

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

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

2:00 PM

March 1, 2022

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Principle Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer; Beverly M. Zendt, Planning Director; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Darrin Sargent,
Police Captain;

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Stefanie Casella, Planner 1

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Approval of minutes from the January 4, 2021 and the February 1, 2022 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meetings.

Mr. Howe moved the minutes from the January 4, 2021, Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Zendt moved the minutes from the February 1, 2022, Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cronin.

Mr. Britz abstained from voting because he was not present for the February meeting.

The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The application of **Banfield Realty, LLC, (Owner)**, for property located at **375 Banfield Road** requesting Site Plan review approval to demolish two existing commercial buildings and an existing shed and construct a 75,000 s.f. industrial warehouse building with 75 parking spaces as well as associated paving, stormwater management, lighting, utilities and landscaping. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 266 Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District. (LU-20-259)

REQUEST TO POSTPONE

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Stith noted that this would be postponed to the April 5, 2022, Technical Advisory Meeting.

- B. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The request of **The Sagamore Group, LLC, (Owner)** for properties located at **1169 Sagamore Avenue and 1171 Sagamore Avenue** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the demolition of 3 existing principal structures (3 single family units) and 3 existing accessory structures to be replaced with 6 single family structures and 2 2 family structures to total 10 living units and 22 parking spaces where 15 is required. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 224 Lot 14 and Assessor Map 224 Lot 15 and lie within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) District. (LU-21-167)

REQUEST TO POSTPONE

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Stith noted that this would be postponed to the April 5, 2022, Technical Advisory Meeting.

- C. The request of **Elizabeth B. Larsen Trust of 2012 (Owner)**, for property located at **668 Middle Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of two two-unit structures and improvement to the existing structures to create a total of eight units on three lots with associated utilities, connections and site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 147 Lot 18 and lies within the Historic and General Residence A (GRA) Districts. (LU-21-23)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Coranati and Mike Garappey spoke to the application. Mr. Coranati commented that they had received the comments from Staff and they did not have too many questions. The feedback was pretty specific feedback, and they did not have any issues with completing the tasks.

TAC Comments:

1. Mill and Overlay on Chevrolet Ave needs to be 1.5” thick to match thickness of existing pavement
2. MSDOS structure to enter existing pipe via insert a tee, not DMH
3. Crown in driveway should dissipate as it approaches Chevrolet Ave so that all water reaches rain garden. Remove curb and put sidewalk if required on the uphill side so the stormwater can actually get into the stormwater pond.
4. TBM is still in wrong datum.
 - a. Mr. Coranati responded that they switched it all to the vertical 88. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct. They need to be converted on the plan too. Mr. Coranati confirmed that would be updated.
5. Please change Coordinate system to State Plane NAD83.
6. The proposed ROW easement is larger than necessary and should not include the rain garden. 5’ off edge of pavement is sufficient. Please make sure no part of the rain garden is in the easement.
7. Rework of the existing invert inside SMH 2395 will be required to allow the new pipe to enter at the proposed elevation required to cross the existing drain. Installer to work with Portsmouth DPW to make connections to their satisfaction.
8. The sewer profile should include the private portion.
9. Keep the City portion of the sewer main under the roadway.
10. 2” water lines don’t use gate valves. Please relocate main shutoff on 2” line to the driveway apron. 2” waterlines don’t use thrust blocks as the pipe bends, there are usually no fittings. It must be clear that the common 2” water line is owned in common between both lots.
11. If CTS pipe is being proposed for water services, tracing wires need to be installed to DPW standards.
12. There is landscaping proposed along Chevrolet Ave that would block sight distance. Please remove from the plan.
13. The hydrant detail shown is not correct for a blow off hydrant.
14. An agreement with Portsmouth water will be required for water system flushing

15. An easement in the private ROW area will be required for valve access and leak detection.
16. Acquiring the portion of the easement in the portion off site is required for approval.
17. The carriage house structure must be a condo in the remaining mother parcel in order to allow it to have a separate water service.
 - a. Mr. Coranati responded that it would be a condo. The carriage house would be one condo and the front building would be a second condo. They are labeled on the plan as A and B. Mr. Cronin questioned if they were apartments or condos. Mr. Garrapey responded that the front building would be 3 apartments. That whole building would be one condo unit. The carriage house would be a single-family residence and another condo unit. They will be land condominiums. Mr. Wholph clarified that there would be two separate owners for buildings A and B who would then rent their units in the buildings. It is subdivided for condos that have multiple units in them. Mr. Desfosses clarified that the individual units could not be sold as condos. That should be in the condo documents. Mr. Garrapey confirmed that was correct. One entity will own the building and rent the units. Mr. Cronin clarified that the back building only had one dwelling. Mr. Garrapey confirmed that was correct.
18. Please provide architectural plans and all associated data as identified on application checklist.
 - a. Mr. Garrapey commented that they could provide that as part of the submittal package. They can resubmit and upload them.
 - b. Ms. Zendt commented that they just want to make sure there is enough lot area for the units. Mr. Stith confirmed there was enough lot area post subdivision for the existing units. Mr. Coranati added that they went to the ZBA as well.
19. Please Identify where the proposed snow storage will be located.
20. Please correct address on the Drainage Analysis Sediment and Erosion Control Plan.
21. Please update checklist throughout process to properly identify where information is in application and planset.

Mr. Coranati confirmed they could make the changes to the plans based on these comments.

Mr. Cracknell commented that he did not have any additional comments but would need to look at the elevations again from previous submissions. Mr. Coranati responded that they could send it again, but the elevations had not changed. Mr. Cracknell noted that the elevations need to be included in the plan set going forward. Mr. Coranati confirmed they could be included.

Ms. Zendt questioned what the status of the subdivision was. Mr. Garappey responded that it was recommended by TAC that they wait for site plan, so they go together.

Mr. Desfosses requested information on the off-site deed that was part of the plan. Mr. Garappey responded that all of the easement documents were being drafted by legal. They can submit them as part of the application if that is needed. They are agreeable to grant the easements. The off-site one is also underway. They are working with the abutter on the shared driveway easement. Ms. Zendt questioned if the Committee wanted to see this again prior to going to the Planning Board. Mr. Desfosses noted that the easements should be on the subdivision plan. Mr. Garappey confirmed that would be updated. This plan will clean the whole area up. They are anticipating the off-site abutter will be agreeable to granting the Chevrolet Ave. easement as well. They will provide the documents. The two adjacent lots on Chevrolet Ave. are currently vacant. They subdivided part of Chevrolet Ave. travel way that encroaches onto both lots. Everyone is agreeable to granting the easements.

Mr. Cronin questioned if the existing sewer in the off-site easement would be removed or abandoned when the new sewer went in. Mr. Coranati responded that they would be installing a new service to the carriage house which will come off the main sewer extension. Mr. Desfosses questioned if they were replacing the sewer way in the back because of the grades. Mr. Coranati responded that it was a good time to replace it because they were moving pavement. Mr. Desfosses commented that it may be failing. Mr. Coranati responded that they were not sure of the condition. They did test pits to find the sewer service to the manhole but not how rides to the house. Mr. Cronin noted that the plan says the sewer would be abandoned in one place in the plan and removed in another place. It should be consistent.

Mr. Desfosses commented that they should see the plan set with all the changes before it goes to the Planning Board. Mr. Garappey confirmed they could submit their plan and come back to TAC or have them do an administrative review. Mr. Britz noted that they should come back here. Mr. Garappey commented that the easements they include may just be drafts because they won't be finalized until after they get approval. They will submit everything before the next TAC deadline.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there would be basements for these units or not. Mr. Garappey responded that they have had some discussions with the builder about foundation drains. Mr. Wolph noted that may be an option to design a waterproof foundation that would remove the water from the foundation itself. That would be acceptable, but they need to show how that would happen. Mr. Desfosses agreed that they would need to see the detail for that.

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 commented that they need to make sure the proposal is complete before it goes to Planning Board. Ms. Zendt noted that off site easements can be tricky. It has been best practice to get them to know it's a viable project, but she noted she would defer to the Committee on what they want to do. Mr. Britz commented that it would be good to have at least a draft. The foundations could affect the drainage and water. Mr. Garappey commented that he would prefer to have complete TAC sign off before going to the Planning Board, so they would rather come back. They do have prescriptive rights to access the manhole, so they don't necessarily need the off-site easement. Mr. Desfosses noted that they were expanding it, so he was not sure he agreed. Mr. Garappey noted that the abutters were willing to work with them and the City to clean this up.

Mr. Britz moved to continue this application to the April 5, 2022 TAC Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Request of **Mastoran Restaurants Inc. (Owner) and Granite State Convenience (Applicant)**, for property located at **2255 Lafayette Road** requesting Site Plan review and Conditional Use Approval for use 19.40 under Section 10.440 to allow a drive-thru facility as an accessory use to a permitted principal use in the Gateway Corridor Zone. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 272 Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Chris Mulligan, Nicole Doucette and Brett Pernaw spoke to the application. Mr. Mulligan commented that they have gotten a few variances in the past month and Ms. Doucette would address the TAC comments.

Ms. Doucette noted that overall, they were fine with the majority of the comments.

TAC Comments:

1. The OCS HDPE flow control tee outlet structure should have at least 3 SS straps holding it. Also, there should be no or virtually no sump in that assembly as the concrete structure itself has sufficient sump and it could keep animals from drowning. The OCS detail shows a 24" opening in the concrete top for a 32" manhole cover. The opening should be 30" for entry like a standard manhole, not 24". You should specify the distance required from the open top of the tee to the

underside of the manhole top to ensure enough flow can enter the tee in peak flow conditions.

2. The two bollards in front of the Handicapped unloading area don't look like they are spaced out enough to safely pass.
3. Please show the multi-use path with shading so we can see it clearly, confirm it is in the 15' DOT widening easement, and confirm that there are no physical obstructions in the way. Please confirm it will be graded at no more than 1.6% cross pitch and that it extends from property line to property line.
 - a. Ms. Doucette commented that DOT said it was 12 feet. Mr. Desfosses confirmed it was 12 feet.
4. Televis and provide video of existing sewer to DPW for review/approve for adequacy for reuse.
 - a. Ms. Doucette confirmed they would set that up. Mr. Desfosses noted that they needed to see that before it goes to the Planning Board. If they have to replace the sewer line, then they will need to see those plans.
5. Water shut off to be inside of a gate valve box if the shut off is located in the paved area.
6. Existing water line will need to be abandoned at the main prior to demolition if it is not being reused. Existing service is 1.25" copper. CTS water service will need tracing wire installed, contact Water Dept. for information.
7. Stormwater maintenance plan will be required.
 - a. Ms. Doucette responded that it should be at the end of the storm water report but will double check.
8. Multi use path cross section detailing needs to be provided for approval. 2.5" thick asphalt on 8" of crushed gravel base.
 - a. Ms. Doucette questioned if they were required to install that path. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that they were.
9. What are the plans for the "future EV charging station"?
 - a. Ms. Doucette responded that the "future EV charging station" was on the plan, so that if it is added in the future they would not need to come back. This one is a little further along in the process than other sites. They are already talking to Tesla. One question Tesla had was if they could increase the number of spaces. They are coordinating with the electric company and Tesla on the future charging equipment area. They may put it out closer to the dumpster, so it will be further away from the buffer.

That will be dependent on feedback from Eversource about the transformer locations.

10. A Conditional Use Permit will be needed for the drive-through.
11. A Wetland Conditional Use Permit will be needed for the impacts to the buffer area.
 - a. Ms. Doucette responded that both CUPs have been submitted in the packet. They went to the ZBA and got variances. They did receive a variance for having more than one driveway, but it was unclear if they also need a waiver. It is listed on the plans, but was not include it in this packet.
12. Please provide variance info on the plan set.

Mr. Britz questioned if they were going to add another charging area. Ms. Doucette responded that they were just adding one parking space. The future EV charging station equipment area would be moved near the dumpster out of the buffer and one more space would be added for charging.

Mr. Pernaw commented that Tesla and Chargepoint are both involved, and they were waiting for state funding. Mr. Britz questioned if they were working with Eversource. Ms. Doucette confirmed that they were to determine how many transformers were needed. It will most likely be two.

Mr. Howe commented that he did not see the fire suppression line on the plan. Mr. Pernaw responded that the fire suppression at the gas area would be a dry component. The building is not sprinkled. Mr. Howe commented that sprinklers were required if the building was over 5,000 square feet.

Mr. Wolph questioned what would be on the second story level. Mr. Pernaw responded that the deck would have mechanical equipment on it. Mr. Wolph responded that they would need to consider that during inspection if cars were driving under the mechanical equipment. Mr. Pernaw clarified that the equipment was on the actual roof. The rest of the canopy over the gas area was just for rain cover.

Mr. Eby questioned if there was a handicap space in the future charging area. Ms. Doucette responded that some states have been requiring at least one charging station be ADA accessible. Therefore, they are including an ADA space. The charging station panel is ADA accessible. Mr. Eby commented that they should not have a crosswalk that leads into a parking space. Ms. Doucette responded that they could remove that.

Mr. Cracknell commented that they should create a connector between the multi-use path and the front of the building. They could put it down the left-hand side of the proposed exit driveway then create a crosswalk across the drive to the sidewalk on Lafayette Rd.

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. Howe moved to continue this application to the April 5, 2022 TAC Meeting, seconded by Mr. Wolph. The motion passed unanimously.

- B. Request of ADL 325 Little Harbor Road Trust (Owner),** for property located at **325 Little Harbor Rd** requesting Wetland Conditional Use Permit under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance to replace the existing single family structure, carriage house, shed, barn, and paddock; construct a garage, pool, pool cabana playground; and renovate the existing barn and shed with all associated electric, gas, water, and sewer updates as required on private property and within the public right of way. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 205 Lot 2 and is located within the Rural (R) and Single Residence A (SRA) Districts.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Colwell and Hannah Giovannucci from TF Moran, Bernie Lee, owner Anthony DiLorenzo and Jim Youngblood from Youngblood Builders spoke to the application. Ms. Giovannucci commented that they currently have a CUP from the Planning Board for a DADU. They are hoping to present the wetland CUP at the March 9, 2022, Conservation Commission Meeting and the March 17, 2022, Planning Board Meeting. They are here at the request of the Planning Department because of the complexity of the plan and the potential to impact a number of public ways. They are proposing water going through a half mile of driveway and half mile of Sagamore Ave. It will be a 4-inch C900 PVC pipe underground. They are coordinating gas with Unitil and electric is being coordinated with Eversource and Comcast. They are proposing a gravity sewer going from the island and then a pump force main to Sagamore Ave.

TAC Comments:

1. 1½” Diameter force main is the minimum the City will recommend.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci commented that they were proposing a 1.25” because of the suggestion of the designer. Anything bigger could retain water. Mr. Desfosses noted that the tools they use to clean the pipes are for 1.5”. Ms. Giovannucci questioned if they could do a 1.25” to the right of way. Then join it to a 1.5”. Mr. Desfosses commented that he has been told they cannot clean smaller than 1.5”. The details of why were beyond his expertise to answer so they would need to discuss offline.

2. Permission for sewer connection is conditional on sufficient flow that the contents of the main do not turn septic and cause off site issues for the COP. If the service becomes problematic, a septic system on site will need to be constructed.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci agreed.
3. There can be no meter pits on the water main. The main must go directly into the principle structure for metering.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci confirmed they would do that. They are considering going into the garage. Mr. Desfosses commented that as long as it was a full-time heated pool, then that would work.
4. If chlorine injection is required, it will be inside the principle structure after the backflow device.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci responded that the purpose of that was to flush out the line when construction was complete.
5. Reclamation and replacement of the new binder on Little Harbour Road will be complete to DPW standards. Permanent repairs in Sagamore Ave will need to be approved by the DPW and will include milling and repaving the disturbed areas.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci agreed.
6. The existing water service needs to be abandoned at the main
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci commented that they think there is another line that goes to 321. The hope is to keep that service and then stub and abandon from there.
7. The current layout of the force main crosses the permeable pavement parking area. Instead, continue up Little Harbour Road until approximately the stop sign. Install new manhole at this location and then flow gravity into the city sewer with a wye connection.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci confirmed they would do that.
8. A clean out manhole will be required for the sewer every 1000' of force main so it can be cleaned with a 500' hose assembly. The manhole must be able to flush the main in both directions.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci confirmed that would be updated.
9. An 8" gravity line may be oversized and cause clogging issues. Consider moving the pump chamber closer to the last sewer connection point. Consider using 6" pipe with greater slope.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci responded that the reason they did an 8 inch was because they could do it a little bit shallower. Mr. Desfosses commented that the concern was there would not be enough flow and it will clog. Mr. Colwell responded that this was not an ordinary house. They will have plenty of water in the line.
10. Abandon existing water in place unless required by other permits or authority
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci confirmed that they would.

11. The applicant will need a license from the City for the private mains and primary voltage electricity in Little Harbour Road and Sagamore Avenues.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci confirmed that they would do that.
12. Leak detection and metering easement will be required.
 - a. Ms. Giovannucci agreed.
13. 2.5" water lines are not allowed. Use standard sizes.
 - a. Mr. Desfosses commented that if the line breaks, then they will not find a replacement part. They should use a standard size. Mr. Lee confirmed they would move to a 3" line.

Mr. DiLorenzo questioned if they only had tools to clean a 1.5" pipe. Mr. Desfosses responded that was the standard. Ms. Giovannucci confirmed they would discuss it further.

Ms. Giovannucci questioned if they should put the clean out in right of way or in the private driveway. Mr. Desfosses responded that they were going to need a license for it.

Mr. Lee commented that they were planning to run a 4-inch water pipe up into the house. Mr. Desfosses questioned if they needed that much water. Mr. Colwell responded that they had extensive irrigation. Mr. Youngblood added that the irrigation consultant originally came back with a 6-inch line recommendation. Then revised it to a 4-inch line. Ms. Giovannucci commented that they would have one meter. Mr. Desfosses responded that they should have a separate irrigation meter. Mr. Colwell confirmed that they would have a 4-inch line going to the garage and then a separate meter for irrigation.

Mr. Howe commented that there has been some resistance to a fire suppression system, but they need to make sure they meet fire prevention to code on the premises. Mr. DiLorenzo noted that the project was approved in 2017. They are asking for another approval because the license expired. The project was delayed because the builder passed away. They are proposing the same house it was just moved 18 feet. Mr. Colwell confirmed it was a similar house in a similar location. Mr. DiLorenzo commented that the only major change was the utilities. The fire department and police department have been to the house a few times. The site is an island surrounded by water. The house is designed to look original and is consistent with Portsmouth. It would be an added expense and design issue if they were forced to add sprinklers. They were not part of the house in 2017. This should not be required because the structure is on the island. They came to TAC for the utilities. This has been through the approval process in 2017. Mr. Howe commented that he could only speak to the application now. The concern is that there's no water out there that is reachable for the trucks. The code is clear about what is required. They cannot not approve inappropriate fire access or lack of water supply by code if there is no fire suppression system. If it is an existing building, then they can't do anything about it.

Mr. Colwell sent email from their attorney saying that NH can't request fire sprinklers. Mr. Howe responded that was semi accurate. They cannot pass an ordinance requiring sprinklers. However, they can enforce state and local code that have other requirements. If the site can meet the access and water supply requirements, then they don't need to put in a suppression system. If

they can't, then a suppression system is needed. Mr. Colwell questioned if putting in an access road that was 20 feet wide and adding a hydrant would satisfy the requirements. Mr. Howe responded that the road needs to be 20 feet wide and have a turnaround. There are grading, weight, and drainage requirements. The remote second fire hydrant is not realistic. They can accept less than if there is a suppression system. Mr. Colwell commented that they could fit a 20-foot-wide drive with turnaround and fire hydrant on the site. Mr. Howe commented that he would need to check the code. The turnaround would need to be on the island. This would not solve any concerns about the fact that it's a private road. The City would not maintain the road. They could potentially be delayed getting out there.

Mr. DiLorenzo commented that the fire department had been there several times and have turned around. There are no other houses around this one. Mr. Howe commented that the fire department still must respond and do a search and rescue because they don't know who's there. The code says it's required unless they can satisfy it in other ways. If they put together a plan with code references, then Mr. Howe would review and discuss it. If there is no fire suppression system, then they will need to make some significant changes to the site. Mr. Colwell commented that it didn't seem so significant. Mr. Howe noted that the fire flow requirements for a house that size was thousands of gallons. They most likely cannot provide that on site. The required flow for a sprinkler is 25 gallons. Ms. Giovannucci questioned if there was a dry sprinkler alternative. Mr. Howe responded that a dry system would not work for a building this size. They are designed for a small room. Mr. Wolph commented that the 13D sprinkler system is discreet. They are not like the commercial ones.

Mr. Lee commented that they could upgrade the water line to 8 inches, put multiple hydrants on the property, and create a turnaround. Mr. Lee questioned if there would still be a concern about it being a private road even if they meet all of the code requirements. Mr. Lee questioned if it was outlined in the code that the road could not be private. Mr. Howe responded that the code required more than one access shall be provided. If there is access for a single road, then it could be impaired. Mr. Colwell responded that the development they just approved last fall on Peverly Hill Rd. had 56 homes and one access point. Mr. Howe responded that those houses were sprinkled. That's the key difference. The sprinkler holds the fire in check until they get there. Mr. Howe did not think putting multiple hydrants in was the solution. The water demand is more than what they can supply.

PUBLIC HEARING

Lisa Oaks of 315 Little Harbor Rd. questioned if anyone had looked into the historic value of the buildings, specifically the convent and carriage house.

Mr. Colwell responded that they did look at that. The oldest structure on the site is the caretaker house. It was built in the early 1800s or late 1700s. The plan is to restore it. The one-story appendages will be taken off. The barn will be restored. The only structure that is being removed is the house, which was completely gutted and renovated 22 years ago. The carriage house came later and didn't have historical value. The one with real historical significance was the caretaker house.

Ms. Zendt added that there were not a lot of mechanisms to prevent something like that unless the City has adopted certain regulations to monitor that. A lot of historic properties in private hands are subject to the discretion of the property owner.

Mr. Britz added that there was a demolition delay ordinance. The City has a process for it.

Ms. Oaks questioned if the bridge would be reenforced or redone to support the construction vehicles and fire trucks.

Ms. Giovannucci responded that they were using steel plates to reenforce it. They will consider redoing it if needed.

Ms. Oaks questioned who would be paying to replace the pavement Little Harbor Rd. after the new sewer line was installed.

Mr. Colwell responded that they would.

Mr. Howe questioned if the bridge was being rebuilt to HS20 standards. Mr. Lee responded that it would reenforced to HS20 standards. It will handle 75,000 pounds or a 10-wheel vehicle now. They will ensure it can handle an HS20 load. Mr. Howe questioned if it was a temporary reinforcement. Mr. Lee responded that it was a temporary repair to upgrade the bridge. Ms. Giovannucci clarified that it would be a permanent reinforcement. Mr. Youngblood added that they found the engineer from the early 2000s who was inspecting the bridge every 5 years. The long-term plan will probably be to replace the bridge, but for now they are doing a reinforcement.

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 continue this application to the April 5, 2022, TAC Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cronin. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:35 p.m., seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey
Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee

