

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

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

2:00 PM

August 2, 2022

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Peter Stith, Chairperson, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Patrick Howe, Deputy Fire Chief; Shanti Wolph, Chief Building Inspector; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; Zachary Cronin, Assistant City Engineer, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Peter Britz, Environmental Planner

**ADDITIONAL
STAFF PRESENT:**

Beverly Zendt, Planning Director; Stefanie Casella, Planner 1; Kate Homet, Associate Environmental Planner

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Approval of minutes from the July 5, 2022 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Eby moved to approve the minutes from the July 5, 2022 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

- B.** Approval of minutes from the July 14, 2022 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Site Walk at the properties located at 212, 214, and 216 Woodbury Avenue.

Mr. Stith abstained from the vote. Mr. Howe moved to approve the minutes from the July 14, 2022 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Wolph. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Stith noted the requests to postpone.

- 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

The Committee voted to postpone consideration to the September TAC meeting.

- B.** The request of **Port Harbor Land, LLC (Owner and Applicant)** for property located at **2 Russell Street** requesting Lot Line Revision Approval to adjust the boundary lines on three lots to create one lot with 18,237 square feet (0.418 acres) of lot area, one lot with 52,651 square feet (1.209 acres) of lot area, and one lot with 19,141 square feet (0.429 acres) of lot area. Said properties are located on Assessor Map 118 Lot 28, Map 124 Lot 12, and Map 125 Lot 21 and lie within the Character District 5 (CD5), North End Incentive Overlay District, Historic District, and the Downtown Overlay District. (LU-22-111)

Mr. Stith read Petitions B and C into the record and addressed them as one.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Neil Hansen, Patrick Crimmins, and Bob Uhlig of Tighe and Bond, and Ryan Plummer of 2 International Group were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Hansen stated that he submitted revised copies and responses to the Committee's questions as well as a peer review response letter regarding stormwater. He said a large change to the plan that came out of the stormwater peer review was a significant increase to the amount of onsite stormwater detention that was added to the site. Based on a comment from the peer review and a site walk, it was confirmed that a large portion of the existing parking flowed directly to the railroad and didn't make it to the City's stormwater system. He said they revised their existing conditions model to account for it and also added more detention and revisions to their post development conditions to account for the shifting of watershed areas from sheet flowing offsite to be input into the City's storm system so that flow rates weren't increased into the City's system. He reviewed the Committee's comments.

TAC Comments:

1. Identify loading zones and expected sizes and frequency of delivery trucks. Include delivery truck turning template for turns onto Green Street.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said because the units were sale units, they expect to be dealing with Fed Ex and UPS trucks that could back into the driveway between Buildings 2 and 3, yet still leave enough room for cars. The frequency of moving trucks would be small

once the buildings are occupied and delivery for retail stores would have a limited frequency and would be done off Russell Street.

2. Identify solid waste disposal locations and truck route to remove.
 - a. The plan is to have trash storage in Building 2 and have rollout bins for pickup.
3. State size of domestic and fire water services.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said those are still to be determined and have to be coordinated with DPW.
4. DPW requires calculations for proposed water usage, proposed sewer use, and capacity for each building.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said it's being looked at by the project MVP for water usage.
 - b. The sewer use will be part of the NHDES sewer connection permit, which gets reviewed and approved by DPW prior to submission to the State.
5. Confirm enhanced stormwater treatment will be achieved per updated Portsmouth stormwater regulations.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said it will be achieved. The stormwater treatment systems proposed for the site are the jellyfish filters, which meet the treatment requirements of the Portsmouth regulations. The site also meets the redevelopment treatment requirements that are within the City's stormwater regulations.
6. Consider widening Green at Russell intersection for trucks turning out of development onto Green. Possible median island to enhance pedestrian crossing. Trucks turning enter the opposing lane during turn.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said they would take another look at that intersection and increase the radius of Green Street and also the radius tying from Green Street into Russell Street.
 - b. He said they're not in favor of adding a median but we'll look at improving the alignment to make it work better.
7. DPW needs to review responses to peer review comments on traffic study.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said they sent it out that afternoon, and they were open to having any follow-up as a stipulation to be completed prior to the Planning Board review.
8. Remove offsite paved areas associated with the roundabout from community space calculations.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said they included those as part of their calculations, and if the City wasn't building the roundabout, that land would be used for the park and would be part of the community space. In order to build the roundabout, the land transfer is required so that the land is still being used as a public benefit, which is why it was included in the community calculations.

9. Please reformat the community space calculations to clearly show the required and proposed calculations per lot.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said they included that breakdown on the overall site plan (Sheet C102) but would be happy to add it to the community space exhibit for consistency.
10. Please revise map and lot numbers to be consistent and accurate. Map 119/Lot 4 has been mislabeled in various areas.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said he did find that the lot was mislabeled on the Lot Line Revision Plan. He said he didn't see any other location but would look through their submitted materials and ensure that it's corrected for submission to the Planning Board.
11. It appears there are multiple easements to be granted between the lots. Several lots are under common ownership. Has the applicant proposed to overcome the doctrine of merger?
 - a. Mr. Hansen said the applicant's counsel has reviewed their proposed easements and lot line adjustments and is comfortable with what they're proposing, and they would be happy to do any necessary follow-ups between the applicants counsel and the City's legal department.
12. Two portions of the wide pedestrian sidewalks community space easements do not appear to be 10 feet wide throughout. Please confirm that all sections conform to the zoning ordinance requirements.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said the ordinance states that the sidewalk needs to be a minimum of 10 feet in width. He said the project's sidewalks were a minimum of 12 feet along Maplewood Avenue and a minimum of 14 feet for the remainder of the site. He said the wide sidewalk community space easements are included as the portion between the building's façade and the right-of-way, which is consistent with how they did similar calculations for past approved downtown projects. He said the applicant will work with DPW to determine the fair share contribution amount that will be dedicated to Maplewood Avenue drainage improvements.

Prior to Planning Board Approval:

13. Provide backup information on deeded parking spaces.
14. Applicant will work with DPW to determine fair share contribution amount that will be dedicated to Maplewood Ave drainage improvements.
15. Applicant will work with DPW to determine fair share contribution amount that will be dedicated to Maplewood Ave intersection and traffic improvements.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said he wasn't sure if Item 14 was related to the Market Street intersection as opposed to Maplewood Avenue but was happy to work with the City and DPW to determine those fair share contributions.

Prior to Construction:

16. Address need and potential need for permits, including but not limited to flagging, blasting, stormwater discharge, temporary dewatering, and temporary construction permits.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said they will need all those prior to construction as well as an alteration of terrain and sewer connection through NHDES and an EPA analysis.

17. Project will require a construction phasing plan.
 - a. Mr. Hansen agreed and would welcome input from TAC on the timing of when it would need to be completed.

Post Construction:

18. Applicant must agree and add note to plans to conduct a post construction video of sewer and drain on Deer, Maplewood, and Russell.
 - a. Mr. Hansen said they would add that note to the plan.

Mr. Eby said the sidewalk width on Maplewood Avenue looked like it was only 6 feet wide but Mr. Hansen had said it was 10 feet. Mr. Hansen said it was actually 12 feet wide and explained that the dimensions on the plans from the property line to the building's façade made it confusing, so they would clean it up and make sure the width is clearly labeled. He noted that the City's definition of a sidewalk included street trees and street furniture.

Ms. Zendt said there were some blank sections on the community space calculations and some of the comments might be confusing to the Planning Board, like the one about removing offsite paved areas associated with the roundabout. Mr. Hansen said they would clean it up and add it to the exhibit where they could be compared side by side.

Mr. Eby asked if the existing parking lot usage on the site was public parking. Mr. Hansen said it was owned by the Sheraton but anyone could park there. Mr. Eby asked if it was possible that people parking there today wouldn't be able to park there in the future, and Mr. Hansen agreed.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough Street said the food service in the commercial space would have delivery more often than occasionally. She said she was concerned about the dueling crosswalk because of cars turning onto Deer Street and she suggested using something to calm traffic. She said some of the soil group numbers seemed questionable. She said there was no size indicated for the second-floor greenspace and thought it could have a green roof with paths and decks on it to allow more natural control of water runoff. She said there was a lot of light proposed for a dark sky area. She said the tree boxes and curbs might cause people to fall and suggested that a hardscape item to be put around the tree boxes.

Attorney Larry Gormley representing the Market Wharf Condominium Association said he was present to address parking issues. He said the condo had an easement to park on the current lot since 1987 for 58 deeded spots that were subject to being moved by the owner per the deed. He said that seven years before, it was agreed that the condo parking would be relocated to the underground garage at the Sheraton and that they negotiated an agreement that addressed issues of right to park, type of spot, ease of entry and exit, etc. with the prior owner. He said the property was then sold to Port Harbor Land, who said the condo association parking would be

relocated to a new building but shared nothing else. He said he filed litigation seeking judgement about the condo's rights related to parking because Port Harbor Land had chosen not to communicate with them and threatened to evict them from their own deeded site. He noted that part of the parking was stacked spots and didn't believe their deeded rights could be stacked and he expected that the condo would be given the least desirable spots. He spoke to other issues, like pirating their garage spaces and not having an entity to control parking. He said, given the litigation, the parking suggested by the applicant might not work and may result in a shortage of parking. He said he represented 29 owners with deeded property rights and said it was incumbent on the City to take their concerns under advisement in rendering a decision.

No one else spoke, and the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Eby referred to the issue raised by Ms. Bratter about traffic calming and asked if there would be two lanes between Russell and Deer Streets. Mr. Cracknell said it would be one lane between the two crosswalks. It was further discussed. Mr. Eby said it would not be a safe crossing and suggested monitoring it after construction to see how it was being used and perhaps initiating traffic calming at that point. He said he had concerns about putting in a marked crossing at that location but would prefer one crosswalk as far away from Maplewood Avenue as possible. The Committee agreed that there should be a peer review. Mr. Cracknell recommended asking the peer review to solve the problem and suggest other options that would make it safe.

Mr. Desfosses asked what lighting codes would be on all the fixtures and if all the light fixtures would be confirmed. Mr. Hansen agreed. Mr. Desfosses asked what the wattages on the wall wash lights would be. Mr. Hansen said he didn't know but would confirm it.

Mr. Eby asked if deliveries would be made using Russell Street or using the parking spaces. Mr. Hansen said they didn't have a defined use for those commercial spaces yet. Mr. Eby suggested requesting a loading zone on Russell Street similar to the ones used on Raynes Avenue but thought it would be up to the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee. He asked if the solid waste would be stored in Building 2. Mr. Hansen said it would be stored in Buildings 1 and 3 and that there would be an area identified in the garage. Mr. Eby asked if there would be a barricade to keep people from crossing in front of the railroad tracks. Mr. Hansen said there was no intention to put a fence at this point. Mr. Cracknell asked how much the grade changed. Mr. Hansen said it was the same grade along the line. In response to further questions, Mr. Hansen said that, due to the building's shape, there was a lot of unused area that the trash would go into and didn't know if the trash would be separated. The Committee said they needed to know because it would be a different occupancy issue.

Mr. Desfosses asked how much room was needed for railroad crossing gates and if the driveway would be in the way. Mr. Hansen said he didn't know. Mr. Desfosses said it should be confirmed that there would be enough room. He asked about water infiltration and test pits. Mr. Hansen said they were not infiltrating anywhere; he said the previous development had a GeoTech report and had found that the ledges were very shallow, so water wouldn't have anywhere to go. Mr. Desfosses said when the drainage system was put in Green Street, a bunch of rock would have to

be removed, which would cause the temporary removal of the gas line and water main in that section. He said it should be planned for ahead of time with a note.

The Committee asked where the second exit for the Building 2 lower level parking was. Mr. Hansen said there was a second stairwell on the left side of the building.

Ms. Zendt was asked if the applicant acknowledged the easement and the potential conflict if there was a parking easement issue before the Planning Board's approval. She said there was a pre-existing covenant that was before the Planning Board recently and they accepted the idea that it might be part of their consideration, but she thought they would want to see a resolution to the issue. She suggested asking the Legal department about what degree that could be part of the Planning Board's deliberations. The Committee asked if the Planning Board would need a schedule stating that all the lighting is dark-sky compliant. Ms. Zendt said the Planning Board would look at the photometric study to make sure the lighting was compliant and would want the Committee to review what they could. Mr. Cracknell suggested that the applicant's lighting manufacturer look at the plans and certify the lighting.

The Committee said there were very limited sight lines coming out of the parking garage due to the sharp lines of the building and there were concerns about pedestrians walking out in front of traffic. They further discussed it, including the possibility of having a warning device for when a vehicle exited the garage.

Mr. Eby moved to continue the application to the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Cronin. The motion passed unanimously.

- C. The request of **Port Harbor Land, LLC (Owner and Applicant)** for property located at **2 Russell Street** requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of 84 residential units, commercial space, and parking in three buildings with associated community space, paving, utilizes, landscaping, and other site improvements including three proposed land transfers to allow for the realignment of the Russell Street & Deer Street intersection and for the City's future construction of a roundabout at Russell Street and Market Street (Land transfer area 1 is proposed from Map 119 Lot 4 to the City of Portsmouth. Land transfer areas 2 and 3 are from Map 119 Lot 1-1C to the City of Portsmouth); Conditional Use Permit Approval to provide 343 parking spaces on separate lots where 341 spaces are required as permitted under Section 10.1112.62 of the Zoning Ordinance; and Conditional Use Permit Approval to allow a 40,000 square foot building footprint within the CD5 as permitted under 10.5A43.43 of the Zoning Ordinance. Said properties are located on Assessor Map 118 Lot 28, Map 124 Lot 12, Map 125 Lot 21, Map 119 Lot 4, and Map 119 Lot 1-1C and lie within the Character District 5 (CD5), North End Incentive Overlay District, Historic District, and the Downtown Overlay District. (LU-22-111)

Please see Petition B.

- D. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The request of **Frederick J. Bailey III & Joyce Nelson (Owners)**, and **Tuck Realty Corporation (Applicant)** for properties located at **212, 214,**

and 216 Woodbury Avenue requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval for a Lot Line Relocation to create the following lots: Proposed Lot 1 to be 60,025 square feet of lot area where 26,012 square feet are existing, Proposed Lot 2 to be 12,477 square feet of lot area where 29,571 square feet are existing, and Proposed Lot 3 to be 7,917 square feet of lot area where 24,836 square feet are existing. No changes in street frontage are proposed. Said properties are located on Assessor Map 175 Lots 1, 2, and 3 and lie within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (LU-22-129) **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

The Committee voted to postpone consideration to the September TAC meeting.

E. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The request of **Frederick J. Bailey III & Joyce Nelson (Owners)**, and **Tuck Realty Corporation (Owner and Applicant)** for properties located at **212 Woodbury Avenue** requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of an eight-unit condominium development consisting of four (4) single living-unit structures, two (2) two-unit structures, 18 parking spaces where are 13 required, and associated stormwater, utility and site improvements with access to the development from Boyd Street. Said properties are located on Assessor Map 175 Lot 1 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (LU-22-129) **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

The Committee voted to postpone consideration to the September TAC meeting.

F. The request of **Randi and Jeff Collins (Owners and Applicants)** for property located at **77 Meredith Way** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one (1) existing lot with 22,463 square feet of lot area and 31.7 feet of street frontage into two (2) lots with associated 73.3 foot road extension as follows: Proposed Lot 1 with 11,198 square feet of lot area with 73.79 feet of street frontage, and Proposed Lot 2 with 11,265 square feet of lot area and 31.61 feet of street frontage. Said property is located on Assessor Map 162 Lots 16 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (LU-22-61)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney Chris Mulligan, owner Jeff Collins, and project surveyor Brenda Kolbow were present to speak to the application. Attorney Mulligan addressed the Committee's prior comments.

TAC Comments:

1. Roadway extension and driveway area for turnaround easement must be built to City standard. Please provide detail for DPW review.
 - a. Attorney Mulligan said they concurred and will add detail to the plan to the effect that DPW should review it.

2. Sewer on plan on Meredith way is not as shown. Update to existing conditions. Sewer service installation to Pine Street will require easement from City. Please update to existing conditions and indicate easement area on plans.

- a. Attorney Mulligan said they will update the existing conditions to indicate the easement area on the plans.

Ms. Kolbow asked if the existing lines should be verified. Mr. Desfosses explained where they should be installed and said they might need an easement; he said the existing house did not connect to the sewer and might also need an easement.

3. Rain garden will require overflow pipe connection to the City drainage system, location to be determined by applicant and approved by DPW.

- a. Attorney Mulligan said they will add that to the plans.

4. Design of rain garden is incomplete. Test pits in location of rain garden results and drainage calculations required.

- a. Attorney Mulligan said they will add those to the plans.

5. Have test pits been completed? If so, what were the results?

- a. Attorney Mulligan said they will add those to the plans.

6. Please show drainage calculations.

- a. Attorney Mulligan said they will add those to the plans.

7. Turnaround easement time and the language for it.

- a. Attorney Mulligan said that was something they normally worked out with the Legal department and had it reviewed and approved. He said the distance from the garage door to the easement area was 18 feet and was sufficient.

Prior to Planning Board Approval:

8. Proposed water shut off for proposed eastern house must be installed in the right of way and not installed in asphalt. Please update plans.

- a. Attorney Mulligan said they would revise it and put it in the correct location.

9. When attending Trees & Greenery Committee to get approval to remove vegetation in the buffer for the road extension applicant should encourage the Committee to support planting a line of oak trees that will match those along Pine Street.

- a. Attorney Mulligan said they would agree to do that; he noted that the Trees and Greenery Committee would provide them with the trees.

Ms. Zendt asked if the easements could be on a separate easement plan with unique identifiers so that it would go a lot quicker.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Zendt noted that a few PWD comments were still pending and asked if it should be moved forward without the test pits, rain garden, and sewer service information. Ms. Kolbow said they would add the test pit information and drainage calculations to the plans and would coordinate the sewer location with Mr. Desfosses.

Mr. Desfosses said there had been zero progress made since the previous month, including that the rain gardens showed no drains and there was no location shown for the sewer line. He said he didn't know where the water line reduced down to one inch. It was further discussed. Mr. Desfosses said he wanted to see all the information offline so he could ensure that it was right. It was decided to have a meeting the following week and also do a site walk.

Mr. Desfosses moved to continue the application to the September meeting, seconded by Mr. Cronin. The motion passed unanimously.

- G.** The request of **Road to the West, LLC (Owner and Applicant)** for property located at **140 West Road** requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to improve and install stormwater infrastructure, relocated dumpsters, install landscaping, and increase parking spaces from 102 spaces to 122 spaces where 119 are required. Said property is located on Assessor Map 252 Lot 2-13 and lies within the Industrial (I) District (LU-22-99)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney Chris Mulligan, project engineer Alex Ross, property owner Alex Choquette, and architect Mark Gianniny were present to speak to the application.

Mr. Ross referred to the previous comments that they had not addressed. He said the Committee had asked for a drainage easement and additional test pits at the back of the property. He said they were showing a 10-ft wide drainage easement on the site plan and Test Pits 5, 6, and 7 at the back of the property. He noted that they removed the three parking spaces and changed them to landscape areas. Referring to the landscape plan, he said the proposed large trees over the drain line would be replaced by smaller plantings so that maintenance on or replacement of the drain line could be done if necessary. On the utility plan, he said they relocated the grease trap closer to the building. As for grading and drainage, he said they moved the pervious pavement at the far end of the parcel to be up against the building, and enlarged the detention pond out back and added a treatment swale. He said they included all the test pits with all the related information. Mr. Desfosses asked if the detention pond had a staged outlet. Mr. Ross showed the basin and detention pond areas on the plans.

TAC Comments:

1. Pretreat stormwater prior to detention basin. Please update on plans to include calculations and details.
 - a. Mr. Ross said the pervious pavement had an underdrain that runs to a treatment swale that conveys that runoff to the detention pond, and the majority of the rear parking lot goes through that drainage.
2. State what surface water CBA will receive and need for catch basin in that location.
 - a. Mr. Ross said Catch basin A is close to the front of the building and its purpose is to have a basin to distribute the flow into the stormwater chambers; the water that will go to that basin is the roof runoff.

Mr. Desfosses commented that it could be a manhole, and Mr. Ross agreed.

3. Include sewer manhole detail.
 - a. Mr. Ross said the utility plan shows that it would be the sewer manhole, where it would tie in and connect with the grease trap. He said there was an issue with the existing pipe that has to be repaired, but they could add a sewer manhole detail to the plans. Mr. Desfosses suggested using the State standards for the manhole.
4. The updated landscape plan shows three new landscaped islands with a tree in each one, please add some additional plantings in islands (herbaceous/shrubs).
 - a. Mr. Ross said small plantings will be added to surround the trees.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the plan showed removing the gravel underneath the spaces and putting 18 inches of loam so that the plants would survive. Mr. Ross said they would make sure there was enough loam.

5. The cistern plan for irrigation is a sustainable solution. Please provide details on cistern operation and maintenance.
 - a. Mr. Ross said the owner has reached out to some contractors and they could provide a plan of how that would work.

Mr. Desfosses said to make sure the City system is protected through backflow devices in case the water gets comingled. The applicant said the CSI engineering group's design and drawing would include a second meter and backflow preventer.

6. Please list all State and Federal permits that will be needed for this project on the plan set.
 - a. Mr. Ross said a note will be added to that effect.

Additional Items Prior to Planning Board Approval:

1. Continue granite curbing around entire parking lot in vicinity of CB B for drainage.
 - a. Mr. Ross concurred and said it was in the corner by the main entrance. He said they would add curbing at that location.
2. Please provide a letter stating how all TAC comments and stipulations have been satisfied.

- a. Mr. Ross said they would provide the letter.

Mr. Desfosses said the two new trees in the right-of-way along West Road would need approval from the Trees and Greenery Committee. He said he noticed on the grading plan that they were lowering the ground in the back parking lot and it would necessitate removing all the gravel in the lot. Mr. Ross said there was a way to adjust that. Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. Ross to show the outfall structure on the grading plan with the detention basin contours.

Mr. Cronin asked if the jellyfish filters were integrated into Catch Basin B. Mr. Ross agreed and said Manhole B collected water from the storm tech, which was the roof runoff. Mr. Cronin asked that it be labelled and noted on the plan.

Mr. Desfosses said the plan showed light spillage over the property line and that it would need to be rectified. Mr. Ross said they would add more specifics to the lighting plan and make sure the light poles were a safe distance from the wires.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Cronin moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

Items to be addressed prior to Planning Board approval:

- 1.1) Plans will be updated to include treatment swale details and calculations. DPW to review and approve prior to Planning Board consideration.
- 1.2) Catch Basin A will be changed to a manhole.
- 1.3) Sewer manhole detail, in accordance with State standard, will be added to the plans.
- 1.4) Landscape plans will be updated to include additional plantings and loam planting beds within the three landscape islands.
- 1.5) Cistern operation and maintenance details will be added to the plans. DPW to review and approve prior to Planning Board consideration.
- 1.6) All State and Federal permits as required for this project will be listed on the plans.
- 1.7) Plans will be updated to show granite curbing around entire parking lot in the vicinity of Catch Basin B for drainage.
- 1.8) Grading Plan will be adjusted to correct reduction in grade behind building. DPW to review and approve prior to Planning Board consideration.
- 1.9) Light poles will be shown on plans at least 10 feet from the overhead power lines with details that will show light temperature, cutoff shields, and mounting height. DPW to review and approve prior to Planning Board consideration.
- 1.10) Outfall structure will be added to the plans.
- 1.11) Catch Basin B will be moved to the curb and a note will be added regarding jellyfish filter.

1.12) A letter will be provided to the Planning Department with the updated submission stating where resolved conditions can be found on within the submission and how outstanding conditions will be resolved subsequent to Planning Board approval.

Conditions Precedent to Building Permit:

1.13) Drainage easements will be dedicated and accepted by the City.

1.14) Plantings in the public Right of Way receive approval from the Trees and Greenery Committee.

1.15) A full set of documents including all plans, studies, and the aforementioned letter – will be submitted for staff review and Planning Board consideration.

The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Christopher H. Garrett Revocable Trust of 2007 (Owner and Applicant)**, for property located at **1299 Islington Street** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide one (1) existing lot with 27,366 square feet (.628 acres) of area and 199.33 feet of street frontage into two (2) lots as follows: Proposed Lot 1 with 15,000 square feet (0.344 acres) of lot area and 100 feet of street frontage, and Proposed Lot 2 with 12,366 square feet (0.284 acres) of lot area and 99.33 feet of street frontage. Said property is located on Assessor Map 233 Lot 119 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) district. (LU-22-33)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Project engineer Alex Ross was present to speak to the petition. He noted that the plans have change and addressed the comments from the previous meeting.

Relating to the subdivision plan he said they added the correct lot number to the parcels and the assessor said he would give them the correct mailing address after approval. Relating to the site plan, he said there was a comment at the previous meeting about where a foundation drain would go and how it would work. He said it would be located at the back left of the parcel and would have a stoned outlet protection area. He said they shifted the front setback and the house a little closer to the street to have a bigger backyard. He said they originally did Test Pits 1 and 2 on the left side of the parcel but were now adding Test Points 3 and 4 to the rear of the parcel. He said test pit data was added to the site plan.

TAC Comments:

1. Please state how the proposed septic system meets the requirements set forth in Section 11 of the Subdivision Regulations and ENV-WQ 1005.03 (Minimum lot size). It appears that NHDES approval is needed for the septic system and a waiver for installation on undersized lot.
 - a. Mr. Ross said they had been in contact with DES; it's a small parcel. He said the City provides water and sewer to a lot of the surrounding lots, but as you head west on Islington Street, it doesn't. He said DES is open to the fact that they need a waiver,

minimum lot size, and so on. He said they would go to the Planning Board for subdivision approval and then submit a septic plan to the State and seek their approval.

2. Foundation drain must daylight into a stormwater detention area. Day lighted drain must be sufficient distance from proposed leach field.
 - a. Mr. Ross said they added the location of where the foundation drain will daylight and also added the stone protection area. He said it was not a State or City requirement that the foundation drain go to a stormwater detention area, but if it was a concern they could look into it or have a rain garden. He said the State has a gradation of permeability for soils that runs from 2 to 60, where 2 is the best soil. He said their soil ranged about 4-6. He said the natural grade from Islington Street ran to the rear of the property to an abandoned railroad track. He said all the direct abutters had no concerns at the BOA meeting. He said they didn't think drainage is an issue but would review it with DPW if more is required.
 - b. He said the State does have a setback from a foundation drain to a septic tank to a leach field, which they met, and that the State would review their septic plan if it was submitted.
 3. Demonstrate with stormwater calculations that stormwater flow to adjoining properties will not be increased post construction.
 - a. Mr. Ross said drainage wasn't a concern at the previous meeting – the concern was where the foundation drain would be located. He said what they showed is a possible house-size configuration driveway leach field and that it might change. If DPW or the Committee thinks the drainage is an issue, he said it could be made a condition prior to building permit.
- Mr. Desfosses said he didn't think it's an issue but thought it could be rectified. He said the soil was good, and suggested that some kind of stone drain along the rear property line infiltrate that water downhill from the leach field.
4. Owner authorization form needed.
 - a. It was submitted July 5 and resubmitted today.
 5. Is there an existing easement for sewer line across the neighboring property? If so, will this easement need to be updated?
 - a. Mr. Ross said the existing house appears to have a sewer line that cuts off the corner of the neighbor's property. He said the house owner didn't think it was the correct location, but they would check into it. He said there was currently no easement.
 6. Please contact the assessors department regarding new Map and Lot numbers as well as street address. Preliminary Map/Lot numbers and street address must be listed on the plan set submitted to the Planning Board for final approval.

- a. Mr. Ross said the Map and Lot numbers are shown on the plan, and if it got final approval, the assessor would give them the mailing addresses.
7. Please list all State and Federal permits that will be needed for this project on the plan set.
 - a. Mr. Ross said the Subdivision Plan, Note 3, noted that Lot 119-1 will be served by City water and a State-approved septic system. He said a State subdivision approval for Lot 2 is required, and that Note 7 stated that all necessary State and City permits must be obtained, including but not limited to State septic permit, building permit, and driveway permit.

Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. Ross if he had looked at the driveway permit yet and made sure there was no vegetation that would interfere with sight distance. Mr. Ross said some of the vegetation would have to be clipped back in the right-of-way. He said they surveyed up and down the street and would provide that profile. Mr. Desfosses said it should be shown on the plan if vegetation was cut off from someone else's property and that it would have to go to the Trees and Greenery Committee if it was big. Mr. Ross said it was 4-6 inches. Mr. Cronin said if the large tree was in the right-of-way, it would need Trees and Greenery approval as well. Mr. Ross said he thought the big tree was on the property but would note it and show it on the plan.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Casella reviewed the Committee's comments and included them into the motion below.

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

Items to be addressed prior to Planning Board approval:

1.1) Plans will be updated to include infiltration trench downslope from leach field and appropriate foundation drains to address runoff in accordance with NHDES Subsurface rules. DPW to review and approve prior to Planning Board consideration.

1.2) The existing sewer line will be scoped to confirm location on plan set. DPW to review, evaluate if easement is needed, and approve prior to Planning Board consideration.

1.3) Note 3 on the Subdivision plan will be updated to change "Lot 2" reference to the appropriate Map and Lot number.

1.4) Any proposed tree removal in the public right of way should be added to the plans.

1.5) A letter will be provided to the Planning Department with the updated submission stating where resolved conditions can be found on within the submission and how outstanding conditions will be resolved subsequent to Planning Board approval.

1.6) A full set of documents including all plans, studies, and the aforementioned letter – will be submitted for staff review and Planning Board consideration.

Conditions Precedent to Building Permit:

1.7) Any proposed tree removal in the public Right of Way will receive approval from the Trees and Greenery Committee.

1.8) Any use of blasting or hoe ramming needed for rock removal will require vibration monitoring to ensure there is no damage to the surrounding properties.

1.9) Applicant will receive approval and waiver from NHDES for septic system or extend city sewer service to newly created lot. If city sewer is needed to serve lot, applicant will coordinate with DPW.

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee