

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

Remote Meeting Via Zoom Conference Call

Per NH RSA 91-A:2, III (b) the Chair has declared COVID-19 outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 2020-04, Section 8, as extended by Executive Order 2020-24, and Emergency Order #12, Section 3. Members will be participating remotely and will identify their location and any person present with them at that location. All votes will be by roll call.

2:00 PM

FEBRUARY 2, 2021

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet TH Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Fire Department; Mark Newport, Police Captain; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the January 5, 2021 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the January 5, 2021 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Clipper Traders, LLC, Portsmouth Hardware and Lumber, LLC, Owners and Iron Horse Properties, LLC, Owner and Applicant**, for properties located at **105 Bartlett Street and Bartlett Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition and relocation of existing structures and the construction of 152 dwelling units in three (3) buildings, and associated community space, paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping and other site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 157 Lot 1 and Lot 2 and Assessor Map 164 Lot 1 and 4-2 and lie within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W) and Character District 4-L1 (CD4-L1) Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins from Tighe and Bond and Robbi Woodburn spoke to the application. Mr. Crimmins commented that this application was last here in December. Feedback from that meeting has been incorporated. Mr. Crimmins commented that he would review what was changed and then go over the TAC comments.

Ms. Walker clarified that the legal notice went out with the new accurate unit count of 152 residential units and no office space, but the agenda is incorrect. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that 152 units was the correct number. The submitted package has a new set of site plans and a TAC comment and response report. The drainage analysis was revised to reflect the latest design. The truck turning exhibits have been updated. The buffer impact exhibit was included. This project has a net improvement with 29,000 sf reduction in impervious surface, new pedestrian pathway, and storm water improvements. The open space exhibit shows the plan is providing 23% community space and a public park area. The parcel is providing almost 35% of the lot area as public open space. The latest trip generation memorandum has been peer reviewed. The environmental summary memo was included to show the existing soil and ground water samples. The site was reduced in density from 170 to 152 units. A portion of building A was removed. The shape of building C was revised to pull it further back from the buffer. That creates a more expansive courtyard between buildings B and C. Parking was reduced from 103 spaces to 95 spaces. Some of the pavement from the Cabot St. view corridor was pulled back. The path along the building was realigned. When the path along the pond is designed in the future it can tie into the path further off the pond. The City can add more path later if they elect to. The path is designed in a manner to allow for fire trucks to access the rear of the buildings. It will be a wider path at the corners to allow for the outrigger's placement. The proposed path will be a porous asphalt pavement, which they believe is the Staff's preference. If that is not the preference it can be changed. There would be better retrieval with a rain garden and other storm water treatment. The invasive plants in the 25-foot buffer will be removed. The invasive plants will also be removed in the construction areas. Stabilization practices will be included in the plan.

Mr. Howe questioned if the path would be wide enough in the critical areas for the ladder truck and outriggers. Mr. Crimmins responded that the width will support the ladder truck and the full outrigger.

TAC Comments:

1. Water Main: Developer must provide a "capacity analysis" for the proposed water line and for determination of pipe sizes needed for the water main and connection to McDonough St.
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they agree with this. They will provide a more detailed demand analysis and work with DPW on the size.
2. Water demand analysis submitted needs to include irrigation in addition to domestic use.

3. Engineer to confirm that porous Pavement will be able to support design load of fire truck if required.
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that it would be designed as such and a note would be added.
4. Third party inspection required during installation of utilities including sewer, water, and drainage.
 1. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was fine.
5. Provide written certification from registered engineer that the installation of the stormwater system complies with the plan and should perform as designed.
 1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.
6. Change note for the telephone manhole at Bartlett St to say 'alter the manhole structure as necessary to construct tip down. The same note will be required for the City's drainage manhole on the edge of the existing driveway.
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that a note would be added.
7. The sleeve under the RR will likely need to be replaced. The new line through this sleeve must be sized by the capacity analysis
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they agree with this comment.
8. Loading zone is on opposite side of driveway from buildings, forcing people to cross the driveway at a location with restricted visibility due to curve and parked vehicles.
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that the site driveway is a low traffic area. They looked at how to best divide the ADA spaces. The 20-space parking area would require a van accessible handicap space. The ADA space was changed to stripe and then the striping will continue on the length of the drive. The circulation would be good for those vehicles. The change can be made. Mr. Eby questioned if they planned to combine the access aisle with loading zone. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct and they can be differentiated if needed. It is just a continuation of the access aisle. Mr. Howe questioned if that was part of the fire lane turn around. They will want to make sure fire trucks can still go around there. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they will ensure that's good. Ms. Walker questioned if the fire lane could go through an active loading zone. Mr. Howe responded that they could not because trucks tend to park in the loading zones. Mr. Crimmins responded that there should be room for both lanes. The fire department can review.
 2. Mr. Marsilia commented that they will need to show phased drawings if the buildings are not going to be built all at once. Mr. Crimmins agreed. Right now, the plan is to build everything at the same time.
9. Per the ADA standards, the number of parking spaces required to be accessible is to be calculated separately for each parking facility; the required number is not to be based on the total number of parking spaces provided in all of the parking facilities provided on the site. For this site there are 3 parking facilities; the 20 spaces on the private roadway, the 95 spaces on the surface lot, and 95 spaces underground. This would require a total of 9 accessible parking spaces for the site. They don't have to be located in each facility, but consideration should be given to placing some near the elevator in the underground facility.
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that these comments were understood, and it should not be an issue.
10. Bicycle Route guide sign should be posted at the beginning of the multi-use path to indicate to cyclists that this is the point to enter the path, rather than continuing into the site parking lots. Likewise an END BIKE ROUTE sign should be placed in the same area facing the opposite direction.
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that would be added.

11. A double yellow center line should be added to the area above the 4 parallel parking spaces to the south of the circular drop off area, to reinforce that there is two-way traffic flow in this section.
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that could be added.
12. The dumpsters look very small for a site with this many residences. How often will they be emptied?
 1. Mr. Crimmins responded that they looked at this with the development team. The dumpsters are the typical size that have been used on previous projects. They should be sufficient. A letter from the trash removal company can be provided to show that they should be sufficient.
13. Sharrow pavement markings should be thermoplastic, not paint.
 1. Mr. Crimmins agreed.

Mr. Cracknell requested clarification on the average grade plain for each building. Mr. Crimmins responded that they were working to show the allowed grade plain. The plan shows what would be allowed and what is proposed. The proposed is less than what is allowed. The actual building heights are shown as well. Mr. Cracknell questioned if the podium in front of the building was a little higher than building B and A. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there would be a fence and security for the lumber yard at night. Mr. Crimmins responded that they will work with the development team on what will be provided for security measures. Signage can be added. Mr. Desfosses noted that should be on the finished plan.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the applicants were not agreeing to the Bartlett St. sidewalk improvements. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct. Given what this project is already providing and the traffic analysis it is a net positive. Ms. Walker commented that the traffic analysis was peer reviewed and there was no clear determination of the direct impact. Mr. Eby noted that there may be less vehicle traffic, but there could be more pedestrian traffic. Ms. Walker responded they can add a stipulation for a fair share contribution.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there should be more stipulations. Ms. Walker responded that the plan should have addressed past TAC comments and the current comments will be incorporated for the Planning Board. Anything communicated today can be incorporated as a stipulation. TAC just needs to decide if they need to be resolved before Planning Board or after.

Mr. Howe noted that the legend in the truck turning exhibits should show which lines track with which lines. Mr. Crimmins agreed.

Mr. Britz commented that the invasive plants in the 25-foot buffer will be removed except for the Norway Maples and then a wildflower mix will be planted. It would be good to put in more shrubs. Ms. Woodburn responded that the idea was to disturb the ground as little as possible. Planting shrubs would cause more disturbance. Any of the disturbed areas would be addressed with the seed mix as quickly as possible. Other than the two occurrences of the outfalls and the removal of the invasives the soil will not be disturbed. Mr. Britz commented that the invasives will come back, so they will need to think about how to handle that. Ms. Woodburn responded that there would be a lot of wide-open areas in the 25-foot buffer. It will be a maintenance item for sure. Mr. Britz agreed that if they take care of the invasive and just leave it, then they will come back.

Ms. Walker commented that part of the required open space includes the trail along the pond. There needs to be a contribution for the completion of that portion of the trail. To comply with the zoning requirements there needs to be that commitment.

Ms. Walker noted that there were some comments from the public that she wanted to correct and clarify before opening the public hearing. The greenway trail is a multi-use path not a fire road. It can be used for fire access to the pond side of the building in the event of an emergency. It has to be done in a way that the fire trucks can park. The applicant tried to address the concerns about the building heights. Staff is comfortable that the height complies with the zoning. A lot of comments Staff has received relate to further development in the buffer. Those comments are more appropriate to raise during the Conservation Commission and Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there was anything preventing the 1.5-inch orifice for manhole 9 from getting blocked. Mr. Crimmins responded that they could incorporate screening or a grate.

Mr. Howe commented that there should be signs on the path to show where areas are for trucks to deploy for emergency responders.

PUBLIC HEARING

Liza Hewitt of 169 McDonough St. commented that this plan still has a long way to go. The path is a fire road because if there was no path, then they would still need a fire road. The fire road is still in the 50-100 foot set back. The Conservation Commission did not appear to be in favor of the building or paths in the 100-foot wetland setback. The developer is putting the cart before the horse to ask for TAC's blessing on the fire road before the Conservation Commission approves it. Portsmouth has an ordinance for the 100-foot setback for a reason. It is good that there are fewer units, but there are still too many. There was a peer review for the traffic but dumping more cars onto Bartlett St. is concerning. Traffic will be worse with the development going in and the Cate St. connector. It was good to see the elevation contours on the plan. The underground parking is not fully underground. That will make a difference on the Dover St. view corridor. The project is not ready to move forward. The Conservation Commission still needs to review this.

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. commented that it was nice to see one of the buildings almost out of the buffer. The neighbors have asked to protect the 100-foot buffer and keep the lighting and mass to a minimum. The developer has been moving in that direction, but the plan still needs work. The goal of the request is to not over develop the pond. Concerns have not been addressed. The parking spaces that are 600 feet away should be visitor parking. The parking lot was not addressed and will have grade added to it. When it comes up the lighting will shine into people's windows. Lighting is a big issue. The snow removal needs to be looked at. There will be some issues with planting trees in the snow removal area. The plow needs room to maneuver. The applicant will need to consider where the snow will go if that other lot is built.

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

Ms. Walker clarified the comments made about development in the wetland buffer. Limited development is allowed in the buffer area, but that discussion is for the Conservation Commission and Planning Board. It is very common for TAC to be reviewing an application simultaneously with the Conservation Commission. The Planning Board typically does not review an application until there is a recommendation from both Boards. If anything changed substantially as a result of the Conservation Commission, then the application would have to go back to TAC. The applicant has provided information on the building heights. Staff has reviewed it and they are in compliance. The information has been provided and compliance has been confirmed. Ms. Walker appreciated the comments from the public and the time they have spent to be involved in this process. The lighting is something that can be looked at.

Mr. Desfosses commented that they should look at screening the parking lot given the elevations are a little lower than Dover St.

Mr. Britz thanked the applicant for their efforts. There is still more to discuss at the Conservation Commission, but this plan has huge improvements.

Mr. Howe commented on public spaces being available for use for the fire department. Portsmouth is a City. Mr. Howe did not think that a space should not be considered a public space simply because it could provide fire access. The trucks are going to go where they need to go. It is nice to make sure they can do it safely and appropriately. Ms. Walker agreed that it was good for it to be a multi-use space.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend approval** of this request to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Howe with the following stipulations:

To be Completed Prior to Planning Board Review:

1. Applicant shall submit a plan of Bartlett Street in the area where the extra water main is being eliminated, for review and approval by DPW. The plan shall delineate the existing water connections and note those proposed for elimination.
2. A note shall be added to the plan and Engineer shall confirm that porous pavement will be able to support design load of fire truck if required.
3. Change note for the telephone manhole at Bartlett Street to say 'alter the manhole structure as necessary to construct tip down. The same note will be required for the City's drainage manhole on the edge of the existing driveway.
4. Plans shall note that the sleeve under the RR will likely need to be replaced, to be verified by the water capacity analysis.
5. Placement and design of the Loading zone needs to be updated in coordination with DPW and the Fire Department per comments provided at the meeting.
6. Update plans to comply with ADA standards for provision of accessible parking spaces per guidance provided by City's Transportation and Parking Engineer.
7. Bicycle Route guide sign should be posted at the beginning of the multi-use path to indicate to cyclists that this is the point to enter the path, rather than continuing into the site parking lots. Likewise an END BIKE ROUTE sign should be placed in the same area facing the opposite direction.
8. A double yellow center line should be added to the area above the 4 parallel parking spaces to the south of the circular drop off area, to reinforce that there is two way traffic flow in this

section.

9. Applicant to provide the trash management program for review.
10. Sharrow pavement markings should be thermoplastic, not paint.
11. Plans shall be updated to note fence or other security measures planned for the lumberyard area on the plan.
12. The truck turning template shall include a legend to more clearly delineate the template lines and what they signify.
13. The detail for PDMH9 on Sheet C-506 shall be updated to the satisfaction of DPW.
14. The plan should note either signage or pavement markings that signify fire and emergency access locations on the trail.
15. The lighting plans and details shall updated to include screening of light trespass onto abutting properties, as necessary.
16. The plans shall be updated to reflect that the applicant shall either complete the greenway trail connection to the lot line on the northeast side of the lot as part of this project or the applicant shall agree to contribute a fee for the design, permitting and construction of the trail to be completed by the City in the future.

To be Included in Stipulations of Planning Board Approval Prior to building permit issuance:

1. The applicant shall provide a water main capacity analysis for the proposed water line in order to determine pipe sizes needed for the water main and the connection to McDonough Street system.
2. The analysis of water demand shall include irrigation in addition to domestic use.
3. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall coordinate with the Planning Department and DPW to determine a fair share cost contribution for sidewalk improvements at the Bartlett Street intersection.
4. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) for review and approval by the City's Legal and Planning Departments.
5. Third party inspection shall be required during installation of utilities including sewer, water, and drainage.
6. Provide written certification from a registered engineer that the installation of the stormwater system complies with the plan and should perform as designed.

The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Banfield Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **375 Banfield Road** requesting Site Plan review approval for the construction of a 75,000 s.f. Industrial Warehouse building and associated parking, stormwater management, lighting, utilities and landscaping. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 266 Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Coranati spoke to the application. The parcel is on an industrial zone and currently utilized by small commercial businesses. Most of the lot is previously disturbed vacant land. It is an old solid waste facility. The owner has engaged Barton and Wilcox to look at environmental concerns with the property. A cap and cover remediation plan was submitted to the State. The State wants to see it paved or built over. If any solid waste is disturbed it will be removed completely. A lot of the old solid waste will remain in place. Currently there are two small commercial buildings, an old shed and some asphalt along Banfield Rd. Most of the solid waste is in the peninsula and completely vegetated over. There are test pits throughout the property and they did not find any solid waste in those pits. The demolition plan is simple and shows everything removed will be removed from the property. The existing asphalt in the 100-foot buffer will be removed. There is a wetland CUP for application for the removal of asphalt and storm water outfall in the buffer. There is one small wetland impact on the eastern side of the lot. It will be filled. There is no buffer because it is too small. The proposal is to construct 75,000 sf industrial office building. There will be two entrances on Banfield Rd. with a simple parking area. There will be a truck loading area in the back with at grade loading doors for smaller trucks and loading bays for larger trucks. There will be front and side access to the building. There is a small retaining wall along the front parking lot. The site slopes to the west and all storm water heads to the wetlands. The storm water collection picks up the storm water to bring it to the treatment areas. There will be 3 focal point treatment areas that outlet to a rain garden treatment then to an R tank system to the west of the building. The storm water cannot be infiltrated because of the solid waste. Everything will be lined. After talking with the Conservation Commission, the storm water outfall location was rerouted to run more to the south and then to the edge of the wetland. The edge of the wetland depicts the solid waste limit. There will be some impact to the buffer with the swale, but the storm water will be discharged to a natural area. There are two entrances to make up for the steep slopes. The site will have natural gas and electric on our side of the road. The septic system will be in the rear of the site. The septic tech treatment system allows for a reduced leech field size and better treatment. Balsam firs and red maples will be added in the wetland buffer. The rest of the plantings and vegetation will go around the building. There will be wall mounted lighting and some poles out front.

TAC Comments:

1. Snow storage area shown on plan is on a 2:1 upslope and is not acceptable.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that they can remove that snow storage area.
2. Provide a separate domestic water service from the City's water main.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that would be added.
3. There should only be one driveway for this site.
4. Sight lines do not meet minimum requirements at the east driveway. Vertical crest curve in Banfield Road, as well as shoulder berm limits sight line. Berm on shoulder is less than 25 feet from cemetery, so how will sight line be provided?
5. There is insufficient site distance for slow moving large vehicles exiting the northern driveway that is shown. Due to the proximity of the Cemetery, the site distance through the embankment can't be enhanced therefore, this driveway is not approvable as shown.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that they will look at doing only one curb cut for the site and forgo the eastern curb cut. The western curb cut will be made wider and some islands can be changed in the parking area to get the trucks to the rear. It should not be a major issue. Turning templates will be provided.

6. The site layout all but ensures that the entire paved parking area on the north side will always be shady and this will lead to enhanced amounts of salt needed to treat the parking field. This is not appropriate especially considering the proximity of the large wetland directly adjacent to the developed area. The site plan layout should be mirrored so that the parking is on the south side and the driveway off Banfield is located further away from the hill in Banfield Road.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that they cannot do this because of the grades of the site. All of the treatment for the storm water is on the downhill side of the property. That requires keeping the driveway to the rear on the uphill side. There was concern about salting but all of the storm water will be captured and treated. This will be vetted through AOT.
7. We will need proposed truck types and number of trips daily for an engineer to generate the ESAL value needed for the road reconstruction. Shoulders will also likely need to be added in spots along Banfield. Developer will need to contribute the road reconstruction and permitting efforts.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that would need to be a discussion with the potential tenant and their truck traffic.
8. Unless the project is being built on speculation, the trip generation study should be based on the actual tenant and empirical data from a similar type facility should be provided, to reflect a more accurate representation of the truck traffic to be generated by the site. Are the photographs provided in the submittal taken at a similar facility? Traffic counts should be conducted at a similar facility, rather than using generic ITE trip and truck generation data.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that there have been discussions with a tenant about their traffic needs. The numbers were based on the trip generation in the ITE manual and the tenant.
9. The road reconstruction is planned for summer 2021. Stubs for utilities should be installed this spring before the road is reconstructed and the moratorium for no excavation is imposed.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that is understood. The utilities will be out prior to the repaving.
10. Truck turning plan for movements to and from the east need to be provided.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that they will provide that for the new curb cut.
11. The septic design looks too small for the size of the building/ number of employees expected please confirm. Consider installing sewer force main especially if this building will be used for multiple shifts per day.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that they have talked to the potential tenant and verified the employee count. There is a 75% reduction with the pretreatment. They are looking at the forced main location. There is no sewer within a couple thousand feet. Mr. Coranati confirmed they would verify the shifts per day.
12. Please explain whether all of the contaminated material previously buried has been removed and when it was. Submit reports. If there are contaminated soils here, installing the R tank system directly upslope would enhance the amount of groundwater thence flushing any contamination out of the soil and into the adjacent wetlands.
 1. Mr. Coranati responded that they did submit a report from Barton and Wilcox. They are working with them on the design of the entire site. They can review any details and provide a short synopsis of the site and remediation.

Mr. Eby commented that the plan should show the sight lines in the revised driveway. Mr. Coranati confirmed that would be shown.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if the foundation would be a slab on grade. Mr. Coranati confirmed that was correct. There will be a frost wall where needed. Mr. Marsilia questioned if there were borings on filled land. Mr. Coranati confirmed they did borings in that area and have taken into account what's out there. There were borings for all corners. Mr. Marsilia commented that he would need to see the geo-tech report before the building permit is submitted.

Mr. Howe commented that the updated truck turning movements should show which lines correspond to which truck wheels. The plan should also show what the turnaround in the back looks like for the trucks. Mr. Coranati confirmed that would be updated.

Ms. Walker commented that if mirroring the site was not possible, then the plan should incorporate ways to avoid heavy salt in that area. Also, the City will want a fair share contribution to the road reconstruction.

Mr. Britz questioned if the ground water management permit has been finalized. Mr. Coranati responded that they would need to follow up on that.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if the property across the street had a forced main. Mr. Coranati responded that it was still pretty far away. Mr. Desfosses noted that the septic system was small especially without knowing what is going in there. Mr. Coranati responded that they can look making the septic larger. It hasn't been submitted to the State yet.

Mr. Desfosses commented that if the building is moved back, then there would be more room for turning. Mr. Coranati responded that it is tight on the south corner of building in the 100-foot wetland buffer. If the building is moved back, then grading will go into the buffer. Ms. Walker noted that the building could also be smaller. Mr. Coranati responded that the building is the size the tenant needs. There are no wetland buffer impacts other than the storm water outfall. Ms. Walker noted that there are other constraints besides the wetland buffer. The way the building is situated creates access concerns and concerns about future management and maintenance on the site. It may make sense to do a smaller footprint. It's good that this plan is out of the buffer, but there are other constraints this plan is not responding to. The location of the paved parking area is not addressed.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if the building could shift over 25 feet and put the R- tanks under the driveway. Mr. Coranati responded that there would not be space other than the buffer for the treatment items. The treatment works better with the storm water going downhill to discharge out to the wetland vs. putting the treatment under the parking lot to discharge around the building. The building can't go to the east because of an easement. Mr. Desfosses commented that the site would work better if the building was shifted.

Ms. Walker noted that the Committee was still concerned about the traffic generation in this area.

PUBLIC HEARING

David Ecker of 422 Banfield Rd. commented that he submitted pictures for TAC to review. This site should not be considered until this is addressed. Even with a cap over the top of this site, there will still be an issue. Mr. Ecker noted that the issue will continue to contaminate his land. This issue needs to be

addressed. The water needs to leave the site clean. There has been a lot of digging in the land and they are not approved to do any work. This situation needs to be solved.

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. Howe moved to **postpone** this request to the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of the **Frederick Watson Revocable Trust, Owner**, for property located at **1 Clark Drive** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide a lot with an area of 137,176 s.f. and 75 ft. of continuous street frontage into four (4) lots and a proposed new road as follows: Proposed lot 1 with an area of 20,277 s.f. and 137.23 ft. of continuous street frontage; Proposed Lot 2 with an area of 17,103 s.f. and 100 ft. of continuous street frontage; Proposed Lot 3 with an area of 20,211 s.f. and 100 ft. of continuous street frontage; and Proposed Lot 4 with an area of 53,044 s.f. and 592.50 ft. of continuous street frontage. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 209 Lot 33 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Saari from Altus spoke to the application. Since the TAC Work Session most of the plan has been finalized. There is a closed drainage system in the back that goes to a rain garden at the bottom of the hill. The drains go across the access road which ties into Market St. No trees will need to be cut. The water line was modified, and the hydrant was moved. 8-foot-wide sidewalks were added, and a new sidewalk was added on Cutts St.

TAC Comments:

1. Public (roadway) runoff must be separated from private development runoff for treatment and for the responsibility to inspect/maintain. For this reason, the rain garden should be returned to the center of the cul-de-sac if possible.
2. Rain garden currently shown not acceptable- combines runoff from private (multiple lots) and from public (roadway) runoff; location is problematic for accessibility for inspection/maintenance; conflict for responsible party.
 1. Mr. Saari responded that was a little problematic because the downhill area is beyond the houses. A rain garden does not work in the cul de sac because of the soils. There was nothing in the regulations that prohibits road runoff going through the house lots. It is difficult because the bottom of the hill will all end up in the City system. An easement can be added for storm water. The access would be from the access road for drainage and sewer line.

3. Drainage calculations need to account for “developed” lots. Engineer to confirm if/what impervious area was included for the individual lots. Third party construction inspection is needed for all infrastructure and utilities (water, sewer, drainage, stormwater management).
 1. Mr. Saari responded that was not included. The treatment was a little bit oversized and an extra 15% was added for the rain calculations. This facility is a little bigger, but it is probably accurately sized for the future.
4. Stormwater Inspection and Maintenance Manual must clearly identify responsible parties for each/all components of the stormwater system.
 1. Mr. Saari responded that it is probably not needed. It is in the drainage analysis because of the submission requirements.
5. The pathway through to Market St should be 8-10’ wide and the fence moved so that it is 12’ between fences. There are now bike lanes on Market Street that this will tie into.
 1. Mr. Saari responded that they can carry that all the way through and update the plan. The added light will shine down and be the city standard LED.
6. An accessible entrance to the pathway should be provided for the residents of Watsons Landing, so that they don’t have to go down to Cutts Street to gain access to the walkway. Show a tip down at the end of the path.
 1. Mr. Saari confirmed that there will be an ADA curb ramp.
7. Third party inspection required during installation for utilities including sewer, water and storm drainage.
 1. Ms. Walker noted that a subdivision needs to be noted on the plan to make sure it is incorporated for the future building permit issuance. Mr. Desfosses noted that the DPW does not want a rain garden down there. That would push them to ask the Planning Board to make it a private street. Ms. Walker agreed with Mr. Desfosses. It may not be in the regulations. However, it is pretty common and supported in the storm water regulations that the private and public is not combined. A private road could become problematic. The applicant needs to come up with new drainage solution. Mr. Saari responded that there is a lot of ledge in the soil. Mr. Desfosses commented that the current drainage design will not be easy for DPW to access because of the trees. Mr. Saari confirmed that they would look at redoing the road and rework the drainage. Ms. Walker commented that this may be a result of over development. Mr. Britz questioned how many trees were proposed in the rain garden. Mr. Saari responded that there were none. There will be some tree cutting to access the sewer line, but the entire storm water facilities are in the lawn. Ms. Walker noted that this was a policy and management issue. The plan needs to be realistic about appropriate management for the City. The plan should include the dimensions of the road.
8. Provide written certification from registered engineer that the installation of the stormwater system complies with the plan and should perform as designed.
 1. Mr. Saari agreed.

Mr. Saari questioned if the City had a preference on street trees. Ms. Walker responded that they should consult the Trees and Greenery Committee.

Mr. Marsilia commented that the plan should show 2,500 sf boxes for the proposed lots. Mr. Saari responded that the boxes can be shown for discussion purposes.

Mr. Howe questioned if there would be proposed sprinkler systems for the houses. Mr. Saari responded that lot 4 and lot 3 may need them. Lot 1 and 2 should not need any. Mr. Howe commented that the

plan should include a note. If the door is more than 50 feet from the roadway, then the house needs a sprinkler system. Mr. Howe questioned if they would be single family homes. Mr. Saari confirmed that would be correct.

PUBLIC HEARING

Tom Heart of 165 Cutts St. commented that the City did a good job in planning out and renovating Cutts St. The road could not be better now. Mr. Heart can see a marker for lot 1 from his fence and questioned if that was the center of the house. Mr. Heart questioned if the road would face the street. The drainage from this project should not come back to the houses on Cutts. Mr. Heart requested more information on the style of the houses, if the fence that is there now would remain on change, and if there would be sidewalk. It would be good to add another light with this development.

Barbara Pamboukes of 91 Cutts St. commented that it was disappointing to see how a driveway becomes a City St. with 4 homes placed on a small area. The homes should be placed next to the cul de sac instead of back toward the wetlands area. There is a lot of natural wildlife in that area.

Tom Heart of 165 Cutts St. agreed that the house should be positioned close to the roadway.

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

Ms. Walker commented that for subdivisions they ask the applicant to provide a potential footprint, but they are not bound to that. They do have to comply with setbacks. TAC did ask for footprints to be added but the applicant is not bound to orientation or design. It would be good to have one more lighting location. Mr. Desfosses noted that they don't want to over light the area. If there is 12 feet between the fences, then the light on other end should be sufficient.

Mr. Britz moved to **postpone** this request to the next TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Walker adjourned the meeting at 4:18 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee