

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

JULY 3, 2001

MEMBERS PRESENT:

David M. Holden, Planning Director, Chairman;
David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director;
David Desfosses, Engineering Technician;
Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician;
Michael Magnant, Deputy Police Chief;
John Burke, Parking and Traffic Engineer;
C J LeClaire, Deputy Fire Chief;
Alan Sturgis, Chairman, Conservation Commission

ALSO PRESENT:

Lucy E. Tillman, Planner I

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Irving Oil Corporation** for property located at **2470 Lafayette Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 2,995 s.f. service station/convenience goods II store and a 1,740 s.f. lube facility with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 285 as Lot 14 and lies within a General Business district. **(This application was tabled at the Committee's May 1, 2001, meeting to this meeting. The Public Hearing remains closed.)**

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Mr. Sturgis moved to take the application off the table. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The Chair commented that he was uncertain as to whether committee members had received revised plans and wondered if the application should be retabled as no new materials have been received. As representatives of the applicant were present, Committee members agreed to allow them to address the Committee.

Attorney Bernard Pelech informed the Committee that since the last time he had appeared before them, the applicant had worked out the details of the site drive to the satisfaction of the Traffic/Safety Committee. The applicant has also received relief by the Board of Adjustment for the configuration of the site drive. The request for the diesel fueling station has been withdrawn and taken off the site plan.

Attorney Pelech stated that a final plan would be submitted hopefully to the satisfaction of the Committee and the Planning Board. Access and egress will be available at the northerly drive. In other words, full access to Route 1. The southerly drive would be egress only. Steve Pernaw,

traffic engineer, will amend the application to the State of New Hampshire DOT to allow the present configuration.

Attorney Pelech informed the Committee that Steve Pernaw and Frank Monteiro were present and would be happy to answer any questions the Committee might have.

The Chair asked Attorney Pelech to speak to the proposed right turn improvements at Heritage Avenue. Attorney Pelech referenced further improvements in front of the Fire Station, more particularly, a right turn lane 100' in length. If NHDOT approves the concept, the City would deed whatever additional land is necessary for the widening.

The pavement to the rear of the site will remain even though the diesel fueling station has been withdrawn with the idea being that it would be easier for fueling trucks to get in and out. A State Wetlands Fill Application is pending. The Conservation Commission has endorsed the request. NH Soils is handling that matter.

The Traffic/Safety Committee still needs to review the amended plan. Mr. Desfosses commented that he has grading concerns at the Fire Station. Mr. Monteiro stated that he would be happy to work with Mr. Desfosses on that issue.

The Chair commented that he felt real progress had been made; however, he was uneasy giving approval for plans that do not show details; that he was glad to see that the heavy vehicle traffic/large fueling facility had been taken off the plan. However, he stated that his preference was that the pavement in the rear be removed which would require no filling of wetlands. He further stated that he would prefer to have the State sign off on the Driveway Permit before the application is reviewed by the Planning Board. Mr. Sturgis concurred that the pavement to the rear should be eliminated if not needed.

Mr. Monteiro explained that the design for the right-turn pocket for the Fire Station needs to be completed. Attorney Pelech expressed his desire that the application be placed on the July 31st Agenda of TAC in the hopes that plans could be submitted in a timely fashion. He also commented that it might be necessary for the City to apply for the right-turn pocket.

Mr. Desfosses felt that if the dumpsters were relocated, it might be possible to have a circular route pattern. Mr. Monteiro stated that such was one of the options they were going to look at.

Mr. Cravens moved to table the application to the July 31st meeting of TAC to allow for the submission of amended site plans. Mr. Sturgis seconded the motion which passed unanimously. The Chair commented that the Public Hearing is closed. However, at the wish of the Chair or the applicant, the Public Hearing can be reopened.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **Message Center Management, Inc.** for property located at **680 Peverly Hill Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the installation of a telecommunications facility consisting of a 195' high self-supporting lattice tower with a 12' x 24' equipment shelter with associated site improvements. Three future equipment shelters are indicated on the site plan. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 254 as Lot 8 and lies within a Municipal district.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Mr. Richard Quintal of Message Center Management addressed the Committee. He stated that his company finds spots for wireless providers; such as A T & T and Verizon.

Jim Sperry of B L Engineers presented the site plan and explained that the location is just behind the salt shed structure located at the Public Works Department. The area involved will be a 75' x 80' compound. A 195' tower will be located within the compound itself. The plan indicates four equipment shelters (12 x 24 pre fab shelters). Only one will be installed at the present time. It was Mr. Sperry's opinion that very little site disturbance would occur. The telephone and electric service will be brought in underground. A finished gravel accessway will be provided.

The tower will have the capability of servicing five carriers. Provisions will be made for City utilization.

Mention was made about stormwater treatment that might require the shifting of the tower some five feet over.

Deputy Chief LeClaire asked if there would be space on the antenna for City services with the response being in the affirmative. The question was asked if the four shelters would have fire alarms that would be tied into the City system with the response being that such could be done.

Mr. Allen asked that detail be provided describing how deep the conduits would be with the response being that the information is shown on the construction drawings and typically they are four feet. Mr. Allen requested that such be noted on the site plan.

The Chair made three calls for speakers. Seeing none, he declared the Public Hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

The Chair asked what would happen if the tower should collapse – whether it would collapse within the compound area. The response was that the towers are designed to fall down within themselves. The Chair suggested that an exhibit showing that would be helpful.

Mr. Allen asked what would be stored in the equipment shelters with the response being radio equipment. Mr. Allen asked if any generators would be required with the response being in the negative.

Mr. Desfosses asked as to what size generators would be typically required with the response from Mr. Quintal being 15 kw. Mr. Quintal added that they don't see a need for a generator at this site. If such is needed, it would be the subject of another application.

Mr. Holden referred to the lease line on the lot. He explained that a lease line can be interpreted to be a subdivision; however, he understood the intent is not to subdivide. He asked that a clarification be provided so that no misunderstanding occurs.

Mr. Desfosses moved to approve the site plan. Mr. Allen seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The stipulations follow:

- 1. That a note be added to the plan indicating the depth of the conduits;**
- 2. That the fire alarm system be tied into the municipal system;**
- 3. That the stormwater design be reviewed with David Desfosses, Engineering Technician, with the Public Works Department;**
- 4. That the site plan clarify where the compound will be located;**
- 5. That evidence be submitted that FAA approval has been received for the project;**
- 6. That information be submitted on the wind load design;**
- 7. That information be submitted as to what can be anticipated should the tower collapse;**
- 8. That information be submitted as to what the public can do should they experience interference from the tower; such as, a contact person;**
- 9. That the intent of the "proposed lease parcel" be clarified; that is, an explanation that the intent is not to subdivide.**

.....

B. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:10, II and Chapter 400 of the Pease Development Authority Site Review Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of **222 International LP** for property located at **195 New Hampshire Avenue** wherein site plan approval is requested for a one-story 25' x 107' addition to an existing building with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 299 and lies within the Pease Industrial district.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Mr. Michael Peloso, Civil Engineer, addressed the Committee and stated that he had some revised plans in the form of notes that included additional information from A T & T. He asked and received permission to submit the plans to the Committee.

The proposal calls for a one-story addition on slab on grade for the purpose of supplying fibre optics to the building to service the computer rooms. One to six additional employees would be on site. All utilities have been installed as part of the 195 New Hampshire Avenue proposal. Emergency standby power would be available in the form of a 750 kw electrical generator. Mr. Peloso spoke to the fire suppression system which would be a pre action type with smoke detectors and heat detectors. He mentioned the master box which is already in place and is located adjacent to the mechanical room.

Mr. Peloso advised the Committee that a plan had been proposed to reduce the amount of parking. Therefore, the amount of storm water generated from the site would decrease by some 1.92 cfs including additional roof drainage.

There will be no alteration to the landscaping plan associated with the existing building.

When asked by the Chair what the difference was between the plans before the Committee and the previously submitted plans, Mr. Peloso stated that the primary difference is the stand by generator and the fire suppression system referring to the notes for A T & T numbered one through four.

The Chair made three calls for speakers. Seeing no speakers, he declared the Public Hearing closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

For the record, the Chair noted the usual reluctance of the Committee to receive amended plans on the day of the meeting. However, in this instance, where the Committee makes recommendations to the Planning Board and the Planning Board makes recommendations to the Pease Development Authority, he urged the Board to take an action on the request. In other words, the Committee is not an approving body.

Mr. Allen moved to **approve**. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The only stipulation was from Mr. Allen who jokingly commented to Mr. Peloso, "don't let it happen again" referring to the late submission of amended plans.

.....
C. The application of the **City of Portsmouth** for property located off **Junkins Avenue** wherein site plan approval is requested for improvements to the parking lot located at the rear of the Municipal Complex with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 110 as Lot 1 and lies within the Municipal district.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering addressed the Committee and explained that the proposal calls for additional parking to the rear of City Hall by re-orienting the existing parking spaces. Forty-four striped parking spaces are in place with numerous other spaces being utilized by employees.

Mr. Chagnon spoke to screening to protect the neighborhood and proposed signage regarding one-way traffic. At the present time, access to and egress from the parking area is two-way along Mt. Vernon Street. The proposal calls for a one-way loop out to Junkins Avenue. In other words, vehicles in the parking area will not be allowed to exit onto Mt. Vernon Street. It was Mr. Chagnon's opinion that such a situation would significantly reduce the impact to the abutting neighborhood.

Mr. Allen inquired if parking would be increased by 22 spaces. Mr. Chagnon responded by stating that the parking out there right now is deceiving; that there are 53 vehicles out there. So, spaces would, in actuality, be increased by 13.

The question was asked if there were any drainage concerns with the response being that the increase in pavement would be very minimal. It was Mr. Chagnon's opinion that by removing some pavement, rearranging some pavement and increasing landscaping that there would be no impact on drainage.

The Chair referred to washouts occurring on the driveway going out. Mr. Chagnon stated that was something they could look at pointing out that there is a rather steep embankment; that at the edge of the guard rail, the terrain drops off rather sharply.

Mr. Desfosses spoke to the blind corner as one leaves the facility via the narrow roadway. He expressed his concern about pedestrian safety.

Bob Hassold of 15 Mt. Vernon Street addressed the Committee and stated that Mr. Desfosses was on to something about the blind corner. He stated that more traffic would be going in on Mt. Vernon Street even though traffic would only be one-way. The Chair pointed out that the existing two-way traffic flow has been in effect for a long period of time. Mr. Hassold concurred. He (Mr. Hassold) asked that the City's application be scrutinized in the same manner as any other application, and he asked for some peace and quiet on his street.

Mr. Burke commented that the Traffic/Safety Committee had reviewed the situation on Mt. Vernon Street and had recommended the posting of 10 mph signs and making Mt. Vernon one-way.

Jack McEnany of 40 Mt. Vernon Street addressed the Committee. He did not feel that the proposal would really cut the traffic count. He emphasized the point that the residents really need their neighborhood back. He spoke to the fact that Mt. Vernon Street is the Police Department's driveway; that people rushing to get to work creates quite a problem. It was his opinion that the best thing for everyone would be to give the Police Department its own egress and access.

Kathy Beauchamp of 21 Blossom Street addressed the Committee. She felt that the proposal was putting the cart before the horse; that is, the repaving of the back of the Police Department before the bigger picture was looked at.

Her particular issue was pedestrian access. She pointed out that she lives on Blossom Street; that pedestrians are not allowed in the back of the Police Department. It was her opinion that residents should have a way in and out on foot.

The Chair pointed out that how to allow access is a matter of City policy; that recourse could be had with the Police Chief and the Police Commission. The Chair pointed out that the site plan addresses parking. He encouraged Ms. Beauchamp to write a letter to the Planning Board raising pedestrian access as a concern; that such a letter would also be provided to the City Manager. The Chair continued on to state that it may not be possible to address her concern of pedestrian access as part of this plan. Ms. Beauchamp submitted photographs depicting the difficulties with pedestrian access.

The Chair made a call for speakers.

Bob Maranhas of 39 Mt. Vernon Street addressed the Committee and spoke to the flooding of Mt. Vernon Street from storm water runoff as well as his concerns about traffic. He stated that he would like to see all the traffic enter and exit outside of Mt. Vernon Street.

The Chair pointed out that Mt. Vernon Street was used as an access when the Municipal Complex was a hospital. In response to that statement, Mr. McEnany stated that one of his neighbors, Mrs. Murphy, who has lived on Mt. Vernon Street for some 40 years, recalled that the hospital used the area as a doctors' lot. They would come once and leave once resulting in significantly less traffic.

Mr. Hassold referred to the situation where the residents are not allowed to walk up behind the Police Station anymore commenting that the pathway from Mt. Vernon Street to the front of the complex is not even lit.

The Public Hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

The Chair invited Mr. Chagnon back to the podium and asked him about the drainage concern. Mr. Chagnon reiterated that it was his opinion that there would be no significant increase in drainage; that if existing conditions presented a problem, he was not aware of it. He did not feel that the existing condition would be exacerbated.

Mr. Burke felt that it would be helpful to quantify the amount of people who would no longer be coming out of Mt. Vernon Street headed towards South Street. He felt that the proposal would better orient the spaces and would make the aisles more efficient and the whole parking area safer. He felt that the increase in traffic would be modest at best, and the speed would be posted at 10 miles per hour.

The comment was made concerning two-way flow in the parking area and the fact that the aisles would have to be wider and the spaces would be perpendicular which would probably double the budget.

The northerly exit was brought up again with the thought to increasing visibility.

Deputy Police Chief Magnant spoke to the neighbor's concerns. However, he felt that the reality of the situation was that there would probably be a net gain of 13 spaces. He wondered what effect that increase would have on traffic.

The Traffic/Safety Committee has not seen the plan. It was thought that it might be a good idea to have the Committee take a shot at it with a report back to the Committee which would include a quantification of traffic volumes.

Mr. Holden felt that all alternatives should be reviewed so that the end result is a plan that does what it is supposed to do. He stated that he would feel better about the proposal if the drainage questions were answered and some tweaking was done of the plan with additional clarification on pedestrian access.

Mr. Holden commented that the use is not the question. The property is municipal serving a municipal use serving a governmental objective.

A motion was made and seconded that the application be tabled to the Committee's July 31st meeting. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Stipulations follow:

1. Review of storm water runoff with David Desfosses, Engineering Technician, with the Public Works Department;
2. Review of the plan by the Traffic/Safety Committee with a report back to the Technical Advisory Committee;
3. Clarification on pedestrian access;
4. Review of alternatives to the plan; such as, the enhancement of visibility along the northerly driveway.

.....

Adjournment was had at approximately 3:20 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Barbara Driscoll, Administrative Assistant in the Planning Department.