

MINUTES

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

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

2:00 PM

SEPTEMBER 4, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet T.H. Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department and Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT: n/a

.....
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 31, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

Mr. Roediger moved to postpone to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting on October 2, 2018, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. 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 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 31, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

Mr. Britz moved to hear Items B and C together and vote on them separately, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. 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 31, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notices into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe and Bond, George Coombs from Lonza, Justin Pasay from DTC Lawyers, Vinod Kalikiri, traffic engineer, and Mike Mates from the PDA were present on behalf of the applicant. This application was presented at the June meeting. Since then, revisions to the plans have been made. These revisions include additional information on the site plans, responses to comments from the TAC meeting and subsequent meetings with the Fire Department and the peer review. The site plan revisions provide additional information about the doors, access, and hydrants. The building will be 105 feet high. Renderings were included to give scale. The buildings are conceptual, but they show access based on the minimum access required for the size of the buildings. Fire lanes were added throughout the site to provide access to all sides of the buildings. It replaces the sidewalks that were previously shown, so there was

not a significant increase on impervious surfaces. The storm water management was designed to accommodate the impervious surface and storm water. There will be a rain garden, gravel area, and the stream will be extended for additional wetland mitigation. The applicants have responded to the peer review letter. One comment in the peer review was to provide a stamped copy of the stream restoration plan. That has been provided. DTC has provided a supplemental letter on how to address the phased construction.

Ms. Walker noted that Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering was present if there were any questions about the peer review.

Mr. Roediger requested that Mr. Crimmins confirm that the verbiage for the proposed buildings was correct in terms of stories, square footage, etc. Mr. Crimmins responded that the square footage was accurate. Mr. Roediger clarified that the overall exterior height of the building was for a 5-story building. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct. Ms. Walker noted that the Planning Board needed to be aware that what they are reviewing was a little different. Mr. Crimmins responded that the height required a submission to the FAA. An application was submitted to them and there is no hazard. Ms. Walker clarified that it was the height that was most important for the Fire Department. Mr. Roediger confirmed that was correct.

TAC Comments:

- Assuming the gates on Goose Bay Drive will be activated with a pass card, how will vehicles that don't have a pass card be able to turn around if they turn onto Goose Bay Drive from Corporate Drive?
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they would add a turn around after the gate, so cars can use that. It would be adjacent to the garage. Mr. Eby questioned what made the gate go up. Mr. Coombs responded that badges were required. Mr. Eby questioned what would happen if someone did not have a badge. Mr. Coombs responded that they could talk to the security guard.
- Sidewalks in front of Building 3 appear to end with no crosswalk or tip down.
 - Ms. Walker questioned if it was meant to access the parking lot because it does not go out to Goose Bay Drive. Mr. Crimmins responded that they could eliminate it and provide crosswalks because there is a sidewalk across the street. Mr. Eby responded that would be fine. Ms. Walker questioned if there was a reason the sidewalk was not extended all the way out to Corporate Drive. Mr. Crimmins responded that the sidewalk would go from the proposed café to Corporate Drive. Mr. Crimmins added that they would clean up the sidewalk on the plans. Ms. Walker questioned what the other driveway's purpose was. Mr. Crimmins responded that was the main access. Ms. Walker questioned why there was not a sidewalk. Mr. Crimmins responded that it was an existing driveway with no sidewalk now. It would not need a sidewalk after because people would be able to use the other one. Ms. Walker questioned if there was a reason there was no sidewalk there now. Mr. Crimmins responded there was not. One could be added. Ms. Walker questioned what the double line on the plan was. Mr. Crimmins responded that it was a shoulder. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that he would verify the sidewalks and clean it up. Ms. Walker noted that the sidewalk

should run out to Corporate Drive. The dashed line should be change to a solid line because the dashed line makes it look like it's not there.

- Bike racks outside of the parking garages would be better located on the other side of the road closer to the entrance of Building 3, or closer to the entrances to Building 1 and 2.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine.
- The trip distribution percentages appear reasonable. With this information it is apparent that over 100 new vehicle trips will be added to the Gosling Road interchange with the Spaulding Turnpike. Therefore, the two signalized intersections at the interchange should be analyzed to determine the projects impact at these locations, and to identify any necessary mitigation at these locations.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine. Ms. Walker noted that it looked like existing zip code data was used for the updated trip distribution. She asked if they had accounted for future employees. Mr. Kalikiri responded that they had a good handle on the demographics for Lonza, so the new trip distributions are expected to be similar. There was one analysis done based on the roadway traffic and one based on the zip codes. Both results were pretty consistent. Mr. Coombs added that the employees worked in shifts that were not at peak times. Mr. Kalikiri added that those intersections are not included in the PDA Master Plan. Mr. Eby wanted to have those intersections included because they are not included anywhere else. Mr. Mates added that the PDA has never done traffic studies off the trade port because it was not in their jurisdiction. Mr. Eby recommended they do it.
- All manholes located on the flatiron side of Corporate are to be raised to grade as part of the sidewalk construction, also provide 3' shoulder alongside the sidewalk before grading down to the stream.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the added fire lanes would result in a lot of pavement that will be rarely used by a vehicle. The applicants should look at alternate materials, patterns or colors for the lanes. Paving this to 20 feet wide is a mistake for the site plan. There could be a concrete walkway with something in the middle. It would still be fire truck accessible. Mr. Roediger added that it has to be able to support 80,000 pounds. Mr. Roediger expressed concerned about changing the look because the maintenance and plowing has to remain the same. It also needs to be marked appropriately. It is first and foremost a fire lane that needs to act like that at all times. Ms. Walker noted that any changes made would be subject to the approval of the Fire Department.

Mr. Cracknell was not a fan of cul-de-sacs without a mountable island in the middle to break up the impervious surface. Ms. Walker noted that again any changes would need to be subject to the Fire Department's approval.

Mr. Roediger commented that the utility notes need to include the radio strength testing for all the buildings. Mr. Crimmins responded that would be added.

Mr. Marsilia requested clarification on how the first building would be constructed. Mr. Coombs clarified that the building would be built in phases. The plan is to build 2/3 of the building with utilities and a manufacturing space.

Mr. Roediger commented that the building would need to be outfitted for life safety systems. He asked if they are designing for 100% build out. Mr. Coombs responded that they were not to that level of design yet. The Fire Department will be included in that planning. Ms. Walker added that goes back to working with the applicant to detail the phasing plan to be clear about what is being approved. They may need to work with the Fire Department and Inspections Department. The intent is that the shell of the building will go forward, then the applicants will come back to TAC and Planning before more is done. This project will be presented in phases.

- Additional comments regarding the proposed phased approval will be shared at the meeting this afternoon. The City is generally in agreement with the proposal, but will have more specific comments this afternoon.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine.
- Applicant shall work with the City's Planning and Legal Development to develop a recommended phasing plan for all site improvements to present to the Planning Board. Subsequent phases shall require a noticed public hearing with TAC and Planning Board for amended site plan approval.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the project, the applicant shall reach an agreement with the City regarding phasing of the water and wastewater services. This shall be in addition to the required industrial discharge permit, which is issued by the City.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine.
- The City has reviewed the stormwater management and drainage and makes the following recommendations with the understanding that the project will be subject to additional review by the PDA to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Pease stormwater discharge permit as well as NHDES as part of the AOT permit process:
 - PDA staff and Board should review and address any outstanding issues raised by the third party peer review and have the third party peer reviewer do a final review of the plans prior to construction.
 - Updated plans and drainage report should be provided to the City's Planning Department reflecting any future revisions to the drainage based on PDA's final review and approval.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine.

Mr. Pasay commented that the TAC comments were consistent with what Attorney Ciandella wrote in the letter. The stream improvements will hopefully take place this fall. The shell of the building would be constructed after that. Ms. Walker confirmed that the phased plans needed to be worked out before this went to the Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses noted that Altus Engineering made a number of recommendations. It is not clear that the storm water design will work until the off-site improvements are made. Mr. Mates questioned if the improvements were on Corporate Drive. Mr. Desfosses responded that there

were multiple issues downstream on this site that needed to be addressed. It was outlined in the peer review.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the plans needed to show the proposed easements for the water and sewer lines under Goose Bay Drive that will become part of the site. That way the City can continue to maintain them.

Ms. Walker reviewed the stipulations that were discussed including adding a turn around after the gate, extending the sidewalk and cleaning up notations to show the existing sidewalk extension out to Corporate Drive. Additional analysis on the recommended intersections for the trip distributions was needed prior to Planning Board. Mr. Kalikiri suggested that because the construction will be done in phases, then the intersections could be looked at later in the project timeline. It could be a condition of approval or associated with a different phase because it won't be impacted with this phase. Mr. Eby responded that it was fine if it was not completed right away. Ms. Walker responded that the applicants could work with the Planning Department to figure out when that analysis needs to happen. The applicants will work with the Planning Department for the phasing plan. The storm water management and drainage plan needs to be revised. The utility easements for the private portion of Goose Bay Drive and the grading plan needed to be included in the plans.

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. Eby moved to recommend approval for Item B to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

1. Applicant shall updated the plans to show the turnaround after the gate on Goose Bay Drive to enable vehicles to turn around if no pass card is provided.
2. Applicant shall update the plans to extend the sidewalk along the driveway along the southwest portion of the site to Corporate Drive. Plans shall be updated to clearly distinguish existing and proposed sidewalks.
3. Applicant shall update the plans to relocate the bike racks outside of the parking garages closer to the entrance of Building 3 or Buildings 1 and 2.
4. Applicant shall update the traffic analysis to include the Gosling Road interchange with Spaulding Turnpike. Timing of the update shall be included in the phasing plan (see item 9.)
5. Applicant shall update the plans to show that all manholes located on the flatiron side of Corporate Drive are to be raised to grade as part of the sidewalk construction.
6. Plans shall show a 3' shoulder alongside the sidewalk before grading down to the stream.
7. Applicant shall update the plan to include the revised standard note on radio strength testing.

8. The applicant shall consider ways to modify the pavement treatment for the 20' emergency access drives and cul-de-sac to improve the overall aesthetic and break up and the uninterrupted asphalt. Consideration shall be given to the suitability of the design for the multi-modal use of the areas. Final design shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department.
9. Applicant shall work with the City's Planning and Legal Departments to develop a recommended phasing plan for all site improvements, including interim grading plans, to present to the Planning Board. Subsequent phases shall required a noticed public hearing with TAC and Planning Board for amended site plan approval.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the project, the applicant shall reach an agreement with the City regarding phasing of the water and wastewater services. This shall be in addition to the required industrial discharge permit, which is issued by the City.
11. The City has reviewed the stormwater management and drainage and makes the following recommendations with the understanding the the project will be subject to additional review by the Pease Development Authority (PDA) to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Pease stormwater discharge permit as well as NHDES as part of the AOT permit process:
 - a. PDA staff and Board should review and address any outstanding issues raised by the third party peer review and have the third party peer reviewer do a final review of the plans prior to construction.
 - b. Updated plans and drainage report should be provided to the City's Planning Department reflecting any future revisions to the drainage based on PDA's final review and approval.
12. Plans should include water and sewer easements to benefit the City for any private portions of Goose Bay Drive.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Britz moved to recommend approval for Item C to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Coleman Garland, Owner**, for property located at **185 Cottage Street**, requesting Site Plan approval to demolish two existing residential buildings and to construct a 2-story medical office building, with a footprint of 7,000 s.f. and Gross Floor Area of 14,000 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 174 as Lot 14 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe and Bond, Architect Jeremiah Johnson and Contractor John Ricci were present to speak to the application. The project is located at 185 Cottage Street on the corner of the Route 1 By-Pass. It currently has two residential buildings on it. The proposed project is to demolish one of the buildings and construct a 7,000 square foot two-story medical building. The building will be located in the corner toward the intersection. There are 34 proposed parking spaces. Pedestrian access will be provided from the site to Cottage Street. A “do not block” striping is proposed on the plan to prevent back up on the By-Pass. Storm water from the building and parking lot will go to a rain garden. There will be a small storm tech system to treat the driveway runoff. Utility connections are shown on the plan. There is an existing sewer easement that crosses the site. The water and gas come from Cottage St. There is an existing overhead electric service. A landscape plan has been included. The elevation drawings are required for the Planning Board and those are in process.

TAC Comments:

- Detectable warning panel not needed for HP spaces.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that could be eliminated.
- A 50 foot length of double yellow center line at the entrance of the driveway will help to keep traffic on the right side of the driveway when entering.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be added.
- The bike rack should be closer to the main entrance of the building.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be relocated.
- The driveway corner radius closest to the By-Pass should be larger to allow for larger vehicles to turn right from the driveway without encroaching on the opposing lane of Cottage Street.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that the driveway would be revised.
- Changes to the signalized intersection of Cottage Street and the Bypass could be occurring as part of the Frank Jones Center redevelopment. While the traffic study for that project is still under review, the possibility exists of closing the median at the Cottage Street intersection and restricting movements to right in/right out.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that he had talked to Mr. Eby about the median comments and DOT conceptual plan.
- The DOT’s long range vision for this area includes taking this parcel for the widening of the Bypass and an access road to Boyd Road. There is no design or timetable for these changes, but the applicant should be aware of the possibility of the parcel being taken by the state.
- Terminate all water and sewer services for both homes, not all of the utilities are shown on the plans.
 - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.
- Show how the dumpster vehicle will use the site.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that the site is challenging give then shape. The thought was that it would be accessed during off hours. Adjustments could be made to the site plan as well. A trash truck can come in to load and turn out. A note would need to be added about the timing. Ms. Walker noted that it seemed like a lot of uninterrupted pavement. If that has to be done to make it easier to access the dumpster, then it should be offset with landscaping. Mr. Crimmins questioned if

they could add the off hours note instead. Ms. Walker responded that if there was a different way to access it that would be best, but the hours could work if that was the only way.

- The infiltration system under the driveway may be too low based on the nearby wetland elevation. Provide soil data for that location.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that they would review the elevation based on the RCS soil values for the site. They could potentially change the sidewalk, which would allow a curb break to get some storm water management. Mr. Desfosses commented that a soil test is needed if they are planning to do any underground system.
- The parking spaces shown are too narrow for high turnover use and there are only 2 HC spaces which is the minimum per code but depending on the use, may be inadequate.
 - Ms. Walker commented that the plans showed that they were trying to provide a lot of parking. She asked if that is that based on projected use for staff. Mr. Crimmins responded that the applicant was trying to maximize the parking especially because they don't know what parking would be needed for part of the building. Mr. Crimmins clarified that the spaces should be 9 feet wide. Mr. Desfosses responded that at least some of them should be. Mr. Crimmins confirmed he would look at it.
- Mill and resurface Cottage St from the driveway to the signal using 1.5" of high strength pavement mix. Replace traffic loops during process.
 - Mr. Crimmins responded that he would have to confirm this with the applicant.
- Given that the proposed site plan maximizes the number of parking spaces required by ordinance, please consider ways to break up the parking lot with landscaped islands to reduce the amount of uninterrupted pavement.
 - Ms. Walker noted that this had already been addressed. Mr. Cracknell added that unless there was a reason not to, then it would be good to add four elm trees in the same alignment with the other elms on the street edge. It would be better to replace the shrubs. Mr. Desfosses pointed out one tree that was almost on top of the sewer line. It should be at least 10 feet away from the sewer line. Mr. Cracknell commented there should be a privet hedge along the edge. There could be zelcovas in between the elms.

Mr. Britz questioned if it was possible to save the 15 and 24-inch oaks. Also the maintenance plan needs to be referenced in the site plan because that is what gets recorded. Ms. Walker commented that the applicant needed to provide a document from the private utility service. Mr. Crimmins responded that they did not have that yet. Ms. Walker noted that a waiver would be needed to keep the existing overhead electrical service.

Mr. Cracknell suggested pulling out the pediment on the front 8-12 inches and have a pediment canopy over the front door. The gable should be pulled out a little bit and pulling the windows apart would give it a classy look. The double hung windows are good. The applicants should look at the asphalt shingles.

Ms. Walker questioned if there was any irrigation on the site? Mr. Crimmins responded that there was not. Ms. Walker thanked Mr. Crimmins for providing a green building statement.

Mr. Eby noted that the painted crosswalk across the driveway was not needed. Ms. Walker questioned if Mr. Eby was comfortable with the “do not block” driveway markings? Mr. Eby confirmed that was fine.

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 postpone to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting on October 2, 2018, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:07 pm, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee