

**MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

2:00 P.M.

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

JULY 1, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: David M. Holden, Planning Director, Chairman;
John Burke, Parking and Transportation Engineer;
David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director;
Steve Griswold, Captain, Fire Department
Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician (Water); and,
Alanson Sturgis, Chairman of the Conservation Commission

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy E. Tillman, Planner 1

.....

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS

A The application of **Great Islington Street, LLC** for property located at **871 Islington Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for the conversion of an existing structure from office use to twelve dwelling units and artisan studio space with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 165 as Lot 4 and lies within a Business district. **(This application was tabled at the Committee’s June 3, 2003, meeting to this meeting. The Public Hearing remains open.)**

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

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernard W. Pelech addressed the Committee and stated that they had appeared before the Committee approximately a month ago. Subsequently, they appeared before the Traffic/Safety Committee at an on-site and at a regular meeting. As a result of the meeting, several changes have been made to the plan. Such changes include upgrading and elevating the sidewalk along Islington Street to standard City spec concrete. The sidewalk will run from Tony’s Radio up to the next curb cut.

Another change calls for a landscaped area with plantings between the site in question and Patrix Beauty Salon immediately to the south of this property which, at the current time, is basically unrestricted parking separated by bumper curb stops. The proposal calls for a 4’ landscaping area with arborvitae. Furthermore, a sidewalk will be placed from the main entrance up to Islington Street along Frenchman’s Lane. The sidewalk will be on the lot in question. The landscaped island in the middle of the parking lot will be reconfigured. The travel aisle width will be reduced from 24’. The on-site sidewalk will connect to the sidewalk on Islington Street.

Together with additional plantings as noted on the plan, a utility pole, that doesn’t appear to be necessary, will be removed with the applicant working with the telephone and power companies.

At this point in his presentation, Attorney Pelech stated that he would turn the presentation over to Ken Wood of Attar Engineering to answer any questions the Committee might have.

Mr. Wood addressed the Committee and stated that Attorney Pelech had summed it up pretty well and stated that if the Committee had any questions, he might be able to explain something further.

The Chair asked Mr. Wood to review the stipulations from the last meeting.

1. That a letter be submitted to the Planning Department clarifying the status of the monitoring wells and how they are proposed to be abandoned. **Such is contained in Mr. Attar's letter of June 20th;**
2. That a detail on the party wall be submitted. **(This was summarized in the June 20th letter. The opening in the four hour fire wall will be bricked up. The existing doors will be removed and replaced with brick;**
3. That the site plan indicate how the property lines are being delineated and how vehicles will be prevented from going over the property lines. **(done);**
4. That the ownership of Frenchman's Lane be clarified. **(Attorney Pelech has submitted a letter);**
5. That documentation be submitted to the Planning Department regarding proposed traffic. **(John Burke, the City's Parking and Transportation Engineer, is satisfied with the submitted documentation);**
6. That the site plan be reviewed by the Traffic/Safety Committee with a report back to the Technical Advisory Committee. **(done);**
7. That the existing sidewalk on Islington Street be labeled on the site plan and that the applicant work with the Public Works Department as to the condition of that sidewalk. **(The sidewalk is the same elevation as the street. The sidewalk will be replaced with a concrete sidewalk with granite curbing and will extend from the adjacent curb cut at Patrix to the next curb cut on Frenchman's Lane);**
8. That an internal sidewalk out to the Islington Street sidewalk be indicated on the site plan. **(done);**
9. That the site plan indicate two water services in the right-of-way. **(done);**
10. That the site plan indicate how the parking spaces will be separated off from Frenchman's Lane. **(done);**
11. That the site plan include a vegetation plan. **(Ms. Tillman indicated that the vegetation plan is a work in progress);**
12. That the site plan indicate the snow removal area(s). **(done);**
13. That site lighting be included on the site plan. **(Site lighting will be in the center aisle and the two side lines);**
14. That the site plan indicate underground utilities. **(done);**
15. That the issue of vehicles backing onto Frenchman's Lane be resolved. **(The site plan indicates that there will be three handicapped accessible parking spaces off Frenchman's Lane. It is anticipated that these spaces will be used less frequently than the existing spaces);**
16. That a schematic be presented indicating how the inside is going to work. **(done);** and,
17. That the site plan note that more parking is provided than is required. **(done)**

The Chair asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

A motion was made and seconded to approve the site plan with stipulations. The motion passed unanimously.

- 1. That the existing water service be discontinued outside of the building;**
- 2. That the site plan indicate the location of “No Parking” signs on Frenchman’s Lane;**
- 3. That the site plan indicate the proposed modifications to Frenchman’s Lane with said revisions to be approved by the Planning and Public Works Departments prior to the Planning Board meeting;**
- 4. That a Fire Department connection be installed in the building;**
- 5. That the site plan indicate a master box connection to the fire alarm system;**
- 6. That sprinkler and fire alarm plans be submitted (one set each) and the appropriate permits acquired. The applications can be obtained from the Fire or Building Departments;**
- 7. That a note be added to the site plan indicating that the openings in the four hour fire wall be bricked up;**
- 8. That a note be added to the site plan regarding the status of the monitoring wells and that said note shall be reviewed by Tom Cravens of the City’s Water Department prior to the Planning Board meeting;**
- 9. That the site plan include spot grades on the sidewalk adjacent to the handicapped accessible spaces and that the site plan indicate some sort of sidewalk curbing or curb stops for that area;**
- 10. That a sidewalk easement be submitted by the applicant’s attorney and reviewed as to content and form by the City Attorney;**
- 11. That a note be added to the site plan that the lighting shall not spill over onto adjacent properties; and,**
- 12. That the site plan indicate what areas will have granite curbing.**

Mr. Allen indicated that the entrances should have granite curbing. The Chair stated that it was his understanding that Frenchman’s Lane would not become any narrower at any point than it is presently. Mr. Attar replied that such an understanding was correct.

Attorney Pelech indicated that the issue of the monitoring wells was ongoing. The Chair stated that a decision would have to be made prior to the Planning Board meeting.

.....

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **Old Tex Mex**, owner, and **Michael Brown**, applicant, for property located at **3510 Lafayette Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 60' x 72' addition to be used as storage space related to the conversion of the existing property to a business office and indoor storage space for a construction/restoration company with associated site improvements. The proposal also involves the enclosing of the existing patio. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 297 as Lot 8 and lies within a Single Residence A district.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton of Millette, Sprague & Colwell addressed the Committee and informed the Committee that the change in use to a construction/restoration business had been approved by the Board of Adjustment. The proposal calls for a 4,000 s.f. addition plus the construction of an addition over the area currently used as an outdoor patio. Board of Adjustment approval is needed for relief from the 105' setback requirement from Lafayette Road.

Mr. Moulton went on to state that very little site work is involved as the area is currently paved. There will be no change in impervious surface. The dumpster will be relocated and screened with a stockade fence. No changes are anticipated to the entrance. No additional parking is required. It is anticipated that some thirty employees will report in on a Monday morning and then work at job sites during the week. The addition will be fully sprinklered. The existing building is sprinklered. The handicapped spaces will be restriped.

Mr. Allen inquired if there was any intent to have floor drains or water/sewer type services in the addition. The applicant, Michael Brown, replied that the addition would have two sinks; that the addition would be used for storage purposes.

Mr. Allen inquired if there would be any refinishing or striping of furniture on site. Mr. Brown reiterated that the use would be for storage. Mr. Brown was asked if he could live with a prohibition on that use (striping of furniture) and he replied in the affirmative.

The Chair inquired as to why the utilities were not shown as being underground. Mr. Moulton replied that it was his understanding that the utilities are existing and that there would be no change. The Chair stated that the proposal is for a rather large addition. Mr. Moulton was unsure if such would necessitate a change.

Mr. Brown interjected that Mike Regan (an electrician) had looked at the site and felt that as a prior use was a restaurant use that there would be no problems with the existing service. The Chair inquired if there was any reason why the electrical service could not be underground with the response from Mr. Brown being "other than cost".

The Chair stated that Mr. Moulton is correct in stating that existing utilities are allowed to remain as long as the service is not changed; however, the Chair reiterated his statement that the addition is sizeable.

The question was asked if there would be any work done in the parking lot with the response being that pavement would be removed for the addition and that there would be some restriping.

Mr. Allen inquired if there would be any egress from the addition. Mr. Brown indicated that there would be four doors evenly spaced out.

The question was asked if some parking spaces would be eliminated along the property line with the response being in the affirmative.

Mention was made that the walk in freezer shown on the plan is no longer there; that the compressor is still there. Ms. Tillman suggested that if the walk in freezer is no longer there, that it should be removed from the plan.

The Chair asked if there were any other questions from the Committee. There were none. The Chair made three calls for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen moved to approve with stipulations. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. Mr. Sturgis felt that as the addition would be a good size, that the utilities should be underground. The Chair suggested that the stipulation be made that they be underground and that the applicant could appeal and make his case at the Planning Board.

Mr. Allen suggested that if there are to be sinks in the addition, that they drain to a sewer lateral. Mr. Brown stated that there would be traps running underneath the concrete floor.

The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That the electrical service be underground;
2. That the site plan indicate the location of the garage doors on the 60' x 72' addition;
3. That the site plan indicate what will be eliminated with such to be reviewed by Lucy Tillman of the Planning Department;
4. That the walk-in freezer be eliminated from the site plan;
5. That the landscaping plan be approved by Lucy Tillman of the Planning Department;
6. That the site plan clarify the location of the dumpster and show the screening;
7. That the site plan indicate the installation of a master box connection; and,
8. That sprinkler and fire alarm plans be submitted (one set each) and the appropriate permits acquired. The applications can be obtained from the Fire or Building Departments.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 2:35 p.m.

.....

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