

## MINUTES

### SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

#### CONFERENCE ROOM A CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

2:00 PM  
2018

JULY 31,

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Peter Stith, Principal Planner; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department and Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director;

---

#### I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Clipper Traders, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street, Portsmouth Lumber and Hardware, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **105 Bartlett Street**, and **Boston and Maine Corporation, Owner**, for railroad property located between **Bartlett Street and Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Preliminary Subdivision Approval to consolidate and subdivide five lots and a portion of another into 5 lots, a right-of-way, and a remainder of one lot as follows:

- (1) Proposed Lot #1 having an area of 20,667 ± s.f. (0.4747 ± acres) and 143.44' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.
- (2) Proposed Lot #2 having an area of 51,952 ± s.f. (1.1927 ± acres) and 80.91' of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street and 386.88' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (3) Proposed Lot #3 having an area of 102,003± s.f. (2.3417 ± acres) and 809.23' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (4) Proposed Lot #4 having an area of 61,781 ± s.f. (1.4183 ± acres) and 481'± of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (5) Proposed Lot #5 having an area of 177,435 ± s.f. (4.0733 ± acres) and 297.42' of continuous street frontage on a proposed right-of-way.
- (6) Proposed Right-of-Way having an area of 69,621 ± s.f. (1.5983 ± acres).
- (7) Map 164 Lot 4 reducing in area from 13 ± acres to 4.7 ± acres and having 75'± of continuous street frontage on Maplewood Avenue, and decreasing intermittent street frontage of 234'± on Bartlett Street to 105'± of continuous street frontage on Bartlett Street.

Said properties are shown on Assessors Map 157 as Lots 1 & 2 and Assessors Map 164 as Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and are located within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W), Office Research (OR)

and Transportation Corridor (TC) Zoning Districts. (This application was postponed at the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** to the September 4, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **70 and 80 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Review Approval, under Chapter 400 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Site Review Regulations, for the construction of three proposed industrial buildings with heights of 105 feet: Proposed Building #1: 132,000 s.f. footprint and 440,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; Proposed Building #2: 150,000 s.f. footprint and 490,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; Proposed Building #3: 62,000 s.f. footprint and 220,000 s.f. Gross Floor Area; and two 4-story parking garages, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lots 1 & 2 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district. (This application was postponed at the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** to the September 4, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **70 and 80 Corporate Drive**, requesting Subdivision approval, under Chapter 500 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Subdivision Regulations, to merge Map 305, Lots 5 & 6 (17.10 acres), Map 305, Lot 1 (13.87 acres), Map 305, Lot 2 (10.18 acres) and a discontinued portion of Goosebay Drive to create Map 305, Lot 6 (43.37 acres). Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lots 1 & 2 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district. (This application was postponed at the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** to the September 4, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Dorothy Kiersted and Theresa Sessions, Owners**, for property located at **50 Lovell Street**, requesting Site Plan Review approval to demolish the rear deck on the existing house and the existing garage; to retain the existing building as a single family residence with a footprint of 1,001 s.f. and Gross Floor Area 3,095; to construct a three story, two unit residence with a footprint of 1,660 and Gross Floor Area of 4,634 s.f.; to construct a three story single residence with a footprint of 1,165 and Gross Floor Area of 3,360; with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 147 as Lot 2 and lies within the General Residential C (GRC) District. (This application was postponed at the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

### **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. This application has been presented at a previous TAC meeting. It's a large rectangular lot with an existing single-family home on it. There are single-family homes along Cass St. The existing garage will be removed and the single-family home will stay. The site layout plan shows the construction of a two unit and one unit building with access off Lovell St. There will be parking available in the unit garages and the driveway of the building. All of the new construction will be on slab. There will be no foundations and the buildings will be connected to existing utilities. The team worked with Phil McDonald from Underwood Engineers for a peer review on the drainage plan. They are close to a final sign off from them.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

- Proposed manhole in Lovell St – It is unlikely that the existing 12” sewer has that much pitch across the proposed invert. Instead label as existing sewer elev. approx. \_\_\_\_\_ (field verify). Provide proper invert and ensure new 8” pipe matches crown of existing pipe. Manhole detail shows concrete invert, please change to State and City required brick invert.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that sheet C3 had been revised to show the sewer elevation. The crown matching has been verified on sheet C4. The detail on sheet D2 has been revised to show the brick invert and brick fill.
- Use 8x4 tapping saddle for water main connection.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that sheet C4 would be revised.
- Gas service should have 36” of cover, no more, no less.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that detail H on sheet D2 was revised to show a 36” cover.
- All proposed manholes in the street shall have hinged covers that meet City Standards.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be updated on the plan.
- Driveway section still shows the impermeable barrier.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the driveway detail would be revised.
- Engineer to address Underwood Engineer’s comments per their 7/25 email:
  - LCB Detail ok but please specify perforated and base sump dimensions in detail, fix sump elevations on plans or delete (see attached).
    - Mr. Chagnon responded that the elevations had been revised on sheet C5.
  - Cover appears to be only 1.6’ not 1.8’ please re-check and provide 1.8’ min. cover (see attached).
    - Mr. Chagnon responded that the cover had been revised on sheet C5.

- Re-check grading, contours missing, flat spots, delete 15 contour or fix spots to correlate (see attached).
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the grading had been revised on sheet C5. The fieldstone wall was removed.
- Grading/contours need additional adjustment/correction.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the grading had been revised on sheet C5.
- There are large existing deciduous trees existing at the rear of the property, two 20" Ash trees and a 24" hardwood. It is not clear what trees will remain and which will be removed. If any of these trees are proposed for removal please provide a clear explanation.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that all trees would remain.
- Landscaping: Consider relocating the proposed fieldstone wall further from the existing mature trees (which are largely on the abutters property). It appears that the footings for the proposed wall will likely damage or kill these mature trees.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the wall had been removed and the grades had been softened. That should help to keep the trees in better health.
- Pedestrian Walkways: They should be added to Units 1-3.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be revised. Mr. Larosa confirmed that they would talk to the landscape architect to connect the decks to the drive in the front.
- Parking/ Driveway: The turnaround area in front of Unit 4 should be shortened to reduce impervious area and prevent parking in this area.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the driveway was designed so that a 19-foot vehicle could move into the turn around and back into the garage.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that the two notes on C4 about the water and sewer drain should be included in the condo documents to reflect that they are responsible for the maintenance because they are private utilities. The storm water maintenance plan in the drainage calculations should put in the condo documents. The storm water facilities should be maintained on site. Also, note 29 is not as complete as it should be. It should reference in the site plan that the owners are responsible for the storm water maintenance in perpetuity.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that note 30 on the utility plan should also be on the site plan. Mr. Desfosses added that the utility installations on site need to be witnessed.

Mr. Desfosses commented that there should be a note about providing access to the property for the water department. The valves are on the lot. There should be a note to allow the City to have access to the valves. The maintenance would be the condo association's responsibility. Mr. Britz questioned if a note on the site plan would be enough? Mr. Desfosses responded that it should be in an easement.

Mr. Pezzullo requested that when the revised plans were sent to Underwood then a copy should be sent to DPW as well.

Mr. Roediger noted that the turning template made it look like you could not back into the garage in unit 4 without going onto the grass. The vehicle can't stay within the confines of the pavement. Mr. Larosa responded that it was just the overhang of the truck on the grass not the wheel.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if there would be basements? Mr. Chagnon responded that there would not be. They would be built on slab.

Mr. Britz questioned if DPW needed to wait to here the status of the storm water review. Mr. Pezzullo responded that there was nothing in the comments that would substantially change the design.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

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

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend Site Plan Review approval**, seconded by Mr. Roediger with the following stipulations:

1. Revise Plan Sheet C3 to label existing sewer elevations. (and field verify).
2. Revise Sheet C4 to provide proper invert and ensure new 8” pipe matches crown of existing pipe.
3. Update Sheet C4 to show State and City required brick invert.
4. Update Sheet C4 to show 8x4 tapping saddle for water main connection.
5. Update gas service detail (Detail H, Sheet D2) to show 36” of cover.
6. Update sewer details (Detail E, Sheet D2 and Detail P, Sheet D3) to show that all proposed manholes in the street shall have hinged covers that meet City Standards.
7. Update Driveway section detail to remove the impermeable barrier.
8. Engineer to address Underwood Engineer’s comments per their 7/25 email:
  1. LCB Detail ok but please specify perforated and base sump dimensions in detail, fix sump elevations on plans or delete.
  2. Cover appears to be only 1.6’ not 1.8’ please re-check and provide 1.8’ min. cover.
  3. Re-check grading, contours missing, flat spots, delete 15 contour or fix spots to correlate
9. Pedestrian Walkways to be revised to show walkways between front door, rear decks and parking area for Units 1-3.
10. A note shall be added to the Site Plan and condominium documents with a reference to the Operations and Maintenance Plan indicating that the property owner(s) are responsible for Stormwater Maintenance.
11. Sheet C4, Note 30 shall be revised to remove the language “In city streets”.
12. Applicant to provide water utility access easement to Portsmouth DPW for access to water meters, valves and pipes with a reference to the easement on the [site plan](#).
13. Applicant to update plan with a note that “parking is prohibited outside of designated parking areas on the plan”.

The motion passed unanimously.

E. The application of **Portsmouth Housing Authority, Owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street**, and **Ed Pac, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **152 Court Street**, requesting

Site Plan Review approval to demolish a portion of the existing building on 152 Court Street and to construct a 4-story, 64 unit workforce housing building with a footprint of 12,361 ± s.f. and Gross Floor Area of 58,975 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lots 37 & 38 and lie within the Character District 4 (CD4) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the July 3, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering, Attorney John Bosen, Development Director Peter Roach, Randy Dunton from Gorrill and Palmer, Scott Donovan and Carla Goodknight from CJ Architects, and Craig Welch from the Portsmouth Housing Authority (PHA), spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon noted that the project was for a workforce housing development. PHA owns property on Court St. that has the Feaster Apartment building on it. In order to do the development the property line will be relocated. The line follows along the building at 152 Court St. The lot line will be relocated to still have a “U” shaped lot. Part of the 152 Court St. building will be removed to allow for the construction of the new workforce housing building. There will be dedicated community space in the middle with a spiral walkway to accommodate ADA regulations. Detail about the parking spaces was added to the plan as requested. The development will provide 20% community space, which allows for a height bonus. Utilities will be connected on Court St. Eversource requested a new pole underground, which will feed to a new transformer at the Court House. That will be their responsibility. It will loop back from the Court House to Court St. TAC requested the team look at alternatives to the drainage plan that was presented. The Feaster Apartment Building has a flat roof that drains to a catch basin in the back. That feeds into a combined sewer. There is a City easement for a catch basin at the property line. Mr. Chagnon looked at connecting at that system, but it would be overwhelmed by the runoff. Mr. Chagnon looked at what they could do to comply with storm water separation. There is an off site area and currently that system crosses the adjacent property that has the law firm on it. It then goes to Roger St. with an outfall to North Mill Pond. The pipes from Roger St. across and up easement are all 12-inch pipes. Mr. Chagnon looked at increasing that capacity of that system. Mr. Chagnon proposed providing a second piped access to the system. Then when the systems were combined replacing the system to allow for more capacity. The pipe would cross private property. There have been discussions with the abutters and it is showed as an easement on the plan. This is the solution that was presented with this application. There are additional ways to look at it.

- Sight lines at the site driveway are limited due to the fence on the abutters property. While it does not affect the sight lines to see oncoming vehicles on Court Street, it does limit the sight lines for oncoming pedestrians on the sidewalk. The applicant should work with the abutter to relocate or modify the fence to increase the visibility for pedestrians on the sidewalk and vehicles exiting the site. This existing situation will be exacerbated with the increase in traffic using this driveway to exit the site.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the applicant was willing to request modification and work with the abutter if they are agreeable. Mr. Cracknell commented that if it is a brick

sidewalk there, then that sidewalk should be brought out to the edge of the curb line. There is a triangle space that is missing the sidewalk. It should be extended. Mr. Chagnon responded that the fire truck turning template needs that whole width for the movement. It could be squared off by extending the sidewalk. Mr. Eby noted that if they did not get anywhere with the fence, then they could add a sign that says watch for pedestrians.

- The proposed taxi/Uber parking space on Court Street is located beyond the stop line for the emergency signal for the fire station. A vehicle parked in the space would not be able to see the emergency signal when it is activated and could cause a conflict with emergency vehicles exiting or entering the fire station. I would recommend eliminating this proposed space unless the Fire Department is ok with it.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would eliminate that space.
- The “Proposed UBER / Taxi Space” on Court Street should be eliminated. Public transit busses making a right turn from Fleet onto Court have to make a wide turn which could impact a vehicle in that parking spot.
  - Mr. Chagnon understood from the previous comments that 20 feet from the cross walk would allow for the turn. This would be eliminated from the drawing and addressed later. Mr. Roediger noted that this could be setting up for an accident. This might be a question for the Pease Trolley to see what they think. Mr. Chagnon responded that it would be taken off the plan and it could go to the Parking Traffic and Safety Committee.
- The emergency signal for the fire station is missing the required EMERGENCY SIGNAL sign. With the increase in traffic through this area due to the proposed project, the applicant should consider installing this sign to increase awareness of the purpose of the signal.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would work with the Fire Department on this.
- The fire station emergency signal that is currently located at the corner of Fleet Street and Court Street, should be relocated to the other side of Court Street, as the project will be closing the entrance to the parking lot and there will now be space to properly locate the signal on the right hand side of the roadway.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would work with the Fire Department on this. A new pole would have to be installed in the sidewalk and stop bar? Mr. Eby confirmed that a stop bar was already there. Mr. Chagnon noted that the controller box in the Fire Department controlled it all. Mr. Desfosses noted that they may have issues with lighting control because of shadows from the four-story building.
- Project should be given correct street number as soon as possible.
  - Mr. Chagnon noted that he had submitted a request for that.
- To reduce unintended use of the proposed driveway as an access to the Parrott Ave. Parking Lot, the parking lot entry via the driveway on the east side of the District Court building should be closed off.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they objected to this request. Mr. Roediger clarified that he watches people use the existing parking lot to get to Parrot Ave all the time. This would help dissuade people from cutting through to the Parrot Ave lot. Mr. Chagnon clarified the entrance Mr. Roediger was talking about. Mr. Welch added that this was also a request from the owner of the Citizens Bank. Mr. Chagnon noted that it was an exit point. They could talk to the Parking Traffic and Safety Committee. Mr. Chagnon was not opposed to that, but want to understand the scope. Signage could be added to state no through traffic.

- Sheet LA-3.0 (Note 14). Material to be changed from bark mulch to a noncombustible material.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the drawing would be updated as requested. An alternative could be to install an irrigation system in the mulch area. Mr. Roediger noted that an irrigation system was not meant to put out fires. Mr. Chagnon responded that it makes the mulch moist so it's hard to catch. Mulch is better for the plant health too. Mr. Roediger commented that they could work together on it.
- Sheet 8.3. Smoking to be prohibited on all decks and balconies
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that a note would be added to the architecture plan stating that smoking would be prohibited in community spaces.
- There may be conflicts with the proposed drainage pipes. City to be notified of any conflicts.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that a note would be added on sheet C6 to address that.
- Brick Sidewalk detail, there are 4.5 Bricks to the square foot.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the note would be revised to reflect that. Mr. Desfosses commented that Court St. has a herringbone pattern and it should match. Mr. Chagnon responded that was fine.
- Wearing course very thick in typical pipe trench detail. Recommend more binder type instead.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be revised.
- Is Removal of the trees along the proposed path necessary? It seems like it would be possible to realign the path to keep away from the trees, make the path narrower and/or consider changing the material or elevating the path to keep it clear of the roots.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they could narrow the sidewalk to 3 feet to avoid the trees.
- Condition of catch basins, CB-B, CB-A, CB-A1 need to be evaluated to determine if they need to be replaced and/or if they can accommodate a 24" pipe.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that was correct given the cover that's available. There is not a lot because the pavement dips down. A change in design to two 12-inch pipes is being looked at.
- Cover over proposed 24" pipe appears to be inadequate. Engineer to verify.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would need to measure again.
- Roadway restoration is required for installation of 24" pipe. Provide permanent trench patch detail. Width of patch to be determined by City.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the plan would be updated to show the street detail and restoration area.
- Stormwater connection permit required.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that he would submit them for approval.
- Sht. C2: Why are trees indicated to be removed on the adjacent property? Might need to replace.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the trees are on City property. They are going to be very close to the proposed building and it will affect their health. Those trees should be removed. They will be replaced with more appropriate trees. Ash trees are more susceptible to diseases.
- Sht. C5: Sewer easement (20 feet wide) needs to be granted to the City for existing sewer in southeast corner of property.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be added to sheet C5.
- Sht. C7: Shed indicated to be relocated. Ownership of shed? Where is shed to be relocated?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the shed is the State's and it straddles the property line. If the sidewalk is narrowed to three feet, then it won't impact the shed.



- Sht.C7: Why are trees indicated to be removed? Sidewalk location/width or other adjustments might need to be made. Are trees to be replaced?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that if the sidewalk was narrowed, then they could work around the trees.
- Summary of proposed drainage design comparing hydraulic condition of existing and proposed closed drainage system in Parrot Ave that was provided by Engineer in 7/27 email/letter needs to be included in drainage report.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the drainage report would be updated.
- Landscaping: Consideration should be given to plant two larger trees along the front of the existing PHA building. Otherwise, I would consider flowering magnolia trees versus the kousa dogwood. The benches should also be replaced with a more appropriate decorative style bench and a small patio should be included at the base. Consideration for changing the location or width of the proposed walkway to Parrott Ave. in order to preserve more of the existing trees.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that in the front of the PHA Feaster building there is an 8-inch oak. The landscape architect Doug Greiner proposed a tree in the landscaping plan that was appropriate. A magnolia tree could replace the accent tree. Another one could be added by the benches. The benches could be upgraded, but that adds to the cost. This is a workforce housing project.

Mr. Bosen commented that they faced a challenge because the deadline to apply for the tax credits was August 24, 2018. If all of the permits are obtained then the project scores more points. The goal is to get all the permits in place before the deadline.

Mr. Roediger commented that they probably need to get with homeland security to talk about the siren pole. It may need to get relocated. It is too close to the building. Mr. Chagnon responded that he would follow up. Mr. Chagnon raised the issue with Eversource, but confirmed he would follow up directly.

Mr. Marsilia requested clarification on the roof plans. Ms. Goodknight responded that structures on the roof would be accessed through a roof hatch on the top of the stairway. Mr. Marsilia questioned if the bump up was for the elevator? Ms. Goodknight responded that the bump ups were slated to hide mechanical details. The mechanical plan was still in the works. The purpose is to provide screening. It was well received by the Historic District Commission. Mr. Marsilia clarified that nothing would be exposed. Ms. Goodknight responded that she was not sure yet. If something was exposed they will have to resubmit to the HDC as an amendment.

Mr. Roediger commented that the roof deck was considered as an assembly use accessory to the buildings. Ms. Goodknight responded that they reviewed it both ways. Mr. Roediger agreed that a single exit was fine.

Mr. Pezzullo questioned the status of the proposed 20-foot wide drainage easement. Is it agreed to in concept? Mr. Chagnon responded that the public could speak to that in the public hearing.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Eric Weinrieb with Altus Engineering represented law firm Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley and Roberts. Mr. Weinrieb understood that the applicants were under a time constraint. They want to be a good neighbor, but don't want to be taken advantage of. There is no drainage easement agreement in place. They first learned about the proposed easement plans yesterday. Ambit Engineering has expressed that there are several ways to resolve this. They have yet to be presented. The plan as presented with the drainage pipe going across the driveway has 6 inches or less of cover. It will not work. Mr. Weinrieb was concerned about the infiltration system proposed. One is at the base of Feaster and another is higher than it. PHA should be worried about having an infiltration system next to old building. The law firm is at a down slope from there. The concern is that water could end up in the basement of the law firm. The drainage needs to be reevaluated. Recharging ground water so close to the tidal resource isn't a benefit. The sidewalk in the current form is not workable. The idea put forth by the City to make it 3 feet wide doesn't work either. There is no compromise on losing the trees. Losing parking stall width is a non-starter for the law firm. The best way is to end the discussion on it and close off the pedestrian access from the law firm to PHA. Tim Phoenix from Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley and Roberts added that they were not opposed to a sidewalk necessarily. It may not work. Mr. Phoenix did not want to lose the trees. The law firm was open to suggestions. They were not here to oppose the project, but wanted to make sure the law firm was protected. Mr. Phoenix encouraged the Committee to give a conditional approval with conditions to work with them for the storm water drainage and sidewalk.

Mr. Weinrieb offered a comment as an abutter. Mr. Weinrieb expressed concern on the stacked parking, and wanted to see that addressed.

John Chagnon commented that the sidewalk could be eliminated.

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

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Cracknell commented that it looked like there was room to have a 24 foot driveway and 19 foot stall. Three feet for the sidewalk could be taken out of there. It wouldn't reduce any parking. It looks like there is 3-4 feet there. The applicants should take another look at it instead of removing it from the project.

Mr. Chagnon responded that there was not 47 feet. There is a ballard that protects the building and it is 42 feet taped on the ground. Mr. Britz questioned if the drain lines could stay far enough back to save the trees? Mr. Pezzullo noted that there may be opportunities that may involve the easement. The existing easement may be able to be modified to accomodate that. Mr. Desfosses noted that there is a lot of stuff in the ground there. It is very flat. Mr. Bosen confirmed that the existing easement allowed for the upsizing of pipes.

Mr. Britz noted that the storm water management was the biggest issue. The Planning Board should not be deciding on that. Can the DPW work it out before the Planning Board meeting? It

could be a condition. What about the infiltration? Mr. Desfosses noted that it will be an issue. The soil down there is horrific. It is mostly infill. Mr. Britz responded that they could put storage in and meter it out. Mr. Chagnon responded that the amount of infiltration taken in at the drainage study was minimal. It could be lined. Mr. Britz noted that the biggest issue was the drain pipes.

Mr. Britz noted that they could consider postponing this application to a special meeting to address this. Mr. Desfosses noted that another meeting could be held in a week to see if the applicants could work with the abutters to address the issues to get to a positive resolution and recommendation to the Planning Board. Mr. Britz noted that it would have to be on the 7th. It may be postponed again, but the project would have a chance.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** to the August 7, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Roediger. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Salema Realty Trust, Owner**, for property located at **199 Constitution Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a 2-story industrial building, with a footprint of 12,800 s.f. and a Gross Floor Area of 12,800 s.f., with 24 parking spaces and proposed stormtech infiltration system, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 285 as Lot 16-301 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Chris Tymula from MHF Design Consultants spoke on behalf of the applicant Antonio Salema. Mr. Tymula went through the changes in the plan sheet by sheet. In the existing conditions sheet TAC asked the applicants to shade in all the existing utility easements. The last set of plans did not delineate the width. That has been added. The wetland buffer has been removed and the legend was updated. The majority of the comments from the workshop were incorporated into the site plan. The dumpster was moved. The triangular piece of pavement was removed. A lot of landscaping was added throughout the site. The plans show site lighting around the perimeter and on the building. An egress point was added. A gravel access drive was added for the utilities. The grading and drainage was essentially the same. The underground infiltration system was rotated. The tree line and drainage was pulled back out of the easement. The applicant was working with Eversource for the electrical connection. The sewer and drain were rerouted to make sure they were outside the 6-foot access easement. The water was routed to the existing line. The plan profile is shown for the sewer connection and detail was provided. There is an erosion control plan. The landscaping plan highlights all changes. The sewer plan profile was added. The TAC comments received today were relative to the sewer main and the details

that could work out with engineering. There is now a full lighting plan that is dark sky complaint.

#### TAC Comments

- Sewer Manhole requires a solid brick invert.
  - Mr. Tymula confirmed this would be added.
- Engineer to verify if NHDES Alteration of Design Permit requires additional 10% design precipitation rates over the Extreme Precipitation Table rates.
  - Mr. Tymula responded that they were starting to look at the permit. It was not an issue. They did not use the 10% and Mr. Tymula will follow up.
- Access easement needs to be granted to the City for access to the water line shutoffs and for routine maintenance/leak detection.
  - Mr. Desfosses responded that this was a different easement. This easement allows water personnel onsite. Mr. Tymula confirmed that was fine.
- Use of building needs to be provided to determine if an Industrial Discharge Permit is required or if use is subject to Fats, Oil, and Grease (FOG) program (ie: grease trap) for the wastewater.
  - Mr. Tymula confirmed there was no tenant at this time. They will make sure it is squared away if needed.
- Engineer to address the need for the 1000 gallon pump station tank. Based on stated daily flow, size of tank might be problematic for odors and sediment accumulation.
  - Mr. Pezzullo noted that a 2.5-day retention time was a little long for solids to stay. There are smaller pump station chambers. Mr. Desfosses added that they might want to switch to an E1 system. Mr. Tymula confirmed he would look into that. Mr. Pezzullo noted that it handles lower flow better.
- Use City approved detail for force main connection to SMH. Detail to be provided by City.
  - Mr. Tymula confirmed he would look at it. Mr. Desfosses noted that he would forward the detail.
- Condition of existing SMH and sewer pipe to Constitution Ave. needs to be determined.
  - Mr. Tymula confirmed that it would be looked at. Mr. Pezzullo commented that it should be looked at now to assess if it needs to be replaced. It's at an odd angle. Mr. Tymula confirmed that he would follow up.
- It appears that the angle of the existing pipe entering SMH is problematic and might need to be corrected.
- Verify that the proposed development has rights to utilize existing sanitary sewer to Constitution Ave. and verify who is responsible for maintenance.
  - Mr. Tymula was not sure how to answer. There is the existing manhole and other units are connecting to it. Mr. Pezzullo questioned if there was a document showing that you can connect to that manhole and is it on the property? Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it's all one lot.
- Provide a statement that list and described "green" building components and systems (Per Section 2.5.3.1A)
  - Mr. Tymula confirmed that he would get that from the architect.
- Names, addresses and telephone numbers of all professionals involved in the site plan design should be provided on Title Sheet.
  - Mr. Tymula confirmed that would be added.
- Applicant to provide completed Site Plan Application checklist noting the location (Sheet/Note) of each required item.

- Mr. Tymula confirmed this would be updated.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if the applicant anticipated doing a build out. It may need to be sprinkled. Mr. Salema responded that at this point it was not planned.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the landscaping plan needed to be modified. No trees should be in the water line easement. Mr. Tymula confirmed it would be updated.

Mr. Britz questioned what the gravel road was for. Mr. Tymula responded that this easement was permitted in 1995. At that time there was a discussion with the City about connecting the roadway. That's not on the books anymore, but that's why the easement is there. Mr. Britz clarified that the City had a right of way easement. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Roediger commented that there was landscaping in the area of where the fire connections and access are. They cannot be blocked. A detail needs to be added for the proposed fire hydrant. Mr. Tymula confirmed that would be added.

Mr. Marsilia questioned what was on the left side of page 1. It looked like a sprinkler room, but it isn't. Mr. Tymula responded that's it is a doorway to get out. The plan would be updated. All of the utilities are coming out the same way.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there would be a special utility room. Mr. Tymula confirmed there would be. The plan is showing just the shell of the building. Mr. Roediger commented that the preference would be to create direct exterior access to that. Mr. Marsilia noted that it should be located in the drawing.

Mr. Britz questioned how the Board felt about the rest of the comments. Mr. Desfosses noted that they were minor comments. Mr. Tymula confirmed that they were mostly minor details.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Britz noted that they have had some problems with things going to the Planning Board that were not quite ready. They have been particular about storm water. Mr. Tymula noted that they could easily get the details and design squared away by next week. The design won't change substantially it's the same design intent. Mr. Desfosses noted that the DPW comments were minor.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend Site Plan Review approval**, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

1. Update details to show Sewer Manhole with a solid brick invert.

2. Engineer to verify if NHDES Alteration of Design Permit requires additional 10% design precipitation rates over the Extreme Precipitation Table rates and update Stormwater Management Drainage Calculations and Design, as applicable.
3. Applicant to provide water utility access easement for water line shutoffs and routine maintenance/leak detection and note easement on the plan.
4. Further review and approvals will be required when use of the building is determined and may include an Industrial Discharge Permit or if use is subject to Fats, Oil, and Grease (FOG) program (ie: grease trap) for the wastewater.
5. Engineer to consider the need for the 1000 gallon pump station tank and revise as applicable.
6. Plans to be updated showing a City approved detail for force main connection to SMH Detail to be provided by City.
7. Condition of existing Sewer Manhole and sewer pipe to Constitution Avenue shall be determined and plans updated as applicable.
8. The angle of the existing pipe entering SMH looks to be problematic and shall be corrected, as applicable.
9. Provide a statement that list and described “green” building components and systems (Per Section 2.5.3.1A).
10. Names, addresses and telephone numbers of all professionals involved in the site plan design should be provided on Title Sheet.
11. Applicant to provide completed Site Plan Application checklist noting the location (Sheet/Note) of each required item.
12. The Department of Public Works shall review and approve the drainage/stormwater design prior to Planning Board review.
13. The sprinkler utility room and exterior access shall be shown on the plans.
14. Trees shall be removed from the easement area on the Landscape plans.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Roediger moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:00 pm, seconded by Mr. Pezzullo. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee