

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

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

APRIL 8, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: David M. Holden, Planning Director;
John Burke, Parking and Transportation Engineer;
Charlie Jones, Fire Marshal;
Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician (Water);
Alanson Sturgis, Chairman of the Conservation Commission;
and, David Desfosses, Engineering Technician (Engineering)

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director; and,
David Young, Deputy Police Chief

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy E. Tillman, Planner 1

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The request of **Ruby Tuesday, Inc.** for property located at **1574 Woodbury Avenue** wherein an amendment to an approved site plan is requested for the construction of a 5,250 s.f. ± building for restaurant use with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 238 as Lot 17 and lies within a General Business district. **(This application was tabled at the Committee's March 4, 2003, meeting to this meeting.)**

The Chair read the notice into the record. Mr. Sturgis moved to take the application off the table. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The Chair stated that it was his understanding that the application was to be tabled once again and he suggested that the Committee table it to a time indefinite so that abutters would be renotified when the project is ready to go forward. Mr. Desfosses so moved. Mr. Sturgis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of **Bellwood Associates Limited Partnership** for property located at **2300 Lafayette Road (Water Country Fun Park)** wherein site plan approval is requested for improvements to certain parking areas with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 273 as Lots 5 and 7 and Assessor Plan 267 as Lots 1-23, 1-24, 1-25, 1-26, and 1-27 and lies within General Business and Industrial districts. **(This application was tabled at the Committee's March 4, 2003, meeting to this meeting.)**

The Chair read the notice into the record. Mr. Desfosses moved to take the application off the table. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Steve Oles of Millette, Sprague & Colwell stated that the proposal involves the creation of additional parking and the reconfiguration of the traffic flow. Mr. Oles reported that a meeting

with the Traffic/Safety Committee resulted in a new traffic pattern calling for a one-way entrance drive into the drop-off zone for buses and handicapped patrons. A 12' wide strip will be provided along the existing parking area to the rear. Mr. Oles noted that the labeling of a "constructed wetland area" had been changed to a "constructed stormwater treatment area".

The Chair inquired if boulders had been placed to obstruct any connection to West Road with the reply being in the affirmative. It was further reported that the boulders along the Singer property are in place. The Chair stated that it was his understanding that, at the present time, there is no access through to West Road. Mr. Oles replied, "correct".

Mr. Oles reported that there was no need to relocate the fire hydrant as a new entrance road had been created altogether. Mr. Desfosses inquired as to the grade of the new road with the response being 3-1 with a 2' wide shoulder along with a guardrail. Mr. Desfosses asked that a note be added to the plan that would state that should the slope be steeper than 3-1, then a metal guardrail will be required.

The Chair made three calls for speakers. There being none, he stated that he would keep the Public Hearing closed. (The Public Hearing had been closed at the previous meeting.)

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Burke moved to recommend approval of the site plan to the Planning Board. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Burke spoke to the intersection of the two lanes that go in one direction and the one lane that goes in another direction and asked if there would be any striping at the intersection. Mr. Oles indicated that painted striping could be provided at that intersection.

The question was called. The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That a note be added to the site plan indicating that a metal guardrail will be required should the actual grade on the site of the new road be steeper than 3-1;
2. That the site plan indicate the striping of the major intersection in accordance with Department of Public Works approval; said approval shall be obtained prior to the submittal of plans for Planning Board approval; and,
3. That a note be included on the site plan indicating that the Technical Advisory Committee is not approving any plan showing a connection through to West Road.

.....

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 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 the **New Hampshire Community Technical College** for property located at **320 Corporate Drive** wherein site plan approval is requested for the renovation of approximately 5,000 s.f. of office area into a child care facility with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 315 as Lot 4 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Ricci, a Consulting Engineer in Portsmouth, presented the project for the New Hampshire Technical College. He informed the Committee that Anita Ward French, an early childhood specialist, was also present. He stated that the site of the project is an old military hospital. Eight additional parking spaces will be created right along the front of the building with one handicapped spot and a 6' crosswalk to a handicapped ramp to get people into the building. He spoke to a "Child care parking only" sign and to "No Parking" signs in front of the entranceway.

Three landscaped islands are proposed. Two sidewalks will be installed, one from the building to the existing sidewalk and the other to the playground area. Two fenced-in areas will be designated for playground space. The one abutting right up to the building will be for infants and toddlers where the entrance to the playground is directly from the classroom; thus, children are not free to get away from childcare providers. The playground away from the building will be for pre-school age children. That playground will have a bike path and play structures appropriate for that age group. Small storage shed will provide security for outdoor equipment.

During the morning hours, the parking spots in front of the building will act as a drop off and pick up area. Mr. Ricci pointed out that nobody arrives and leaves at the same time adding that children are walked into the classroom and conversely, at pick-up time, the parents go to the designated classroom and walk the children to the vehicles.

Mr. Ricci reported that the change in the drainage from pre-development to post-development was so insignificant that he did not provide a drainage study. Mr. Desfosses agreed.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Desfosses and Mr. Ricci regarding the location of the handicapped parking space with it being agreed that Mr. Ricci would take another look at the location. Charlie Jones expressed his desire that people have access to a sidewalk from the playground areas. Ms. French explained that State regulations are pretty strict on latches on gates in order to prevent students from getting out.

The Chair stated that he had one question for Maria Stowell of the Pease Development Authority, who was sitting in the audience. He stated that he felt he was correct in assuming that the existing parking spaces were previously calculated; that the applicant has more than sufficient parking for its use; and that any subsequent applications will be handled separately.

The question was moved. The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That the fencing be shown on the site plan;
2. That note 12 be adjusted;
3. That the configuration of the new angled parking spaces be reviewed as well as the location of the handicapped parking space;
4. That the sign for the handicapped space be so labeled on the site plan; and,
5. That the site plan indicate the location of the sidewalks leading from the play areas.

.....

B. The application of **Michael Brigham** for property located at **487 Cutts Avenue** wherein site plan approval is requested for the creation of six residential house lots ranging in size from 15,394 s.f. to 30,326 s.f. with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 210 as Lot 26 and lies within a Single Residence B district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton of Millette, Sprague & Colwell spoke to the proposal to create six lots from an existing lot. The proposed lots will service single family residences. The existing drive off of Cutts Avenue will be eliminated and the property will be transferred to abutting neighbors. The proposed driveways will be off Michael Succi Drive or Chase Drive. The lots will be serviced by individual utilities and individual driveways. The proposal includes the installation of a 700' water line coming off Chase Drive and Michael Succi Drive. Two fire hydrants will service the property. Each lot will meet frontage, area coverage and so forth.

It was Mr. Moulton's opinion that the application was very straight forward and he requested approval so that the application could move forward to the Planning Board.

The Chair inquired as to the breaking up of ledge. Mr. Moulton responded by stating that the amount to be removed from the site would depend on how steeply the driveways were configured. It was his opinion that 20,000 to 30,000 yards of material would be removed from the site. He commented that the highest point of the site is approximately 67' and the lots would be going down to 48 to 50' which would be much lower than the house currently sited on the property.

Mr. Moulton went on to state that the applicant had met with various City departments and that discussion was had on whether the applicant would be allowed to process some of the gravel on site. Such a situation would be of benefit to the applicant in terms of transporting. Mr. Moulton felt that 10,000 yards could be used on site and the remainder would have to be removed. The Chair asked if all 30,000 yards of material would be crushed with Mr. Moulton responding that they would crush as much as they could for ease in transporting.

The Chair stated that he has discussed the matter with Dave Allen, the City's Deputy Public Works Director, who felt that crushing on site would be appropriate as long as materials were not brought in from other sites to be crushed and then removed. The Chair inquired as to what type

of machinery would be used so that the neighbors could have a sense of what to expect. Mr. Moulton stated that they were sensitive to the concerns of the neighbors; that they were looking at using the lower end of the property with the hill acting as a natural barrier.

The Chair inquired as to the hours of operation. Mr. Moulton responded that the hours of operation would comply with the hours indicated in the City's noise ordinance.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak for the first, second or third time. Seeing no speakers, the Chair opted to keep the Public Hearing open and to have discussion to see where the Committee was at.

Mr. Cravens commented that the City would need a couple of gate valves for the water line; perhaps one at the hydrant. He also asked that a "T" with a stub and a gate be installed at the end of Chase Drive and Michael Succi Drive and that a gate valve and lengthening of pipe be had at the last house. A further request was that the site plan indicate the location of the shut offs within the right-of-way. Mr. Cravens went on to state that he would be interested in seeing the anticipated water demand for the project.

Discussion then ensued on the existing wells on site and whether or not the wells would be abandoned or whether one well would be used for irrigation purposes. After Mr. Cravens explained the process that would need to be followed for such a purpose, the applicant indicated that the wells would be terminated.

Mr. Burke inquired as to the steepest grade of the driveways. Mr. Moulton indicated that the way the driveways are designed at the moment, there would be an 8% grade and that the anticipated amount of material to be removed would be about 25,000 yards. Mr. Burke wondered if a driveway profile would be helpful. The Chair felt that such should be required and reminded Mr. Moulton that if he was proposing an 8% grade and the plan is approved as such, then he (Mr. Moulton) would not be able to go to 10%.

Discussion was had on the two land swaps shown on the plan and the need for revised lot descriptions.

Mr. Desfosses and Mr. Moulton then discussed the need for the submittal of a drainage study. Mr. Desfosses explained that he needed to see how much water would be coming down the hill in order to determine the size of the swale and the size of the driveway culverts and to ensure that the roadways would not be flooded.

Mr. Moulton stated that the site would be flattened out; therefore, there should be less flow. Mr. Desfosses stated that he sort of agreed with Mr. Moulton; however, he needed proof. Mr. Moulton asked if the purpose of the study was to determine if there would be an increase in runoff with Mr. Desfosses stating that such is not really an issue as the runoff would be dumped overboard directly; however, he reiterated that he needed to know what would happen to his streets and how big the culverts should be and whether the catch basins would be able to handle the volume.

Mr. Moulton asked if they would be asked to fix a pre-existing problem. Mr. Desfosses indicated that he was not aware of any problems and he wanted to guarantee that there wouldn't be any in the future. The Chair interjected that after everything is all said and done, that the proposal calls for the topography to be changed considerably and calls for a lot more impervious area. Therefore, the City needs to have a handle on what will be required minimally to handle the stormwater runoff.

Discussion then ensued on the requirements for a site plan versus a subdivision plan and the requirements associated with the Shoreline Protection Act and a cemetery buffer.

Mr. Desfosses asked that the driveway for lot 5 be reconfigured so that it sweeps around the property corner so that it is not so tight.

Mr. Desfosses inquired if there would be a need for view easements on the property. Mr. Brigham, who was sitting in the audience, stated that they intend to be the builder and he wouldn't need view easements. The question was asked as to what would happen as the lots are sold. Mr. Brigham indicated that they would take a look at the suggestion.

Ms. Tillman inquired as to how the material that is blasted from the upper lot would be transported down. Mr. Moulton explained that all material would be moved on site and not on City streets at all adding that the crushing itself would be done as far away as possible from any residential properties.

Ms. Tillman inquired as to the width of the paved drives on Lots 3 and 4 and the distance between the two driveways. Mr. Moulton replied that the width is 10' and the distance between them is 10'. The Chair wondered if such could be increased at all.

The Chair went on to state that he felt that the project was a good one; however, there is a need to sweat out the details. He stated that concern had been expressed at the Planning Board level as to the number of lots. He went on to state that he was trying to figure out a way of bringing the site together for the benefit of everyone. He continued on by stating that if crushing were done on site, then construction vehicles would not be using City streets as much.

The Chair spoke to the submittal of elevations that would give him some comfort level adding that the least amount of slope would be preferable.

The Chair stated that he anticipated that subdivision applications would be filed, and Attorney Pelech, who was sitting in the audience, indicated that he would submit the paperwork.

Ms. Tillman pointed out that with regard to elevations, building height is calculated around the building with an average grade calculated from back side to front side.

The Chair noted that Dave Allen, the Deputy Public Works Director, was not present and wondered if he had problems with the proposed sewer connection. Mr. Desfosses reported that he believed that the sewer was okay as long as they have details.

The Chair suggested that revised plans be prepared reflecting some of the comments of the Committee and suggested meeting at 2:00 p.m. on April 15th at Public Works.

Mr. Desfosses moved to table the application to April 29th. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The following represents comments from the Committee:

1. That driveway profiles be submitted;
2. That the water line on Michael Succi Drive be in the street and not in the shoulder;
3. That the site plan indicate the location of the gate valves with one being at a hydrant, that at the end of Chase and Michael Succi Drives, the site plan indicate a "T" with a stub and a gate going off Michael Succi Drive towards Market Street; and, a gate valve and lengthening of pipe at the last house;

4. That the site plan indicate the location of the shut offs within the right of way;
5. That information be submitted on the water demand for the project;
6. That the water line shall be installed in accordance with Water Division construction standards and specifications;
7. That the wells on site be abandoned in accordance with NHDES standards;
8. That lot descriptions and areas for the lots involved in the two land swaps be submitted; and, that Subdivision Applications be filed for those land swaps;
9. That the site plan depict the opposite edge of pavement on Chase Drive including curb cuts;
10. That the utilities for Lot 2 be within the property line;
11. That a drainage study be submitted;
12. That the boundary monuments be included on the site plan;
13. That erosion control methods be shown on the plan;
14. That the site plan include a note regarding what is allowed and what is not allowed in the Shoreline Protection Area;
15. That the site plan indicate a note regarding what is allowed and what is not allowed in the cemetery buffer;
16. That the driveway configuration for Lot 5 be swept around property corner so that it is not so tight;
17. That the driveways for Lots 3 and 4 be laid out by a surveyor;
18. That view easements be shown on the plan, if appropriate;
19. That a detail be submitted on how to fix street(s) once utilities are installed; said detail to be reviewed by David Desfosses of the Public Works Department;
20. That the width of the driveways for Lots 3 and 4 and the distance between the driveways be re-examined;
21. That elevations be submitted that would give a sense of the reality of the topo;
22. That confirmation be had with David Allen that the sewer situation is "okay"; and,
23. That a submittal be made of how the ledge/rock crushing will be handled.

.....

C. The application of **Tyroch Realty Management, Inc.** for property located at **480 State Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a two-story four unit residential structure with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. The existing motor vehicle repair station structure will be removed. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 127 as Lot 14 and lies within Mixed Residential Office and Historic A districts.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering addressed the Committee and stated that he was representing Mr. Dow, who was in the audience. Mr. Chagnon informed the Committee that Bob Iafolla was also present as project manager.

The proposal involves the removal of the existing building (gas pumps have already been removed) and the construction of a two-story four unit residential building. Historic District

Commission approval has been received and the necessary Variances have been received from the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Chagnon explained that the site's existing curb cut is pretty much an open one. The proposal calls for additional sidewalks and planting areas on the Middle Street side. A proposed sidewalk is indicated for State Street and will rap around the bend. An opening will serve six parking spots on the site for the residential units. Some trees will be planted as part of the sidewalk improvements contemplated by the City for Middle Street. Those improvements are planned up to 116 Middle Street and with the current proposal, the improvements will be extended to the intersection of Middle and State Streets.

The building is set up for a finished floor at one elevation. As one goes around the building, grade changes and the number of steps varies so that the steps come out to a point where they are 7" above sidewalk at the property line all the way around. The sidewalk is going to be brick. There will be a curb at the gutter line in the street and then the sidewalk. The property line will be at the back side of the sidewalk. There will also be another 7" reveal of curbing that will hold back and provide a definite edge to the sidewalk/property line interface and allow for some plantings in front of the building on all sides.

Drainage will be all sheet flow. The interior back courtyard drainage will flow out and go down the gutter line on State Street through to Middle Street to a catch basin on the westerly side of Middle Street.

Utilities will be connected underground with sewer, gas and water coming in off of State Street on the westerly side of the structure. Underground electric will be from a pole. The existing pole is in a location that is not suitable for redevelopment. The applicant is working with Public Service to relocate that pole just off the sidewalk on the northeasterly corner of the building. The service will enter the building underground from there.

The Chair inquired as to revisions to the right-of-way alignment. Mr. Chagnon stated that they had met with John Burke, the City's Parking and Transportation Engineer, to discuss some possible modifications to the plan. Apparently, the proposed sidewalk tip downs exit into an area that is not safe for pedestrians. The curbing will be brought around so that there is a continuous curb line on the easterly side of the property.

In order to keep a 5' sidewalk, the sidewalk will be moved onto the applicant's lot. The applicant is willing to grant the City an easement for the relocation of the sidewalk onto private property subject to the City providing the applicant with some documentation that the property owner now and in the future will be held harmless from any liability for having the sidewalk on private property. An additional easement will be required for the push button for the pedestrian walk signals as the mast arm is proposed for a location that is further away from the crosswalk than is desired.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak for the first, second, third and final time. There being no speakers, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

The Chair asked Mr. Chagnon to explain the drainage so that the Chair could see how it is getting into the existing system. Mr. Chagnon explained that the site presently has a slight hump upon which the existing building is located. Some of the existing drainage flows towards State Street. Most of it falls to Middle Street. The proposal calls for an approximate 8" change of grade from the gutter at State Street to the gutter at Middle Street. Basically the storm water runoff now flows down through State Street and flows around the corner to a catch basin on the

Middle Street side. It is not anticipated that there will be any change to the drainage pattern with this proposal. The parking area will be elevated so that the drainage will flow out to State Street, and then flow down the gutter line and come around and enter the catch basin on Middle Street. There is a small area at the intersection that is negatively sloped. Mr. Chagnon felt that the owner would verify that a puddle of 1" sits there after a rainfall. He felt that the situation could be tweaked when the intersection is reconstructed.

Mr. Desfosses stated that it was his understanding that Mr. Chagnon would design the curb line that the City would follow when the City repaves and that the grades would be tweaked. Mr. Chagnon responded that the grades would be from the top of the curve rather than the bottom.

The Chair stated that it was his understanding that the project would not result in increased drainage or water flow onto adjacent properties. Mr. Chagnon responded by stating, "no, it will not".

The Chair went on to state that if the proposal calls for any site lighting, that the lighting should be reflected down to avoid any glare on adjacent properties adding that if site lighting is proposed, the location of such should be indicated on the site plan.

Mr. Cravens stated that the existing monitoring wells on the site (for the gas pumps that have been removed) should be abandoned according to NHDES standards. Mr. Chagnon responded that the State would tell the applicant when they can be abandoned and that it may be some time (a few years) in the future.

Mr. Cravens went on to comment that the water main on Middle Street is no longer active adding that it has been replaced with a 20" main. Mr. Craven inquired if the fire and domestic services on State Street had been sized with the response from Mr. Chagnon being in the negative.

Mr. Desfosses asked that Mr. Chagnon verify with Tom Richter of the City's Engineering Division the type of brick that is used in the City sidewalks and indicate that type on the detail sheet. Mr. Desfosses indicated that 1" stone dust is sufficient versus the 3" stone dust that is indicated on the detail.

Discussion ensued on any anticipated need for street closings. Mr. Iafolla of Myriad Management indicated that the only street closing that they visualize would be for the installation of the water line which he felt would be for a very, very brief time on State Street.

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That the site plan indicate the proposed site lighting if such is being proposed;
2. That the site plan indicate that the monitoring wells will be abandoned in accordance with NHDES standards;
3. That the water main shown on the site plan is no longer active;
4. That the water lines be installed in accordance with the Water Department's standards and specifications;
5. That the type of proposed brick to be used in the sidewalks be verified with Tom Richter of the Public Works Department and indicated in the detail;
6. That 1" compacted stone dust is sufficient versus the 3" indicated in the detail;

- 7. That the site plan indicate that any street closings will be coordinated between David Desfosses and John Burke of the Public Works Department;
- 8. That the site plan indicate the location of the shutoffs in the right-of-way;
- 9. That the revised plan be approved by the Public Works Department prior to submission of the plans for Planning Board approval;
- 10. That the site plan clearly denote what the developer will construct in the public right-of-way and what the City will construct;
- 11. That the easement language for the sidewalk and pedestrian signal be approved as to content and form by the City Attorney;
- 12. That an easement be granted to PSNH with approval of the Public Works Department as to the signal location;
- 13. That a pole license be filed with the City before actual construction begins on the project;
- 14. That the landscaping plan be approved by the Planning Department;
- 15. That the site plan indicate the future location of mast arm; and,
- 16. That the site plan indicate that the City will abandon the old water service

The Chair commented that he thought that the proposal would be a marvelous return to what the site once was.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:30 p.m.

.....

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