

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

2:00 P.M.

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

JANUARY 4, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director; John Burke, Director, Parking & Transportation; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician, and Steve Griswold, Captain, Fire Department

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

1. The application of **Saco Avenue Professional Building, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **125 Brewery Lane**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 4-story, 64' x 240', 15,500 ± s.f., 48-unit residential building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 154 as Lot 2 and lies within a Business district. (This application was tabled at the November 2, 2004 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Allen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Holden indicated that the Committee had only received plans at the meeting, and not beforehand, which is not standard practice. The applicant has indicated that they will be requesting to be tabled but have asked to up-date the Committee on this project.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, addressed the Committee. Also present was Chris Keenan, council for the applicant.

Mr. Chagnon reviewed the plans. On November 2nd issues were identified and he will not be able to go through all of them but most of them were just drafting changes and there was some confusion over the loading area issue. He was looking for clarification on that.

Mr. Desfosses indicated there was unnecessary paving at the loading area.

Mr. Chagnon stated that area was necessary to unload if there was a side door and that was the reason for that. He will look into that further now that he understands it. The primary concern dealt with the access to the site, tying into the neighborhood. The owners met with Mary Griffin and discussed the applicant entering off of her property to construct some improvements so that the area is connected from a pedestrian point of view. He had an exhibit that showed three areas where they propose to provide some off-site construction with the permission of the abutter so that they can circulate pedestrians through the area. The first was a connection across the extension of Brewery Lane, in front of building C, where they propose to put a sidewalk across and then cut through an existing

landscaped island that exists on the Plaza 800 property. The grass has been beaten down by pedestrians already so its obvious that they are using it as a way through the property. They are proposing to put in a sidewalk, a couple of steps for the grade change and a crosswalk. That will lead to the sidewalk that is along side the dry cleaner that in turn connects the other sidewalks in Plaza 800. The second feature is to the south of that to add a crosswalk from the end of the sidewalk along Brewery Lane to across the internal driveway. There is nothing there now that people can use. That would be essentially a device to recognize the traffic that is going on there. Then, on the east/right side they are proposing another crosswalk that would go over to an area on the north side of the Liquor Store. The sidewalk ends now at the corner of the Liquor Store. Those were their thoughts on this and he would appreciate their input. He also thanked Mary Griffin for her willingness to work with them on their proposal.

Mr. Chagnon indicated they were asked to meet with the City Attorney to address the Conservation land and easements. He turned the presentation over to Attorney Chris Keenan to address that.

Attorney Keenan indicated that he met with David Holden and Assistant City Attorney Suzanne Woodland to discuss the easements in this matter. The Conservation Easement is in place and the City does have the right and deed to that easement to access utilities throughout this entire site. There have been problems with the sewer treatment and they want to make sure that the City has access to it. An abutter also contacted them about plantings along the easement to block the view from the Aldrich Street homes. That abutter's request will be honored.

Attorney Keenan indicated that the Chevrolet Easement is owned in fee simple by the developer. In large part, there was a contiguous connection to the Conservation land to the green space on this development. The City maintains it. There is a public right of way over the easement.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the City did not maintain that street.

Attorney Keenan said that he made an assumption and would look into it and find out.

Mr. Holden tried to clarify that the City comes down Jewell Court, turns left on Brewery Lane, right thru the alley by the Malthouse, take a left onto Chevrolet and back out to Cass Street. That is how the City plows it. If that is the case, then Chevrolet Avenue as it enters this site would be private and Brewery Lane from the intersection of Jewell Court through the Plaza 800 is private.

Mary Griffin, President of Griffin Family Corporations, of 738 Islington Street, indicated that several years ago Peter Loughlin represented them and an agreement was created indicating that the City would continue until perpetuity to maintain Chevrolet Avenue.

Mr. Allen indicated they would check on that.

Attorney Keenan indicated that the Jewell Court easement, which went through the property, was subject to a Quiet Title by the City in Rockingham County Superior Court. Therefore, the center of the former City Yard is easement free. Brewery Lane and Chevrolet Avenue both have written right of ways for the public to use them. They hope to meet with the Department of Public Works this month to look at the utility easements across the center of the property.

Mr. Holden asked them to review the issues from the November 2nd TAC meeting. In terms of the site issues, they will go over those when they submit a revised plan. He would like to see those for the February meeting. The major issue is that a meeting should be set up to meet with DPW to discuss sewer and drainage issues.

Mr. Allen indicated they have had some preliminary meetings and everyone knows what the issues are.

Mr. Holden indicated that they are still waiting for a traffic study. Easements and parking are on going issues. He wasn't sure what the shortcut was through Jewell Court but he assumed Jewell Court would be part of the traffic study? The City will continue to work with the applicant regarding off site improvements.

Mr. Holden indicated a concern of his was that the proposal was for approximately 48 units and he asked if there were plans for additional buildings on the lot?

Attorney Keenan indicated there were no plans for additional buildings at this time. But, there's always a possibility of something going in. He believes the developer wants to see what the project looks like at this point to get a sense of it.

Mr. Holden indicated that part of the concerns was to assess the total impact to the area and perhaps as part of the traffic study it might be appropriate to look at the entire build out of the lot rather than look at it in phases. He asked if that would be possible.

Attorney Keenan indicated he would try to make that happen.

Mr. Burke felt that defining the project was an important issue.

Mr. Allen's concern was that they were making these comments based on nothing as they do not have any plans. They have comments from a previously submitted set of plans but they don't have a set to comment on at this point. They will be starting with a clean slate when they get a new set of plans.

Mr. Holden indicated that the applicant was working on the new plans but there was still a lot of detail that they needed to see on the plans and some assurances that it was coming together. He indicated, for example, a concern with the existing approved site plan for the first phase which shows that the parking on Building B exists but if they are dealing with the future of Brewery Lane it would be unusual to have parking spaces backing out onto the Street. These are things that they need to work out.

Mr. Allen made a motion to table this matter to the March 1st TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Issues raised at the November 2, 2004 TAC meeting:

- 1) A crosswalk at the back entrance of Chevrolet Avenue is shown 20' – 30' off of the street and it is unclear why that was done;
- 2) There are interior stairways shown on the layout and it is not clear where they go;
- 3) The loading area by Building C is oversized and it should be reduced;
- 4) The City of Portsmouth normally requires one single handicapped ramp rather than one at each corner (3 shown on the plans);
- 5) There is a 4' sidewalk shown heading towards Plaza 800 that needs to lead somewhere;
- 6) That a meeting should be set up with DPW to address sewerage and drainage issues;
- 7) More information is required about the proposed pond;
- 8) Details are required on the plans on the water feed, keeping in mind that the City only allows one meter per lot;
- 9) Lighting needs to be shown on the plans;
- 10) The sprinkler system needs to be shown on the plans;
- 11) Hydrants need to be added to the plans;
- 12) A revised traffic study should be submitted, including the Bartlett/Islington intersection and the Middle/Cass Street intersection;

- 13) A meeting should be set up with the applicant, the Planning Department and the City Attorney to address the conservation land, easements with Chevrolet and Brewery Lane, as well as parking;
- 14) The sidewalk on Chevrolet Avenue should be the City standard of 5' concrete;
- 15) Concern was expressed over the shortcut through Jewell Court;
- 16) It was felt that the sidewalk should be extended to encompass Building B and a detail should be provided showing the general conditions on both sides of the right-of-way;
- 17) The elevations and slope of the retaining walls should be noted on the plans;
- 18) That the City address their contribution to off site improvements.

Issues raised at the January 4, 2005 TAC meeting:

- 19) That the applicant meet with the Public Works Department regarding sewerage and drainage issues;
- 20) That a determination be made regarding who maintains the upper half of Chevrolet Avenue and Brewery Lane from the intersection of Jewell Court;
- 21) That the traffic study should address the entire build out of the project;

.....

2. The application of **Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust and Joker's Realty One, LLC, Owners, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **2460 Lafayette Road**, wherein site plan approval is requested for the expansion of an existing 124,852 ± s.f. Wal-Mart Store to a 190,800 ± s.f. s.f. Wal-Mart Supercenter, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 285 as Lots 16-1 & 2 and lies within a General Business district. (This application was tabled at the November 30, 2004 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off the table. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernard Pelech spoke on behalf of Wal-Mart. Also present was Paul Hayner of Hayner & Swanson, the Site Engineer. Since their last appearance before this Committee they have had several meetings with City Staff and NHDOT regarding the issues of traffic. It appears that at this point in time they will be working with the City and the State to develop a Development Agreement regarding a contribution from Wal-Mart to Route One improvements at the Constitutional Avenue intersection. They are currently in the process of doing a survey of the right of way line at Constitution and Route One for the purpose of the preliminary design of that intersection. They hope that they will be meeting with City Staff soon to share the results of that survey. He went through the items from the last TAC meeting regarding easement issues and he indicated he would then turn their presentation over to Paul Hayner to go through the other items on the list.

Attorney Pelech indicated that the waterline easement has been submitted as recently as yesterday with Assistant City Attorney Suzanne Woodland and she was satisfied with the language of the easement

and the Salema easement. She did ask that there be some clarification on the plan prior to recording that.

Attorney Pelech indicated that he submitted copies of all correspondence between NHDOT and the developer to the Committee for their review. They will identify where the easement line leaves the property for clarification on the plan. He also was looking for some guidance from the Committee on pole height of the lighting. They were currently talking about 42 poles on the site and his concern is that they were presently showing some poles being 32' high on a 3' base, some 35' high on a 3' base. As the City is currently looking at lighting and revising the City Regulations, they are trying to get some comparisons with various height poles, down to a 24' poles, for the next meeting. If they were to look at 18' poles it would look like an aluminum forest. Ms. Tillman was going to look at the plant species for salt tolerance but she was satisfied with the location and amount of landscaping.

Ms Tillman indicated that was correct and they could work on that together.

Paul Hayner, of Hayner/Swanson, of Nashua, introduced himself at the new civil engineer on this project. Mr. Bloeman, of SANS Engineering will continue to be the civil engineer of record. For the purpose of this project he will be the project manager for public meetings. Since the last TAC meeting, they have addressed the comments from that meeting and those have been incorporated into the plans.

Stipulation review:

- 8) That the size and type of the two grease traps be noted on the Site Plan;

The grease traps have been identified as 2,000.

- 9) That a Site Plan set be provided to the all Committee members, complete with revision dates and a note of what the revisions were;

They have provided plan sets for this meeting.

- 10) That the note on the Site Utility Plan behind Joker's that reads "Line to be abandon by city (typ)" be revised to read "Line to be abandoned according to City standards";

This has not been noted on the plan.

- 11) That a note be added where the easement line leaves the property for clarification;

This was addressed by Attorney Pelech.

- 12) That the water service be changed to a 4" service;

This has not been changed on the plans.

- 13) That the irrigation system be changed to come off of the domestic water meter in the building;

This was changed.

14) That the applicant work with the Planning Department and the DPW to revise the parking plan to address pedestrian safety and aesthetics;

A meeting was held to review the parking lot plan and they did make some changes as a result of that meeting. They essentially revised the parking lot intersection and added a stop sign, widened the sidewalk from Route One to the Building to 6' wide so that two shopping carts can pass on the sidewalk, and they provided ramps down midpoints between the intersections so that it is possible for pedestrians to access the parking lot via sidewalks from any point.

15) That porous pavement be used on the parking lot areas to break up the significant amount of flow from the site;

After some extensive research on this, he spoke with the NH Department of Public Works, the NH Department of Transportation and they do not recommend porous pavement in this climate due to the fact that the pavement allows water to go through it to the sub basin and in an environment like this, that water sits in the sub basin and saturates it. An alternative is to do leaching drain lines and they have set up about 1,400' of the drain lines on the property that would become perforated in a stone trench and this way address the issue of recharge of the stormwater and reducing their impact off site.

Mr. Haynor indicated that they are currently proposing 52 light poles that are 38' in height in the center of the lot and 35' in height on the perimeter of the lot. The fixture itself is a flat lense full cut off Dark Skies approved fixture. It is neighborhood friendly and works very well at property lines. The foot candles are 1.8 which is very low. 16' poles just wouldn't work in a commercial site such as this as there would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 4 times as many poles. They are proposing 38' height which is less than the Wal-Mart standard.

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 for the purposes of this meeting although it may be reopened at a subsequent time.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden asked about the lighting. He saw three points where the applicant has demonstrated an ability to really work with the City to come up with some innovative ways to improve the plan. One was to revise the parking plan to improve pedestrian safety and aesthetics. He encouraged the applicant to show the differences when they are before the Planning Board. The drainage system is a significant issue that is being addressed in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. Desfosses confirmed that they have come to a compromise on the porous pavement. He felt the porous pavement would have been ideal but it doesn't appear to be out of the laboratory phase.

Mr. Desfosses indicated he would like to see a comparison on the lighting plan showing different pole heights. This is not for his own review as he is cognizant of what is required but to be used as an exhibit for the Planning Board meeting. This is a much larger parking lot than the City is used to.

Mr. Holden indicated there were two issues that were largely outstanding. The traffic issue is still largely outstanding but he is gathering from the applicant's presentation that they have a partnership that seems to be developing that includes the State of NH, Wal-Mart and the City of Portsmouth to address deficiencies on Route One and at this point Wal-Mart is committed to preparing a survey that

would look at that right of way and make it available to the City and the State for the basis of evaluation.

Attorney Pelech indicated that was correct and he also added that he would be drafting a Roadway Agreement similar to, but not the same, as what was entered into with PSNH regarding the Gosling Road reconstruction. Wal-Mart is committed to paying its fair share of the roadway improvements based on a formula to be determined by the City and the State. The next step is to find out where the right of way lines are and whether the five lane profile can fit in the existing right of way or whether the State will have to do a taking for the expansion. They are prepared to assist the City and the State by doing the survey and will also provide conceptual designs if necessary. They would then hope that within the next 4-6 weeks they would be able to arrive at an agreed to contribution and finalize the agreement. It is just a matter of finding out what needs to be done for roadway improvements and what the cost is going to be and agreeing upon a contribution. They have become aware through John Burke that \$360,000 is available from NHDOT for this project and that money would be used for the final design and right of way taking. That is pretty much the status of where they are. He talks to Doug DePorter on a weekly basis and he also talks to John Burke regularly. The issue holding them up with NHDOT is whether or not the design division of DOT is going to require a "traffic study" or whether they are going to pass on that determination to Doug DePorter. The Planning Division of DOT has indicated that they are satisfied with the information that has been provided by the applicant and from their point of view no additional traffic study is needed but they don't have that sign off yet.

Mr. Holden asked if the Agreement would set some guidelines as to timing and scheduling?

Attorney Pelech indicated that is something that will be placed into that agreement which is why they need to rely upon NHDOT to get some understanding of what the process will be.

Mr. Holden indicated that from the City's perspective, the sooner this can be made and the more definite the schedule is the more pluses for all involved.

Attorney Pelech indicated that per discussions last week with DOT, they have no problem with the City taking the management role in the construction of this project.

Mr. Holden indicated that the second aspect is that they are willing to participate with the Planning Board regarding façade improvements or design review function that might be part of the City's future in the sense that the draft Master Plan is looking at that and the City is trying to work with the applicant.

Attorney Pelech indicated that was correct, even though the Planning Board did not have jurisdiction over elevations but based on representations that it was something that was being discussed as part of the Master Plan, they voluntarily agreed to work with the Department in review of elevations. That has resulted in a series of elevation changes from the Wal-Mart prototype to something that is quite enhanced and something that was designed specifically for this site. It has been submitted to City staff members for further review. They are attempting to break up the rear façade of the building to take away the Great Wall of China look. The front façade has been upgraded but they are working on further enhancements on the other three facades. They will also put together a power point presentation showing the actual progression from the prototype to what is being proposed.

Mr. Holden suggested that they table this to the next regular meeting so that the revised plans can be reviewed on a timely basis and insure that all conditions and any others that they may wish to make are incorporated so that they can dispose of those at the February meeting. They can take it up again in March in the hopes of concluding with a review of some sort of agreement that involves the City, the State and Wal-Mart.

Attorney Pelech will continue to schedule meetings with Mr. Holden and Mr. Burke.

Mr. Holding indicated it would be helpful to provide an annotated set of plans for the next meeting. That will also serve as the basis for the final set.

Attorney Pelech indicated they have to work with the Fire Chief or Fire Marshall on the sprinkler system. He also confirmed that Coast wanted to leave their pick up and drop off area in the front entrance area.

Mr. Holden asked about the parking in the back where it shows parking that would back out into an aisle that goes around the building.

Attorney Pelech thought that had been removed.

Mr. Holden indicated that he might not be looking at the most recent plan and would look for that change next month on the revised plans.

Mr. Allen made a motion to table this matter to the February 1st TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded.

The motion to table passed unanimously.

Stipulations from the November 2, 2004 TAC Meeting:

- 1) A report from NHDOT is required;
- 2) This matter should be scheduled before the Traffic & Safety Committee (if a Traffic Study is not required);
- 3) The water line should show that the fire service connects around the entire building and is connected to the loop with a valve and also identify how the service is going to work with the pump building (the plan is confusing and the area should be detailed);
- 4) The Easement Plan and language needs to be reviewed by the Legal/Planning Departments;
- 5) The City will meet with Coast to work out a bus loading area in front of the building;
- 6) That one or two new lights will be added to the rear intersection with Constitution Avenue;
- 7) That the conditions from the TAC meeting of September 7, 2004 will be brought forward;

Stipulations from the November 30, 2004 TAC Meeting:

- 8) That the size and type of the two grease traps be noted on the Site Plan;
- 9) That a Site Plan set be provided to the all Committee members, complete with revision dates and a note of what the revisions were;
- 10) That the note on the Site Utility Plan behind Joker's that reads "Line to be abandon by city (typ)" be revised to read "Line to be abandoned according to City standards";
- 11) That a note be added where the easement line leaves the property for clarification;
- 12) That the water service be changed to a 4" service;
- 13) That the irrigation system be changed to come off of the domestic water meter in the building;
- 14) That the applicant work with the Planning Department and the DPW to revise the parking plan to address pedestrian safety and aesthetics;
- 15) That porous pavement be used on the parking lot areas to break up the significant amount of flow from the site;
- 16) That a written report be prepared for the Committee regarding trip generations and traffic issues, including all written correspondence with NHDOT;
- 17) That after a response has been received from NHDOT, a meeting shall be scheduled with the NHDOT, the applicant and City personnel to discuss Constitution Avenue and trip generations;

- 18) That the applicant appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee after receiving a recommendation of approval from TAC;
- 19) That an Easement Deed and Easement Plan be prepared for review and approval by the City Legal Department;

Stipulations from the January 4, 2004 TAC Meeting:

- 20) That a lighting comparison be prepared for presentation to the Planning Board;
-

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **145 Heritage Avenue Properties, LLC, Owner, and Carlisle Capital Corporation, Applicant**, for property located **off Heritage Avenue**, wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of three buildings as follows: 1) a 120' x 130' 1-story industrial building with 15,600 ± s.f.; 1) a 210' x 140' 1-story industrial building with 29,400 ± s.f., and 3) a 30' x 90' 2-story garage with 2,700 ± s.f., with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 284 as Lot 7 and lies within an Industrial district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton, of Millette, Sprague & Colwell, presented for the applicant. Also present were Steve Binnie of 145 Heritage Avenue Properties and Dick Johnson, Construction Manager. Mr.Moulton explained that this is currently an undeveloped lot of approximately 4 ½ acres. They are proposing to develop the site for some manufacturing, application, warehouse, and tradecraft-type buildings, along with some office space. There are two buildings, along with a 2-story garage for storage of vehicles and maintenance equipment for the site. They have provided 101 parking spaces which is in excess of what is required for the square footage of the buildings. There are 6 loading areas for the site. To accommodate the truck traffic, the exit aisles are extra wide so that they can handle tractor trailers coming up from Lafayette to Heritage. The connections to water and sewer utilities are already existing. They will trench across to the gas service. Electricity will be provided from an existing pole which will be undergrounded into the buildings per Site Regulations. They have provided dumpsters for the various buildings. Lighting consists of wall pack lighting on the back of the buildings and they propose 20' high light poles, which they feel are appropriate for this area. Traffic generation was shown at 48 trip ins during the morning peak hour and 49 trip ins during the evening peak hour and 72 trips ins throughout the day. Mr. Moulton indicated that although this was an increase, it was not an alarming increase for the site. There are limited areas for snow storage on the site so it would have to be trucked off if it started to pile up.

Mr. Moulton indicated that drainage is an issue for this site. They have brought the water back as much as they could with a detention area in the back that is built within the buffer zone. There is a smaller wetland there which is less than ¼ acre in size so it is non-jurisdictional as far as buffer. The detention area would outlet into the treatment swale that would then enter to a full drainage system which brings it back to existing drainage structures on Heritage Avenue. The total off site flow has been reduced as a result of this design although the flow to the catch basin has been slightly increased.

Mr. Moulton indicated this was the trade off that has to be made to get the water to go where you want it to go. They did an analysis of the catch basin, including any additional run off from the roadway and it proved to be adequate. They also looked at what happens when you go further down Heritage Avenue to Banfield Road and reviewed a site plan that was done 7 years ago for the drainage along Heritage Avenue and the rear of Wal-Mart, and they analyzed what happened at the discharge points. They updated it for proposed additions and proposed development flows, which showed there would be a slight increase in the flow rates and in elevation in that pond.

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:

Mr. Britz indicated that the City wetland maps show that wetland area extending quite a bit into the property and beyond where they are talking about. It wasn't clear to him whether the wetland area was accurate. There was no report from the wetland scientist provided.

Mr. Moulton indicated he had the report with him and he handed it out to the committee members.

Mr. Britz stated that he went out and looked at the property and it wasn't clear to him that it wasn't wetland. There had been quite a bit of storage of materials and disturbance in the area, but looking at the soils and the trees on the site, it appeared to be stressed. He felt there should be a second opinion on the wetland.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Moulton if they would have any problem getting a second independent report on the wetlands?

Mr. Moulton indicated he had no objection to that.

Mr. Desfosses indicated he also went out to the site with Mr. Britz and, understanding that this whole area was originally a construction lay out area for the industrial park, it does seem that some of the trees in the area are stressed and the soil is suspect. Another issue is the elevation in the detention and treatment area is shown as 47, which is below the wetland level immediately adjacent to it and he is concerned that they are not going to align the treatment and that could dry out the ground water and the wetland a little bit. Also, to exasperate the problem, there is a water main that goes through the culvert so adding any additional flow to the pond is not going to be acceptable. Mr. Desfosses has concerns about capacity and flow rates with the existing drainage system. He also did not see the analysis of the closed pipe drainage system. Mr. Desfosses was not sure it was appropriate to have the elevation so low either. He indicated a willingness to meet with Mr. Moulton on these issues as the drainage issues on the site are not acceptable as is.

Deputy Chief Griswold asked that they check with Tom Richter on the street address.

Mr. Burke raised the issue of all three driveways coming together. He asked if that was necessary.

Mr. Binnie indicated the entrance of the project was designed that way because of the design of the buildings. With the lay out of the trucks and the loading area, along with the small wetland, they needed the accessibility.

Mr. Burke asked why not have the driveway on the other side of the lot? He was concerned with safety and indicated he would like to see it moved. His other issue was the 50 peak hour trip ins, sending tractor trailers up to the Heritage intersection, so he would like to look at re-striping to extend the two lanes at that intersection.

Mr. Cravens asked how the water service entered the property. He could see how the fire and domestic enters and goes to the first building, but what happened to the domestic after that? He reminded them that the City only allows one domestic service per lot.

Mr. Moulton indicated he would correct that.

Mr. Cravens also thought it looked like another water line was coming off the fire service, heading towards the next property.

Mr. Moulton indicated he would remove the line from the plans.

Mr. Cravens indicated that the City could only tap 2" or 4" water service so they would have to change their 3" service.

Mr. Burke asked if they would consider putting up a standard "No Trucks" sign at the entrance.

Mr. Moulton indicated he would add that to the plans.

Deputy Chief Griswold asked about the garage and whether there was going to be a business included in that building?

Mr. Binnie indicated it was strictly a parking garage.

Deputy Chief Griswold asked that they stipulate to a master box for the property and also a knock box on each building.

Mr. Britz asked if they would label the size of the small wetland on the site plans. Also, Mr. Britz asked if the detention pond in the rear of the property could have plantings and treatments to help the habitat.

Mr. Allen made a motion to table this matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded.

Mr. Holden indicated that the Site Plan and some of the discussion on it seems to be that it has been maximized, which is appropriate, but sometimes when you maximize the site development you have off site impacts that may not be appropriate. When you look at the site review criteria it does allow one to consider off site impact and whether or not it is appropriate. Where Mr. Holden was going with his comments was if there was any change in use, they would be looking at parking relief. So, by approving the Site Plan, it is agreed that the site plan that is presented is appropriate but if, right out of the gate the uses change, such as a retail space goes to a restaurant, and the parking demand doubles then the site doesn't have the required parking so they have to go to the Board of Adjustment. They would like to figure out how they can put on the record on this site plan what the assumptions are so that if there are site changes of use, they will be holding the developer to what he indicated was going to be there as far as appearing before the Board of Adjustment as a self-created hardship. His concern was that this was an industrial area and he is not convinced that the uses will always remain warehousing as we see the development of this area it seems like business offices and limited manufacturing tend to be the more prominent uses.

The motion to **table** the application until the next regular TAC meeting scheduled on February 1, 2005 at 2:00 pm passed unanimously.

Issues raised at the January 4, 2005 TAC Meeting:

- 1) That a report by an independent wetland scientist be prepared;

- 2) That the elevations in the treatment area need to be addressed;
- 3) That the water main that goes through the culvert and runs across Banfield Road should be evaluated regarding capacity and flow and a drainage system analysis should be prepared which addresses potential off-site impacts in the Banfield Road/Heritage Avenue area;
- 4) That the driveway be relocated to the other side of the lot;
- 5) That the Heritage Avenue/Route 1 intersection be evaluated;
- 6) That only one water meter per lot is allowed and the plans should reflect the connection from the first building to the second building
- 7) That the stray water line coming off of the fire line should be eliminated;
- 8) That the water service must be either 2" or 4" pipe;
- 9) That a standard "No Trucks" sign be added to the entrance;
- 10) That a Masterbox and a Knox Box be added to the plans;
- 11) That the size of the smaller wetland be added to the plans;
- 12) That plantings and landscape treatment be added along the edge of the detention pond in the rear of the property.

.....

B. The application of **Strawbery Banke, Inc., Owner**, for property located **off Marcy Street**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 1-story 3,300 ± s.f. free standing Orientation Center, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 104 as Lot 007 and lies within a Mixed Residential Office district and Historic District A.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Lawrence Yerdon, President of Strawbery Banke, addressed the Committee. He explained that they are building a new orientation center to help meet the needs of their visitors in what is a very unique and complex urban area. They will have a ticketing area and a small retail space. He turned the meeting over to Jeff Clifford, engineer from Altus Engineering.

Mr. Clifford walked them through the plans. The Existing Conditions plan (C-1) shows the existing buildings, the parking lot, and a large green space used for events at the facility. The Site Plan (C-2) shows the proposed structure which is approximately a 3,500 s.f. one-story building accessed from a corner of the parking lot. There will be slight changes to parking and the handicapped spaces are being moved. There will be a sign at the entrance and low level lighting. The building will be served by utilities off of Washington Street as the existing utilities come off of Washington Street. Also, archeological considerations at the sight must be taken into consideration so they would like to follow where existing utilities have gone in the past. In particular there are two major sewer lines that go through the sites. One is a cast iron line for sewer overflow which normally takes stormwater which is on the perimeter towards town. The other line is parallel to it, is reinforced concrete and is a dedicated sanitary use. The water will come off of Washington Street with a 2" line and a 1" line going across to the building itself. The water line is an elevation of 5 which is about 3.5 over the sewer line. Electric and cable would come in through an existing overhead pole, through a conduit and then underground. There is a hydrant on Washington Street and Hancock Street. The building, in terms of grading and stormwater, will be at an elevation of 10.0, the existing flood plain elevation is 9.0 and the old building was at 8.5 so the site is coming up a little bit to accommodate the grading and access. They will maintain the existing drainage configuration. Water comes down to a catch basin and if it goes high enough, it overflows into a catch basin adjacent to it and that flows into the overflow combined sewer system. The amount of water that is coming down was tremendous and the catch basin was able to handle a lot of the flow. In terms of stormwater treatment, it would be a good idea to continue the flow as opposed to going directly to the river via the higher pipe. Mr. Clifford stated that in terms of

impervious that's being added to the site, they are tearing down an existing building and adding a building. They requested a waiver of the stormwater analysis of the site because if it does overflow, it goes into the existing facility and straight to the river so abutters are never effected.

The Chair called for any speakers from the public to speak to, for or against the Petition.

Dan Corcoran, of 168 Marcy Street, felt Strawberry Banke was finally able to construct a structure that was appropriate for their site. He did question where buses would park and asked if they could be instructed to turn their engines off while parked.

The Chair called for any further speakers from the public to speak to, for or against the Petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve. Mr. Allen seconded.

Mr. Cravens indicated that the 1" water service going into the building should have a separate water shut-off after it comes off of the 2", about 10 feet away.

Mr. Allen was concerned about the sewer connection as they were almost 180 degrees opposite the flow direction.

Mr. Clifford indicated they were putting a drop structure in so it was like having a drop in the manhold.

Mr. Allen indicated this would actually take 10 mgv in a storm so it carries a lot. A lot of debris comes through there as well. He would like to see it come directly out of their building and put a drop into the top of the concrete pipe and have a clean out there. He was also concerned about the longevity of their proposal and could foresee problems.

Mr. Clifford indicated that he agreed with Mr. Allen.

Mr. Allen would prefer to go directly into the line and not back into the flow. He would like a detail prepared for his review prior to the Planning Board Meeting.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stated that a lot of people park on the right hand side of Washington Street as you are heading away from Court Street. The gate on Washington Street that leads into the site is the closest access to a hydrant. With the parking and the narrowness of the gate, he felt it was impossible for fire trucks to make the turn off of Washington Street into the site. Therefore, they would be required to go all the way around Marcy Street and have a very long hose line. He felt it was important that he look at the turning radius off of Washington Street into the site to make sure a fire truck can fit down there and so they could use the hydrant on Washington, or, make sure the walkway that comes off of Hancock's parking lot is large enough to support a fire truck so they can get in there.

Mr. Holden asked if he wanted to review the access from either Washington or Hancock to see which is better?

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold felt Washington Street was the better access but it was difficult to make the turn.

Rodney Knowland, of Strawberry Banke, spoke and indicated that the Washington Street gate was never meant to be a fire truck entrance. The Washington Street gate could be made larger but he was concerned that they still wouldn't be able to make the turn to get onto the street. If they turned to the

Hancock Street side, there would be access along the pathway. Another thought was to come down Court Street and turn onto Marcy which is why they located their knox box on Court Street.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold thought they might consider putting a hydrant in however it would have limited flow because it would be at a deadend. He went on to say that he felt it would be a great idea to put a sprinkler system in however he was advised that the building was specifically designed so that they wouldn't have to put a sprinkler system in it. He understood that according to the building code they were not required to put a sprinkler system in but considering the value of the structures that surround the site, a wooden structure without a sprinkler system was not doing much to guarantee the preservation of this building or potentially the surrounding buildings. He stated that in museum situations with houses that are irreplaceable, it made a lot more sense to him to put a sprinkler system in the building to contain a fire. He felt the cost would be off set by reduced insurance premiums over the long term. He strongly encouraged them to consider an automatic sprinkler system in the building, even though it's not required by code.

Mr. Holden asked if it would be advisable to explore options on adding a hydrant before this went to the Planning Board?

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold indicated he would like to meet to discuss the options.

Mr. Holden suggested a meeting between Deputy Fire Chief Griswold, Rick Hopley, Tom Cravens and Dave Holden to explore those options.

The motion to **approve** passed unanimously with the following **stipulations**:

- 1) That the 1" water service should have a separate water shut-off;
- 2) That a detail be prepared showing the sewer connection going directly into the sewer line, (and not headed back into the flow) and reviewed and approved by David Allen prior to the Planning Board meeting
- 3) That a meeting be scheduled with Deputy Fire Chief Steve Griswold, Chief Building Inspector Richard Hopley, Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician and David Holden, Director of the Planning Department, to discuss adding a fire hydrant or alternative fire protection systems;

.....
III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:00 p.m.
.....

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