

MINUTES

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2:00 PM

**FEBRUARY 9, 2016
Reconvened from
February 2, 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; Raymond Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking & Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Portsmouth Fire Department

.....
II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **2422 Lafayette Road Associates, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **2454 Lafayette Road (Southgate Plaza)**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the partial demolition of two existing retail buildings, the construction of a proposed 4-story, 94-unit residential building with a footprint of 28,700 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 112,550 ± s.f., the construction of a 1-story 2,000 ± s.f. restaurant and a 1-story 5,920 ± s.f. retail building, and reconfiguration of the existing parking area, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 273 as Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway (G) District.

The Chair read the notice into record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernie Pelech was present to speak. He commented that he left the February 2, 2016 TAC meeting concerned that the technical review was becoming more of a referendum. He said this was the first planned unit with a large residential component. He believed it was consistent with the intent of the planned unit development in the Gateway, and that it would be consistent regarding what they had heard from the community regarding affordable housing. He asked that the TAC please leave this to the Planning Board to decide whether or not this was a good or bad idea.

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe & Bond was present to speak. He said that at the prior week's TAC meeting he had presented the site plans and gave the overview of the site, utilities, drainage. He said Dave Snell, with PCA had the opportunity to present the building design.

Mr. Crimmins said that Steve Pernaw from their team would give a presentation on traffic.

Steve Pernaw with Pernaw & Company said that their office prepared the traffic evaluation report for the project in September 2015. Since that time, they also prepared Addendum Number 1 in December to reduce the number of apartments from 112 down to 94.

Mr. Pernaw presented a summary of the report. He said the report listed the main site driveway on Route 1 had only 102 morning trips during the peak hour, a little over 300 during the evening peak hour, a little less than 300 during the Saturday peak hour, and the rear driveway carried very small volumes. He said they did projections up to the year 2026 and they included two other developments that the City gave them to include in those projections. The important thing would be 94 units would generate 58 trips during the worst evening peak times, with the morning and Saturday peak hours generating a lower number. He said the signalized intersection would see an impact of a 2% increase. He said the signal was operating below capacity, and the intersection was operating at a Level of Service B or C depending on the time frames tested, which meant a relatively low trip generation rate, so therefore, they would not see big changes. The study said to leave the timing and phasing of the signal as is. Mr. Pernaw said they made some recommendations regarding signage.

Ms. Walker asked if they had done any bicycle and pedestrian counts as part of the study. Mr. Pernaw said no.

Mr. Eby asked if the study considered average or peak month conditions. Mr. Pernaw answered peak month, which was consistent with DOT practice. Summer was usually the peak time, and they performed the study in August.

Chairman Taintor asked him to go over the LEED analysis.

David Snell from PCA spoke. He said they reviewed the building in two ways. They looked at LEED for new construction or LEED for homes. With both of those rating systems, they were able to get above the certified threshold. The main metrics they used to get there had to do with site selection, building envelope and building performance; comparing that with efficient mechanical systems. Those features, along with LED lighting could drive down energy usage. From a water usage standpoint, they used low flow fixtures. He said they always looked for materials that had a high reuse content. Regarding indoor air quality, each unit would have full control of its own temperature and lighting, and the area had a lot of sunlight.

Chairman Taintor inquired about the options of either LEED ND, or LEED ND without the prerequisites, and were they taking the option to get the LEED ND numerical rating plus the ability to get certification under the LEED new construction as an approach.

Mr. Snell said he thought it would be better to use one that would be more building specific. They started to look at the site for ND and in doing so realized there were a lot of credits there that were impossible to get with an existing site. So they decided to focus on the LEED for new construction or the LEED for homes.

Ms. Walker said she was under the understanding they would work toward option B since they were not going to be able to meet zoning requirements, due to existing conditions on the site, and that they plan to ask for a waiver with the explanation that these other thresholds were being met.

Chairman Taintor asked if they did a LEED for an ND scorecard. Mr. Snell said they did not submit one. Chairman Taintor said that would be useful, and it would be hard to make a case for a waiver without that.

Mr. Britz said on the new construction form, there was no background with that form. For instance on one of the categories there were 14 points which bumped them up on the energy and atmosphere, but an explanation would be helpful.

Mr. Snell said there was one credit where they can score up to 19 points based on where the energy usage fell in relation to the national standard, and how far below that threshold it actually was. Their number that they were putting in the yes category was based on experience with similar types of buildings, reviewing their energy models and playing it conservatively. Anything above and beyond that they would not know at this time.

Mr. Britz said he understood that, but it would be helpful to have more than just the checklist. It was not clear looking at the sheet without the background.

Ms. Walker had questions about the parking and access and asked if the residential parking area would be assigned.

Mr. Snell answered they would assign one space per bedroom and that there would be striping and signing for those spaces.

Chairman Taintor asked if they had pursued getting rid of the dead ends. Mr. Snell said it was not necessary due to the spaces being assigned spaces. If they eliminated the dead ends, they would lose spaces.

Ms. Walker said for clarification it would be helpful for them to show on the Site Plan how many of the spaces were reserved for residential parking. Also if they were reserving spaces for residential parking, to make sure that someone that came in through that back access route would clearly understand they would be entering a dead end.

Mr. Eby commented that it looked like 144 parking spaces were allocated for the 94 units and reiterated they should show which ones were reserved for the units.

Ms. Walker asked if there would be guest parking and where those spaces would be located. Mr. Crimmins said guest parking would be in the rear.

Mr. Eby stated he preferred that the pedestrian area between the restaurant and the Big Lots not be open to vehicular traffic, and that it would be best to have signs along Constitution Avenue telling pedestrians where they can enter the plaza from Constitution Avenue.

Ms. Walker said a removable bollard system could potentially be used in that area, but she did not know how the Fire Department would respond. She was not sure how else it could be blocked off.

Mr. Howe said if it were a fire lane, then the Fire Department would not want bollards there, but it was not clear to him if that were considered a fire lane.

Mr. Crimmins said they had access to the building on all sides and the ability to get around the buildings. He said they were open to the idea of keeping it open or blocking it with removable bollards to allow the Fire Department access.

Mr. Howe reiterated that there cannot be bollards in a fire lane.

Chairman Taintor asked, given the grade change, if the outermost double bay could be open. Mr. Crimmins said they would take a look at the grades to determine an option, but there would be an impact to the landscaped area.

Mr. Desfosses asked where the snow storage was. Mr. Crimmins said it would be throughout the landscaped areas, and said he would add that to the plan.

Mr. Pezzullo said he would like to know the snow storage location for the residential parking areas. In the area where there were dead ends, they should also show how they would plow that area without impacting that loading area because it appeared to be a difficult challenge to be able to remove snow from there.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the main parking field and if they were making a commitment that they would not store snow in that field. He said they were adding three more uses to that interior parking field, and that the site had been maximized in every possible way, so it was not possible to determine where they would put snow.

Mr. Desfosses asked how they proposed to load into the 2,000 s.f. restaurant. Mr. Crimmins said it would only be a box truck, so they could sign it. Mr. Desfosses asked how they knew it would be a box truck, and what if something bigger came in. Mr. Crimmins said they were anticipating a box truck, and with anything bigger, they would have to walk it in. But based on prior experience, and with how it was permitted, they were anticipating box trucks.

Mr. Eby said cars coming in from Route 1 would bring traffic in front of the stores. There would be more vehicle / pedestrian conflicts with this proposed design, and a lot of activity happening in front of Petco and McKinnon's. He suggested they allow the main aisle to come straight down the middle as it did currently, possibly breaking the greenspace up into two sections.

Mr. Desfosses agreed. With the herringbone pattern area, it was bad to put parking spaces off a main header like that, as pulling out of those spots would be difficult. He was also concerned about the dumpster near the 2,000 s.f. restaurant, and he was not sure there would be enough space to be able to pick up the dumpsters the way it was shown. Mr. Crimmins said they would prepare a trash and loading exhibit for the next meeting.

Mr. Pernaw handed out some graphics regarding the main access where they would come in and take a left or a right. On the handout, which he said came out of a textbook, he highlighted an area that

showed the same configuration. To simplify traffic flow a feature nicknamed a “canoe” was used to force an either left or right turn, and he said that would reduce the number of conflict points.

Ms. Walker said it would help to know where the conflict spots were. The green space seemed separate from the users that it was intended to service. She suggested they think about how to situate that space so that it was more centrally located or more dispersed.

Chairman Taintor said he agreed, and that it would be good to provide more green space for the residents. He did not think the examples of the “canoe” that Mr. Pernaw showed were relevant to this situation, as none of them seemed to show parking being forced in front of commercial buildings. He said this did not address the concern raised of all the potential moving conflicts up against the pedestrians.

Mr. Eby said the canoe was a great idea. The problem was the traffic ended up in front of the store after they have made their turn.

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Desfosses if, regarding the herringbone pedestrian area, was he suggesting it would be better to have the parking pulled away from the building and have the pedestrian area on the interior next to the building.

Mr. Desfosses said essentially they had created a parking header that was forcing all three of the parking fields to use that pedestrian area. There could be up to 80 cars an hour pulling through there, and it seemed like a lot of commotion in that little area.

Ms. Walker said one of the requirements in the zoning was to allocate space towards pedestrians. It would be helpful if their exhibits showed what spaces they were counting towards those thresholds.

Doug Richardson, from Waterstone Retail said they respect the comment on the header and they would make that change. He said the Site Plan with respect to the greenspace accurately represented what their intention was. He said the space would be a highly functional space, a place to host events and they wanted to slow down the tone of the space.

Chairman Taintor commented that he understood that, but said it created some complications for traffic. He was not convinced that having the greenspace at the intersection of all those vehicle movements would make it a nice greenspace. It was not large enough to be a park, and it would be more of a community space if it were closer to the residents, closer to the theater and to places where people would want to congregate.

Mr. Richardson, said they were trying to upgrade a 1970’s shopping center and update it to have the feel of the new Gateway District. What the plan did not show, was that they had existing tenants who have restricted parking areas as part of their lease agreements that they could not interfere with.

Chairman Taintor asked if they could address where the green space would be for the residents.

Mr. Richardson said there was greenspace along Constitution Avenue, there was space for private patios for some of the residents, and a common patio up on the roof that had community gardens, so

there were actual greenspaces that related to the building, and not just a green square in front of the front door.

Chairman Taintor asked if they would show where the restricted parking spaces were in the plan. Mr. Richardson said they would generate that plan.

Chairman Taintor said the comments they received from the TAC about greenspace concerns, were things they should really consider, because these issues would arise again.

Ms. Walker stated that the landscape plan did not clearly demonstrate what areas were being counted toward the open space calculations. She said that would be very helpful for the TAC to get a full understanding.

Mr. Desfosses asked if it was appropriate to move the bus pullout to be in proximity to the apartment building. It would be better because it would be closer to one of the main sidewalk aisles that went directly into the plaza and it was next to the apartment building. Where it was shown, it was not adjacent to anything. In the case of a snow event, the sidewalk might not be clear for days.

Mr. Crimmins said he agreed with the place that Mr. Desfosses suggested they move it to, however, they cannot do that because of a corner where the site lines would be blocked.

Ms. Walker said they might consider the frequency of the bus being there, which was once per hour and asked if they should still be concerned with once per hour, and Mr. Eby said yes they should.

Mr. Eby said the original plan from August did not have any access onto the Water Country exit driveway, but he said now they needed an analysis of that driveway. The volume would be 800 cars an hour in the summer coming out of that driveway.

Ms. Walker said that in going back to the bus pullout, the plan did not correspond to the landscape plan, and that needed to be resolved. She recommended that this be a multi-use path and that would connect to what they hoped would be a multi-use path that would go up and down Route 1 and up and down Constitution Avenue. It would need to be wide enough to be used by both bicyclists and pedestrians in two directions, and their standard was a 10 foot minimum width. Since this was remote, as compared to the existing snow plowing network, snow plowing would take a while, so she suggested they consider whether the owner would do some of the snow maintenance of the area. They would eventually want to see that path connect all the way along Route 1 to the edge of the property line and to go onto their site in order to avoid going onto the cemetery property.

Mr. Desfosses voiced concern regarding the Water Country driveway with traffic going down Banfield Road, and he would like to have that analyzed to ensure there would not be any additional trips heading down Constitution Avenue or Banfield Road. He stated he would like to see an iteration that showed how to lead, not force, people to the traffic signal that was not currently utilized to capacity, instead of them heading down Banfield Road.

Chairman Taintor summarized that request and said they were looking for a way to get from the access road to the traffic signal, and some route that would make that work. Mr. Desfosses agreed.

Chairman Taintor said there was a plan entitled the Overall Landscape Plan, which was just for the residential area, and there was a Plaza Landscape Plan, but he did not see a landscape plan that actually represented the overall landscape of both the residential and plaza. He would like to see the titles correspond to what they were, and he would like to see an actual Overall Landscape Plan.

Chairman Taintor commented that the residential parking area has a narrow strip between the two double bays of parking, and stated that the Site Plan Review Regulations required that they have 9 foot wide landscape islands separating the rows of parking. This was the only place where they had not done that. They would need to identify it as a place where they would require a waiver.

Mr. Crimmins said the Overall Landscape Plan, versus the Plaza Landscape Plan was just the overlap of two different consultants that did the landscaping. He said they were showing the amendments to the Plaza landscaping on Sheet C-14. He acknowledged, as per Ms. Walker's comment, that the plans did need to mesh better regarding the sidewalks. He asked if it would be acceptable if they had the Plaza Landscape Plan as one sheet and the Residential Landscape Plan as one sheet.

Chairman Taintor said yes, as long as they were the same scale and that they could be seen clearly if they were to be pieced together, but he said it would be nice to see an Overall Landscape Plan in the same way that they provided an Overall Site Plan.

Mr. Desfosses asked how they would deal with solid waste, where would trash be stored and how would it get picked up. Mr. Crimmins said it would be stored in a trash room, it would be wheeled out towards the access road in two yard rolling bins and picked up by a management company. He added they could show where the designated pickup areas would be. He also said they would look at providing a space for loading.

Chairman Taintor asked what their transformer and generator needs were. Mr. Snell said they knew they would need a transformer, but were not planning for a generator, and they were working with engineers to locate a spot for the transformer on the site. He said it was his understanding that a generator would only be needed for an elevator if it were to be used as an accessible means of egress, and they had accessible means of egress without it. He said he would check the code on that.

Ms. Walker asked what the accessible means of egress was when a person was on an upper floor. Mr. Snell said it would be normal egress stairways in lieu of an elevator on a generator. For example, in a stairwell in a high rise, there would be an area of refuge for a person with disabilities to wait.

Chairman Taintor would want to be absolutely sure that they would not need a generator. He also asked where the transformer would be. Mr. Crimmins pointed out where it would be located across the parking lot.

Mr. Howe said they had an agreement that the pump station would be built by July 8th, and he asked if the one shown was to be intended for the entire complex. Mr. Crimmins said yes, and it was the intent to complete that prior to July 8th, maybe building a temporary house for it and then building the building around it. Mr. Desfosses said they might want to build a CMU wall around it anyway, and Mr. Crimmins agreed. Mr. Howe said it may be required that they have a generator for the sprinkler

system, depending on their calculations, and in the case of an electrical failure, they would need to be reasonably close on all floors. Mr. Crimmins agreed and said that was a good point.

Mr. Howe asked for clarification on the storage sheds, and Mr. Snell said they were a series of shipping containers, and he displayed the views of them.

Mr. Howe said he had concern about parking spaces being alongside the storage sheds, and they have had issues in the past where if a parking space was designed to be right up alongside the building, they sometimes have had to take parking spaces away after the fact, and he asked that they plan ahead for that. He reiterated that they cannot have a parking space next to a door that would swing outwards, referring to the Big Lots building as well as the storage containers.

Mr. Snell said the doors for the storage containers would be on the sides, and the Big Lots building did not have exits on that side.

Ms. Walker said that was a good point, and in looking at the parking exhibit, from the Site Plan, she said, it looked like there was parking all around, but they would need to show that they could access the sheds from either end in case cars were to be parked all the way along.

Mr. Snell said they had done a schematic layout of the interior of them but they had not yet gotten down to the final details inside them.

Chairman Taintor said on Sheet C3B, where the sheds went from one end of the building to the other, they should show their actual proposal. Mr. Snell said it was more accurately reflected on the Landscape Plan, and Chairman Taintor suggested they make the plans work together better.

Ms. Walker asked for clarification about the height calculations. Mr. Snell, said the weighted average around the building was 49.13 feet. The average setback with respect to Constitution Avenue was 34 feet, 1 inch, which would translate to an allowable building height of 51.12 feet, and their weighted average was under that.

Chairman Taintor said the height in relation to the setback was not an average, and at any point the height was related to the setback from the street. He suggested they pick some points to show what the height was in relation to the individual setbacks. So, for example, at the 30 foot setback, what the height was there, and at the 35 foot setback what the height was there, he said their concern was about places where it was over, not under.

Mr. Snell said they would work on that to determine if they needed a waiver, but that was the interpretation they had taken.

Ms. Walker said to check with the Planning Department before they came back to the TAC to make sure they were doing their calculations correctly. She added they should not design up to the maximum just because they can.

Mr. Snell agreed and said the goal for this project was to achieve a 9 foot ceiling, and they had met with the structural engineer to determine what the truss depths would have to be in order to handle the

spans, and that was what was setting the floor to floor heights. He would definitely submit the calculations and talk to the Planning Department, and if it were not in alignment, they would ask for a waiver.

Chairman Taintor asked the Fire Department to comment about the Fire Table, shown on Sheet L1.1. in Detail Number 2. Mr. Howe said that was a concern. They have not allowed fire pits in a common space on a roof top, but they had not yet had that discussion. Mr. Snell said that it was the intention that it be a gas fireplace, direct-fed with a gas line, with an emergency shutoff that would be very visible to anyone up there. It would be a system they had installed in other locations, and he could present additional details on that. Mr. Howe reiterated they would need to discuss that further, and they previously have not allowed that.

Mr. Eby asked about the reasoning for the right turn 35 foot radius coming into the building, and if it could be made smaller. Mr. Crimmins said they would take a look at that. It was to allow for trucks turning, but he understood the concern for pedestrians crossing.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the relocation of the sewer because of the new building, and said the angle shown might be too tight. He suggested they should put in a new manhole in a perpendicular spot. He asked about calculations regarding the sewer, as they needed to verify the capacity. Mr. Crimmins said they would submit those calculations.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the water line was replaced last summer at the Water County access drive, and he was pretty certain that it was constructed where their sewer line was proposed to be constructed. He asked that they take a look at that. Mr. Crimmins said they did walk that just recently, and the next plan would more accurately reflect where the actual locations of the water lines and the proposed sewer line would go.

Mr. Desfosses said there was something going on with the hydrant on the back access road. Somehow it was tied to some internal line, and they did not know how it was plumbed. He asked they go back to old site plans to determine how that was connected, and he assumed that was one that was going to be eliminated or relocated.

Chairman Taintor asked about the three dumpsters that would be added to the existing three dumpsters behind the movie theater, resulting in six total. He asked for clarification about how Big Lots would access the dumpsters.

Mr. Pezzullo reiterated his concerns regarding dead-ends and traffic flow. He specified the one coming from Water Country Road into the residential parking area, and the 21 spaces along the bottom that was the main route into the spaces for the parking, saying it brought them into a dead end and hindered the traffic flow. Again, the snow storage and plowing would be impacted, and he wanted to highlight that.

Mr. Pezzullo said they needed to show grease trap locations for the proposed restaurants, and Mr. Crimmins identified where they were shown on the plans.

Mr. Pezzullo asked about test pits for the drainage location and he asked they provide that information in the drainage analysis, along with the estimated ground water table. Mr. Crimmins said they have done a number of test pits in that area, and they could show that information

Chairman Taintor opened the public hearing and called for speakers.

Rick Beckstead of 1395 Islington Street expressed concerns regarding the amount of cars and traffic. He said he appreciated the very thorough and thoughtful questions asked by the City staff.

Mr. Beckstead commented that the applicant had done traffic studies that some residents had been asking the City to do for a long time. He hoped the Applicant would be willing to share that information with the neighborhoods. He said there was a lot of traffic along Constitution Avenue for four months of the year due to Water Country. He asked that they try to keep traffic from going through the neighborhood areas.

John Pratt from FW Hartford Drive said he was employed by the Granite Bank, an abutter, and he said he was not speaking as a member of the Economic Development Commission. He said the bank was required to put in a bike rack when they did a renovation, and it was used by one person. Riding a bicycle on Route 1 was dangerous. He said the housing was needed, and the proposed residential tenants likely already worked in the City. Having some of these residents use the bus system might decrease the net car traffic. He thought this was a great idea, and said it was very much needed.

Kelly Shaw of Banfield Road sent an email to Mr. Eby and asked him to read it at the TAC meeting. She expressed concerns about the 94 units. She wanted to know how the City was advising the developer on entering and exiting the proposed development. With the large number of new residents, she expressed hope that they be advised to use the plaza light. She also said that the Water Country traffic was not good for the neighborhood, and she did not think this was a good idea.

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 discussion.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Ms. Walker moved to postpone this application until the March 1, 2016 TAC meeting, and Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

As technical questions that came up, like building height, Chairman Taintor asked the applicant to resolve those questions with staff so they can be incorporated into the next round of plans.

The motion to postpone Site Plan Review to the March 1, 2016 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Scott Mitchell, Owner**, for property located at **2839 Lafayette Road and abutting vacant lot**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of two existing buildings and the construction of a proposed 70' x 46' bank building with drive-thru, with a footprint of 3,038 ± s.f.

and gross floor area of 3,838 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 286 as Lots 178 & 19 and lie within the Gateway (G) District.

The Chair read the notice into record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernard Pelech addressed the Committee and said he was brought on board because it was determined that a variance would be needed regarding the parking. He said they went before the Zoning Board in January, and they received that variance to allow parking as shown on the site plan. He said they would be filing an application for a Conditional Use Permit for some disturbance within the wetlands buffer. He believed this project looked like it would be an improvement to what was there now, and they were looking for a favorable recommendation from the TAC, incorporating any suggestions and conditions that the TAC would deem necessary, so they can go onto the Planning Board.

Dave Eckman from Eckman Engineering showed the existing conditions, and explained that two lots were to be merged, which were located across from the Beach Plum on Heritage Avenue. The DOT was pleased with the proposed configuration, but he was not sure if a sidewalk was required, and curbing would not be allowed in that area, according to the DOT. He showed an existing impervious area and said that an existing wooded area would need to be removed.

Concerning circulation around the building, they went with the fire, police and their traffic engineer's suggestions. For safety, they made sure that turning all the way around the building worked. This design was on a tough site, but they looked at a lot of options, and they believed this worked the best.

Mr. Eckman commented that the landscape planner did a great job. It was not hard to make the grading, drainage and erosion control all balance, because it was an existing site. He said the flows were low, and they balanced all of them, the 2 year, 10 year, 25 year and 50 year. He said they were using an underground infiltration system. He pointed out the test pits, one of which was raised so that they could get an underdrain to pump out the back which was not there before. There was an 800 s.f. basement level area that could be used for conferences. The fire protection engineer said that it did not need sprinklers.

He said it was a small site, so snow removal and storage were not issues, as it would be pushed to the perimeter.

He stated there was an isolator row that collected the storm water and filtered out the sediment. He said they had a lot of vegetation in the swales.

Mr. Eckman said there had been another plan on file that showed the entire area as wetlands. They contacted New Hampshire Soils as previously requested by the TAC, but they were too busy to come out, so they hired another wetlands scientist to come out. He did test pits and wrote a letter that was included in their appendices, and they felt confident with their delineation regarding the wetlands area. He said there was a pipe that went across the road, and another large wetland, and that related to the

Conditional Use Permit that Attorney Pelech spoke of. There was a wetland that had about 6,000 s.f. on their lot and they would need a permit for that.

Mr. Eckman said they had sent letters to all of the utilities, as requested, and most responded that there would be no problem. Eversource came out and said they wanted a line moved from one pole to another, but it was a change they had not had a chance to make yet on the plan.

Regarding sewer, because there was a lower level bathroom, they had an ejector pump, then a gravity service down to a manhole, so it was not a sewer line of any significant volume. He stated they had water service, but had not proposed any hydrants yet. The gas company said there would be no problem with whatever they needed.

Mr. Eckman spoke of erosion control. For temporary measures they had check dams in the swales, perimeter controls, a silt fence, they had erosion control matting on the slopes. They went to grass as per request from the TAC and they tried to minimize the pavement.

They used visible light, and he said if there was no motion in the parking lot, the lights would dim. Mr. Eckman displayed the floor plan for the building, and said it would be 3,000 s.f. on the first floor and there would be a mechanical room downstairs. He showed the elevations. The driving force was circulation and positioning the building so that it worked for vehicle traffic.

He said they would have standard signs, which seemed to conform to City regulations.

Mr. Eckman said he was interested in the technical questions that the TAC may have.

Ms. Walker asked who it was that he had met with. Mr. Eckman said he had met with Jim Hewitt of the DOT.

Ms. Walker said that the DOT may not be aware of the plan that the City had for Route 1. Currently, she said, no one bicycled on Route 1 because it was not a nice place to bicycle, but that condition should not be continued.

Mr. Desfosses said the Master Plan that was done by Kimball Chase, stated that at every signalized intersection from Seabrook to the Portsmouth traffic circle, that every time an intersection was redone, with two lanes in both directions plus the left turn lane, the City has for years asked applicants who were directly adjacent to a traffic signal to give the State a 12 foot easement. This was so when the time came, the intersection could be widened, and the State would not have to purchase property to do so.

Ms. Walker added that it did not preclude putting an improvement in that easement area. She also said this was why they were asking for a sidewalk that appeared to be in the middle of nowhere. She said the TAC would follow up with NH DOT to get clarification from them regarding the curbing.

Ms. Walker said she recommended they install a bicycle rack.

Mr. Eby asked if would be one way traffic flow. If someone was leaving the parking field right now it would be confusing so he suggested they do something with the curbing to reinforce that it was a one way flow.

Mr. Eby said the handicap spaces should be 8 feet wide, and they should be placed closest to the entrance.

Mr. Eby said they should include signage directing traffic flow to make it clearer. He said in the back of the building, it might be beneficial to stripe a dividing line down the middle for the queue for the drive-through so they did not block the traffic that was trying to circulate around the building.

Chairman Taintor noted that the site plan showed sidewalks in front of the main entrance whereas the landscaping plan showed landscaping. He asked to provide a pedestrian connection down to the parking spaces at the bottom of the plan.

Chairman Taintor asked if that was a generator between the sidewalk and the side of the building. Mr. Eckman said yes, but they might move that and would like feedback. Chairman Taintor said it made sense to put that further away. Mr. Desfosses reminded them that there were residential units behind the area.

Chairman Taintor, said there were a couple of waivers that would be needed from the Planning Board for this plan. One would be for the second driveway on the lot. The other waiver would be for landscaping, because in the Gateway District, they need a landscape area that was 1/3 of the distance between the street line and the building. He said they had that on the Lafayette side, but not on the other side, because if they conformed to zoning they would only get half of the planned parking in there.

Mr. Eby asked if it was one way traffic, can they look at angled parking spaces, and Mr. Eckman said it would narrow up the aisle way, but he would take a look at that.

Mr. Britz said he appreciated that they received the second wetlands scientist's opinion, but the key thing they didn't look at was the connection of the wetland across the street. There was a big wetland there, and in an earlier report on this site, that other wetland was identified as being connected to their wetland by a culvert. The outlet and the connection to the wetland were said to be connected by an earlier wetlands scientist. As a minimum, he said, the wetland across Ricci Avenue would put them in the buffer. There would need to be at least a Conditional Use Permit for that area. He would want to postpone until after they actually had received that Conditional Use Permit. He said there might be some redesign required to meet the terms of the permit.

Mr. Desfosses state that the gas line actually went to the gate valve, and the water shutoff was the actual water shutoff. Right now they had the gas line shown connecting to the water line, which was not advisable.

They did not show a water service to the other building, and there was no record of the City ever having water service in that building, so they may find that the water services were coming from the veterinarian building. They would need to verify that, figure out where that line was going to, and how to disable it.

Mr. Desfosses said they should show the water service to the new building being directly next to where the other water service was since they would have to get a permit to dig on Route 1. They should

clarify where the gas line was exactly, and verify if the gas line was big enough to service the new building.

The sewer manhole shown on the corner of Sheet C-1, was bolted down because during some storm events that sewer line can become surcharged, and it would pop off if it were not bolted down. This was important because that line would surcharge up to their site, and if their basement bathroom were not plumbed properly, this would be problematic. He said they must verify that the pump functioned properly so that the check valve was functional. The City would not be liable if the system were to back up because he would put a note on the plan, documenting this situation.

Mr. Desfosses stated he was not sure where the Keene Medical sewer went. If the Keene Medical sewer line tied into the City main connector line, it would be necessary to replace that six inch AC line with an eight inch PVC line, because they could not connect multiple services to a six inch line. They would need to determine if there were any other services on that line to see if the line needed to be upgraded. That was on the Existing Features Plan.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the pavement line on Route 1 was erratic, and they showed curbing sticking out. That curb line was shown on Sheet C-2 on the entrance driveway off Lafayette Road. That curbing should be pulled back so that it lined up with the exit driveway of the carwash. Whenever curbing was put on the edge of the road, they should use sloped granite curbing. Also, they should change the angle of the driveway coming in from 80 to 60 degrees. Additionally, there was a section in front of the site, where the pavement dived in to get into the catch basin and came back out with granite curbing. He stated they needed to clean that up, because they would ask them to replace the sidewalk on Robert Avenue. They would need a permit anyway, so they should make it functional for everyone. They would need not the 15, but the 12 foot strip, and they would need to come up with layouts for the proposed path, and make sure the back sign was not in the path or in the State's 12 foot easement so that the sign would not need to be removed for future widening.

Ms. Walker said she preferred they design a 10 foot wide paved path toward the back of that easement line.

Mr. Desfosses said the entire easement would not be needed for the widening. The easement was needed for snowbanks. So it did not mean that the path could not be in the 12 feet, but it should be in a spot so that the State can widen, and that there would be a buffer strip of four feet with the path behind that.

Mr. Desfosses added that the Parking spaces in the little lot were the main parking for the bank, and they should try to make sure those high turnover spaces were nine feet wide, however employee parking could be 8.5 feet wide.

Ms. Walker said angled parking can make that aisle narrower, and Mr. Eckman said he would look into that.

Mr. Desfosses said they should show snow storage on the plan, and suggested they put slope granite curbing there for the plow guy. Near the drive through, coming off Lafayette road, they were showing another arrow behind the drive through. He said they should move that arrow closer to the corner, and

show it as a left-turn arrow. Also, they should show a delineation line so that cars would know there was a bypass lane. The six foot radius shown on the plan might be too tight, he said.

Mr. Eckman said he would determine what the three mystery circles on the plan were in response to Mr. Desfosses' question about them.

Mr. Desfosses suggested they look at the pavement cross section, where they were specifying type B, and type F pavement. He said those pavement mixes were not actually made any more, so they would need to specify what they actually wanted for a mix, because otherwise they would be given a highway mix, which would not be good for their site.

Mr. Desfosses stated they needed to propose a size for the water line.

He said that Eric Eby had a comment about the width of the driveway coming off of Robert Avenue, and said they really needed it to be 24 feet.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the Lighting Plan and the C-2 light shown on the angled driveway coming off Route 1, and he said they should locate that light to the other side of the driveway, so if someone slipped in a snowstorm, they would not slide into the light.

Mr. Eby asked if the driveway on Route 1 was a right turn only, and Mr. Eckman said yes.

Mr. Eby asked if the free standing sign was in the middle of the frontage and asked how close it could be brought to the corner of Roberts Avenue, in thinking about people wanting to make a left into the bank but missing the turn due to the sign placement. Mr. Desfosses said they could put an arrow on that sign.

Mr. Howe asked for clarification on there not being sprinklers.

Mr. Eckman said the fire protection engineer said they would not be needed because the conference room was on the basement level, but they would certainly work to meet the requirements as specified by the local code. Mr. Howe would recommend they have sprinklers it even if they were not required, and added that the requirements were the minimum standards.

Mr. Desfosses said if they did put sprinklers in they need to show that connection next to the other water services.

Mr. Pezzullo asked about the drive parallel to Lafayette Road being 18 feet wide, and Mr. Eckman said that it could narrow for a bit and then bubble back out.

Mr. Pezzullo said that on the Drainage Plan they submitted, he did not see a pre and post development watershed map, so he asked that they include that, and asked that they include the test pits information as well. Mr. Eckman said he could provide that.

Mr. Pezzullo said in looking at Sheet C-4, on the entrance from Lafayette Road there was a low point. He asked if they were intending to put some drainage off the pavement. There was a 60.7 spot grade

as a low point, and was that where they wanted to direct water to. Mr. Eckman answered yes. Mr. Pezzullo said they should put in a pavement shute and rip rap to prevent erosion.

Mr. Pezzullo added that on Sheet C-5, there might be an errant line near the front property corner. Mr. Eckman said it was a fragment of a note, and he would take that off.

Chairman Taintor said the Site Plan Approval did not include approval of signs, only the location, so they would need to get a Sign Permit. He said the City exempted a directional sign up to 4 s.f. Their signs were 7 s.f. each, so they would need variances for more than one free standing sign from the Zoning Board. The City would only allow one free-standing sign per property.

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 discussion.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this application until they received a positive recommendation from the Conservation Commission. They have not applied for a Conditional Use Permit yet and he felt they should not come back to TAC until they have appeared before the Conservation Commission and received a favorable recommendation. Mr. Britz stated it was his intent for TAC to receive changes from the Conservation Commission and revised plans before conducting another public hearing. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Chairman Taintor stated that they would only have to go to the Planning Board once with both applications.

The motion to postpone Site Plan Review indefinitely, to allow the applicant to receive a favorable recommendation from the Conservation Commission, passed unanimously.

.....
III. ADJOURNMENT

The motion to adjourn was had at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marian Steimke
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee