. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to recommend Site Plan Approval to the Planning Board was approved unanimously with the following stipulation:

- 1) The Site Plans shall be amended as follows:
 - a. On Sheet C-5, correct the labels for the two benchmarks (delete the word "rim").
 - b. On Sheet C-9, detail #1, add the specifications for the geosynthetic fabric.
 - c. On Sheet C-10, detail #1, review and adjust the thickness of the pavement layers.

E. The application of **New England Glory, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **525 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting a variance from the Board of Adjustment to create two lots where one currently exists. This matter was referred to the Technical Advisory Committee by the Board of Adjustment at their September 15, 2015 meeting for a recommendation on the variance request based on the number and location of dwelling units proposed for each lot, a plan for access and circulation proposed for both lots, and a rendering of the proposed building. Said property is shown on Assessor map 209 as Lot 85 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (This application was postponed at the December 1, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone the application until the February 2nd meeting.
Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone discussion of this application until the February 6, 2016 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of the **City of Portsmouth, Owner, and Prescott Park Arts Festival, Applicant**, for property located on **Marcy Street (Prescott Park)**, requesting Site Plan Approval to demolish the existing stage and sound booth and replace them with a new 3,145 s.f. stage with a deck and a 45 foot high canopy, and a new 8 foot x 8 foot sound booth, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 104 as Lots 1, 3-2 and 3-5 and lies within the Municipal (M) District and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into record.

Mr. Taintor said that he had spoken with applicant the day before and had communicated to them that an issue had arisen from the Charitable Trust Division of the Attorney General's Office about whether this structure would be allowable. That question was still undecided at this time. He indicated that the applicant did wish to proceed with the presentation as planned. Mr. Taintor stated that he did not expect TAC to take any action regarding this application at that day's meeting.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Tracy Kozak, an architect with JSA, Inc. indicated that Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering was also present to represent the applicant, Prescott Park Arts Festival. She stated that this presentation was a follow-up to November 24 for a reconstructed stage and control booth at Prescott Park. She distributed some supplemental information as a hand out in response to requests and questions from the work session.

Ms. Kozak showed a slide that represented the existing conditions plan and also a plan of the proposed project showing the new stage orientation and configuration. She said the idea behind this application was that rather than repairing a dilapidated wood framed stage that has been in place for 40 years, they proposed instead to increase the safety and quality. By orienting the stage toward the water they could point the sound away from the surrounding neighborhoods, and install proper footings. They have proposed a canopy covering over the roof in two pieces, one of which would be permanent, the other would be seasonal. A smaller footprint of the stage would be possible due to the reorienting and relocating the stage.

Mr. Weinrieb stated they had a detailed survey of the existing conditions done at the site. They had JSA complete a geotechnical report and Independent Archeological Consulting did a Phase 1A archeological analysis of the site. There has been no excavation done to date, and they would have IAC on site prior to any excavation.

He stated that they had submitted the NHDES Wetlands Permit Application in December, and they expect they would be heard at the January 13th Conservation Commission meeting.

Mr. Weinrieb stated they were requesting two waivers as part of this application. They have proposed to use 24x36 drawing rather than the 22x34, which would allow them to do a better detailed design representation.

Mr. Weinrieb said they were also seeking a waiver for not having to have the soil scientists approve the plan because there were no wetlands there; it was open water, so they would use a wetlands scientist instead.

He said when they did the survey, they identified the canopy areas of trees and their heights, as well as their root structures. They wanted to build a walkway so as not to disturb the root structures. They have developed new grading for the site, creating a bowl, directing all the drainage down. They would plan to be cautious regarding drain lines so as not to disturb tree root structures. There was a manhole that had rusted backflow preventers on it, and it was hard to see where the drain lines went and they had not been able to locate any information about where they led to. They specified on the site plan that prior to starting construction, they would test that area during excavation to see if the pipe was live and they would make modifications if necessary. He said they believed that the line terminated in that area.

Mr. Weinrieb stated they were proposing three new walkways, following the City detail with a sand layer and pavers on top. The cross section has been reviewed and approved by the geo-tactical engineer. He said that landscape details would be provided as they moved forward.

The Chair asked if there were any questions regarding the site design.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the pit was at elevation 7 and what the purpose of the pit was. He also asked for confirmation that nothing would get stored in the pit.

Mr. Weinrieb verified that the pit was at elevation 7, and answered that the pit was for the orchestra, that nothing would get stored in there, and that it was open. There would be permanent storage under the stage.

Mr. Desfosses stated that would be below flood stage level.

Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that it would be.

Mr. Desfosses expressed they still have concern about the drainage line and not knowing what the slope would be. They needed to make sure to have adequate slope. Since the excavation had not been done, they would reserve comment on the drainage pipes at this time. He added that all structures should be 4 foot structures so that they could be cleaned.

Mr. Desfosses said he was still concerned about what the electrical needs would be versus what was there now. A large amount of electrical work went into a support building three years ago, and he stated they would want a report from an electrical engineer confirming the support building would be adequate for the needs of this structure. He also said that any utilities between the stage and the control booth should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Taintor asked where electrical panels would be relocated to.

Mr. Weinrieb said he would provide a site electrical drawing indicating that information.

Mr. Cracknell asked that for the three paths being shown as granite pavers, why they would want to introduce a third material when there was already brick and gravel. He suggested they might use stone dust with a granite edging.

The other issue that Mr. Cracknell commented on had come up at HDC and with residents having given him feedback. He said that when the stage facility was functioning it was not easy for the general public to move from the north side of Prescott Park, around the performance and on to the south side without having to go back out onto Marcy Street. It would be important for them to detail what the limit of work was when this venue was functioning. Identify where the rope lines and the edges are; identify where the people were requested to make payment to get in versus someone trying to get access to a boat. There should be some encouragement and protection for the public to go along the waterfront without having to make a donation. The edge between the Whale Lawn, the control booth and the stage should be better defined and made to be more inviting for people.

Mr. Cracknell stated his third comment was regarding the long 125 foot seasonal fence. It would be important for them to provide the detail on how it would go in; how it would function or if it would be removed during storm events.

Mr. Taintor stated he had previously asked for perimeter barriers to be shown on the plan. He did not see that those had been shown on the plan, and so he asked if any additional barriers would be erected for performances beside what was shown on the plan to control entrances and exits.

Ms. Kozak said they were not on the plan but they were shown on the second page of the handout given at the meeting. There would be roped and flagged areas, and the first page of the handout showed how that related to building codes and life safety codes, she said. Assuming the most conservative calculation approach of how many people could fit in the park, they used 7 square feet per person, based on recommendations by the codes. Based on that they could safely egress 40,000 people, but 20,000 was how many can safely fit in. The second page of the handout showed diagrams of where the flag roping would be, and those were shown in green. There were four openings, one at each corner of the square. She said they would end up with more open area because the footprint of the stage would be reduced.

Mr. Taintor asked about the red lines on the plan.

Ms. Kozak answered those were openings in the fence which would be the open perimeter of the boundary. The flagged roping was not shown on this diagram, as the roping changes slightly from show to show.

Mr. Taintor asked for clarification regarding the general public navigating around the roped venue without having to exit the park onto Marcy Street.

Ms. Kozak said that people would be able to get from one side of the park to the other going through the openings, and without having to exit onto Marcy Street.

Mr. Cracknell said it was not inviting to see people filing in through four openings, and it was not inviting to go from one waterfront area to another when they see lines and when it appeared that the Whale Lawn had been included in the crowd area. He suggested they think of a way to make that process more inviting to the public so that people didn't feel like they had to exit onto Marcy Street.

Ms. Kozak said they had a new section of sidewalk previously which would have connected the Whale Lawn to Water Street, they decided not to touch that yet, because there may be implications. This site plan presented was the lightest touch possible and allowed the plan to mesh with the Master Plan more seamlessly.

Mr. Cracknell said that until the Master Plan was done, a perimeter around the Whale Lawn would be a more conservative gesture so there would be no requirement for the public to go through an opening without going into the venue space.

Ms. Kozak said they would address that.

Mr. Cracknell asked about the trail material.

Ms. Kozak said they looked at that and they wanted to minimize the presence of the stage as much as possible and by having brick on the diagonal, it would call more attention to the structure vs. having it blend in more. That was the idea. One other change she wanted to point out, was that they moved a walkway.

Mr. Roediger said he read their occupancy numbers with a lot of trepidation and he was not sure he would interpret them in the same way. He would dispute defining the redline area as exits, as people tend to follow the pathways. To get out, he suggested they tighten that up and look at the age of the audience to analyze their tendency to not want to walk across the lawn. In the end, he said, when he sees large numbers it becomes a cause for a lot of pause, because on one side there was no egress from aside from jumping in the river.

Ms. Kozak said that was a good point, and that was right, that people do tend to leave in the same direction they came in from, and that they would go through to look at that.

Mr. Roediger asked if the plan really called for 11 seasonal trailers.

Ms. Kozak said that was what was used in the past, and this was what PPAF had indicated that they needed and used each year.

Mr. Roediger asked for alternatives; maybe a permanent structure that could have some lifesaving capabilities in it.

Ms. Kozak answered that was an excellent point, but that it would not be part of this phase of construction.

Mr. Taintor asked about how the trailers and fences would be placed at the beginning of the season, typically in May. There would be no roads for access so they would have to have a big crane to get them in there. He asked if there would be gates to the area aside from the one from the stage.

Ms. Kozak said there was an existing path behind the trailer area, and that was the limit of where the trailers would go. She showed on the slide that there were proposed two gates, one on the west side and one on the east side of the stage, and that there could be a third one added if deemed necessary. Also, they have reduced the footprint of the stage by eliminating one leg of the handicap ramp, a 5 foot by 40 foot area. They were able to do that by fine-tuning the grades.

Mr. Taintor commented that the landscaping plan does not match the site plan. The bricks were circular on the landscape plan and rectangular on the site plan.

Ms. Kozak said the landscaping plan was the updated version.

Mr. Taintor said that given that they had a slab storage area under the stage that there would be no way this could be a temporary structure, and that it would have to be permanent.

Ms. Kozak said yes, there were some seasonal structures, but the main roof over the performance area would need to be permanent to be able to withstand heavy winds and to have the steel frame needed to withstand all weather conditions, including snow loads. If they had gone to a seasonal canopy it would have to be much smaller, and it might not be able to withstand a sudden wind storm and it would not be as safe.

Mr. Taintor asked about fence along the walkway. He inquired about what the nature of that fence would be and what the surface of that fence would be.

Ms. Kozak said it would probably be the same as it was now, but that they could do something different.

Mr. Taintor said they were basically creating a wall that the fence does not hide very well.

Ms. Kozak responded that the 125 foot length was something they could address with a change of materials, which right now was a chain link fence with green mesh fabric.

Mr. Taintor suggested upgrading that material.

Ms. Kozak said there were some other items on the handout that she wanted to review. On page 3, the question regarding waste collection that arose in November was addressed. There were no changes proposed, and there was currently a combination of City and festival dumpsters and trash cans, so that would stay the same.

Ms. Kozak reiterated said that the noise would be reduced. A small reduction in the high frequency noise would be due to the canopies. The weather proof nature of the canopy allows for different equipment, and it affords the opportunity to address issues regarding noise mitigation and fine tune those techniques over time.

Ms. Kozak stated they were proposing to place sod and not hydro seed. They would use a hefty 12 inch layer of topsoil and a mix of Rye and Kentucky Bluegrass.

Mr. Taintor asked for clarification on the diagrams on page 4 regarding sound coverage.

Ms. Kozak said they were the primary arrays of speakers, and did not reflect the decrease in volume over distance, but was a geometric diagram. The diagram on the left represented what was there in 2014. The diagram on the right showed the primary array and coverage from the speakers with the reoriented stage. The main difference was the side fill speakers have less impact by reorienting the stage as was shown in that diagram.

Mr. Taintor asked about sound coverage difference in the projection angles.

Ms. Kozak said low and high frequencies would be addressed differently from one another because of how they both travel. High frequencies were directional and could be focused, but the the low frequencies travel in waves like a pebble hitting the water.

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

Rick Beckstead, of 1395 Islington Street, asked that any handouts be given to the public, as he said he has had to ask every time a handout was given to the Board.

The Chair asked Ms. Kozak to provide an electronic copy of the handout to the TAC.

Mr. Beckstead continued to say that he would like to see an evaluation of the stage footings as they were probably still good. He has offered his services in the past to help rebuild what was there now. He has crawled under the stage numerous times, and the footings that were there now were sustainable, but the supports for add-ons over the years were insufficient. He said some were held up with blocks and 2x4s. He expressed concern that the current stage was a hazard. He said that near the concrete pad for the storage for the proposed design, there would be a 5 foot height from which a child could fall down into, and he asked who would be liable. He said the sound changes would be beneficial changes, and sound travels better over water, but what about the sound traveling to the new condos over the water. By doing all of this, it would not improve some of the eyesores that currently exist. We would have issues with getting around the park and the egress. This park was a gift left to the City. He asked how much of the park they plan to fill in for only four months of the year.

Beth Margeson, of 24 Marcy Street, said Prescott Park cannot be used as a park during the summer. It was true that she has had to tell people at the gate that she was not participating in order to be able to enter the area, and it was true that the Whale Lawn has become an overflow area. She did not think this space needed a permanent structure. She suggested that this application could afford the City an opportunity to reset and to consider if this operation belonged in a park. This has become an extensive operation, she said, and too big for the park. She asked this TAC to consider whether concerts belonged in this park, which was near a residential area. The impact of cars and pedestrians was extensive, she said, and the Pierce Island waste water plant will be occupying the roads for three years, so parking there would not be an option. She asked TAC to please consider that impact. She requested that if this were to all go through, to please reduce the operations for the number of days, hours and weeks. She has had vehicles blocking her driveway unloading in front to get to the park. She asked TAC to generate a trip generation report, to consider parking and to look at maximum capacity limits. Regarding the noise level, she said the PPAF was too loud, it was intolerable, and it exceeded the noise ordinance at all times, so she requested that they please turn down the volume and to stipulate that PPAF adhere to the City noise ordinance. She provided a copy of a noise study to the Planning Department. She asked TAC to include a stipulation that trailers not be put on Frisbee Lawn.

Dr. Jane Power Kilcoyne of 67 Gate Street spoke. She said she has taught acting and has produced plays and wants to say that they did not need a building this size to produce a play. This sized stage was intended for large band concerts; it was a big building. She said she understood the pressures of financial, business, political and community issues, but she asked the TAC to please be helpful to the community and City of Portsmouth. To allow a structure to proceed as part of the Master Plan when the Master plan has not been completed was like tail wagging the dog. This project was expensive. If they built a larger stage, they would attract bigger concerts. This was a concern.

Dan Corchran of 168 Marcy Street spoke. He has watched Prescott Park Arts Festival grow for 40 years. For 38 of those years, it was never a problem, but that changed two years ago. The loud volume has caused the festival to deteriorate, and this was the easiest thing to control. Turn it down, he said. Entertainment did not need to be broadcast to all the surrounding neighborhoods, as the audience sits right in front. He said PPAF has been unwilling to control the volume itself. He would ask the TAC to establish noise controls for PPAF, and he said the noise ordinance should apply to Prescott Park too. If that were to happen, a lot of problems would go away.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

The Chair expressed concern and did not want to encourage the applicant to incur more expenses until they knew what the outcome would be regarding the permanent stage. He said they normally would postpone further consideration of this application until the February TAC meeting, but he inquired about how the applicant would like to proceed.

Ms. Kozak answered they were comfortable going forward at this time since they had done most of the work already, knowing that any decisions would be subject to other party approval. All further investigations and studies could happen at the same time.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application until the February 2, 2016 TAC meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Cracknell.

The motion to postpone the Site Plan review until the February 2, 2016 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The motion to adjourn was had at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marian Steimke
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee