

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

2:00 P.M.

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

MARCH 30, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman
John Burke, Parking and Transportation Engineer;
Peter Rice, Water/Sewer Engineer;
David Young, Deputy Police Chief;
Steve Griswold, Captain, Fire Department;
Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician (Water);
David Desfosses, Engineering Technician (Engineering)

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Planner

.....
The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **The RLD Revocable Trust & The AMD Revocable Trust** for property located at **3201 Lafayette Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 2,926 ± s.f. two-story office building, after removal of the existing office building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 291 as Lot 7 and lies within a General Business and Garden Apartment/Mobile Home districts. **(This application was tabled at the March 2, 2004 TAC meeting.)**

The Chair read the notice into the record.

A motion was made and seconded to take the application off the table. Said motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Holden indicated that he had familiarized himself with the record and would be participating in the hearing. There was no objection voiced.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton, of Millette, Sprague and Colwell, addressed the Board on behalf of the applicant. He indicated this was the current site of the Desfosses law office that was a mobile home structure and they propose to replace it with a two story office building. Mr.Moulton indicated they would provide the required parking, sidewalks, dumpster enclosure, etc., in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance. They are not proposing any stormwater treatment because the current situation of the property is that it is a very level area. They have been through two TAC hearing and no concerns were voiced concerning the stormwater treatment.

Mr. Moulton discussed the second Planning Department memorandum. The design of the sewer and connections from the new building. The new plan proposes a sewer connection from an existing sewer manhole. They don't know how its connected to the existing building so it is

shown on the plan as a new sewer line installation. At the suggestion of Peter Rice, of DPW, they will insulate the sewer line.

Mr. Moulton indicated that they have applied to NHDOT for a driveway permit and have been advised they need deceleration lanes at both entrances. This will bring the pavement almost out to the catch basins so they would have to replace the catch basins and drain lines.

Mr. Moulton distributed a copy of the NHDOT letter, as well as a concept site plan, to the Board members.

In lieu of the additional pavement on Lafayette Road, they propose narrowing the 2 entrances, without touching anything within the DOT right-of-way and then they would not be subject to their driveway requirements. This would also be a reasonable alternative to the applicants, whose expenses are escalating.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone else wishing 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:

Chairman Holden asked why DOT reviewed this application and whether it was because it effected their right-of-way. What was the intent of their action?

Mr. Moulton indicated that they have certain standards for business driveways and they were relaying those standards for that design. This is similar to what they have done to other properties in the area. They have standards regarding the deceleration lanes and those are usually required. They also require additional right of way width, however, that was already provided from the Ocean Road intersection.

Mr. Burke indicated that when the Traffic & Safety Committee met at the site, they were desirous of getting a narrower driveway but they discussed that whatever DOT's standards were would be acceptable. Clearly if they require deceleration lanes for speed to access a narrow driveway then he would be supportive of that. It would be a safety issue.

Mr. Moulton indicated that they are not aware of any problems in that area.

Mr. Burke indicated that the City does not have the authority to waive a State standard.

Chairman Holden asked if the residential units are accessed from the driveway?

Phillip Desfosses, one of the applicants, indicated that the main entrance already has deceleration lanes. They use the main entrance for the mobile home park. The driveways on the site are not used by the residential units at all. They are only used by the law office.

Mr. Holden asked if there was anything that distinguishes this property from other properties that have been held to this requirement. It strikes him that these driveways serve multiple purposes. The second driveway appears to be a safety hazard if you don't know that the island is projecting out (on the revised plan).

Mr. David Desfosses asked about the 12 trees proposed. Were those required by zoning and why don't they extend all the way across the front of the property?

Mr. Moulton indicated that they were required under the landscaping requirements. They are required to plan a tree every 8' in front of the property.

Mr. David Desfosses was concerned about what happens in 10 years when the trees have grown and are blocking the sign behind the trees.

Mr. Moulton indicated that he felt that was an enforcement issue and they had no intention of taking the trees down in the future.

Mr. David Desfosses felt that smaller trees might be more appropriate.

Mr. Rice indicated that all sewer issues had been addressed.

Mr. Cravens indicated that all water issues had been addressed. He asked if a concrete containment pad could be added for the oil tank behind the garage, along with a small roof.

Mr. David Desfosses asked how many cars per day use the law office driveway?

Mr. Phillip Desfosses indicated that it was only used for the law office.

Mr. Burke asked why they don't close it if it's not used much. Closing a driveway is always a good thing.

Mr. Moulton indicated that the school buses use the area for picking up and dropping off children.

Mr. Phillip Desfosses indicated that the Traffic & Safety Committee didn't recommend any changes or study. They are not increasing the use or density with this project. They were willing to go along with this as an aesthetic improvement. He felt a compromise would be to leave Driveway #2 as it is and make a deceleration lane according to DOT at the entrance that gets the most use.

Mr. David Desfosses felt this would meet the State standard with one driveway and leaving the other driveway alone. He felt the State would support this as well.

Mr. Burke indicated that they have never done this before so it's hard to tell what DOT would say.

Mr. Holden suggested that they approve this, subject to approval by the State and review by Traffic & Safety. This would also give us review by other agencies that are most affected by it.

Mr. Moulton summarized that they would change their design by leaving driveway #2, which is the first driveway heading northbound, unchanged and improvements will be made to driveway #3 by narrowing the entrance and adding a deceleration lane.

Mr. Holden indicated that if DOT, for some reason, says no, then the application would come back to TAC for further review.

Mr. David Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Mr. Burke seconded. The motion passes unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That a concrete containment pad be added underneath the oil tank behind the garage along with a roof;

- 2. That driveway “#2” (heading northbound, the first depicted as shown on the Site Plan) shall remain unchanged, improvements shall be made to driveway “#3” (heading northbound, the second depicted as shown on the Site Plan), consisting of narrowing the entrance, adding a deceleration lane, subject to review by NHDOT and the Traffic & Safety Committee;
- 3. That the site plan be modified to depict utility changes due to the driveway revisions;
- 4. That NHDOT and the Traffic & Safety Committee shall approve this revised Site Plan; if either agency does not approve this plan, the applicant will return to TAC for further consideration.
- 5. That a landscaping plan be reviewed and approved by Lucy Tillman, Planner.

.....

B. The application of **Erie Scientific Company, Inc., owner, and C & L Construction Company, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **20 Post Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for increasing the size of an existing parking lot and constructing additional water detention areas, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 285 as Lot 9 and lies within an Industrial district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

A motion to table this application to the April 6, 2004 TAC meeting was made and seconded and was approved unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Olde Port Development Group, LLC** for property located at **126 State Street** wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 19’ x 22.5’ addition to the rear of the existing building and to add 1 ½ stories to an existing section of the building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 57 and lies within a Central Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

A motion to table this application to the April 6, 2004 TAC meeting was made and seconded and was approved unanimously.

.....

II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 2:45 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Jane M. Shouse, Administrative Assistant in the Planning Department.

