

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

2:00 P.M.

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

APRIL 4, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director; Steven Miller, Vice-Chairman, Conservation Commission; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician; Debbie Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief; and David Ferland, Captain, Police Department.

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

1. The application of **Martingale Wharf, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **99 Bow Street**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 6/7 story 80' x 45' addition to the left side of an existing building and a 6 story 36' x 56' addition to the right side of an existing building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 106 as Lot 54 and lies within the Central Business A District, Historic A District and Downtown Overlay District. (This application was tabled from the February 28, 2006 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Malcolm McNeill, represented the Applicant. Also present were Robert Ricci, principal of RRJ Properties, Eric Weinrieb, of Altus Engineering and John Merkel, of TMS Architects. Attorney McNeill indicated they have gone through a long approval process by receiving approval from the Historic District Commission on January 11, 2006, and they appeared before the Technical Advisory Committee on January 31st and February 28th. Discussions were held on the utility connections with further involvement with PSNH and the other utility providers. Additionally, issues regarding traffic were discussed in a meeting with Deb Finnigan to discuss the downtown traffic issues and they have recommendations as a result of those meetings. There are continuing issues with DES regarding shoreline issues. On March 22, 2006, Altus Engineering provided a memo addressing the various technical issues. They believe they have addressed the utility and traffic issues and they have a proposal regarding State issues.

Eric Weinrieb, of Altus Engineering, reviewed the color Site Plan with the Committee. He indicated that they met with Mike Coffey from PSNH. They are proposing to add to the existing pole for primary service. In order to provide for an underground vault, the transformer will be below grade however it will be on their parcel, they will be responsible for maintenance and there will be access on the inside of the building. There is an existing pole in the parking lot which will be moved 2' for the remaining utilities. From the sanitary perspective, they will come up the Bow Street trench, remove the 2" and replace with a 4" and have the service far enough away to not effect the existing tap. They

are proposing a new sprinkler system and domestic and fire services. They are working with the City to replace the water line along the front. From an access standpoint, the drop off and green space have not changed. They met with Deb Finnigan and Steve Parkinson and they propose to work with the City to work on improvements in the Penhallow, Bow and downtown areas.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Weinrieb to review traffic changes since their last presentation. Mr. Weinrieb indicated that they used a City GIS map for the Market Street and Bow Street areas. They want to improve pedestrian access. One problem area is that a wheelchair has to pass in front of the Dolphin Striker along the street due to the set of stairs. They will put in crosswalks and they are also looking at extending the double yellow line on Market Street.

Attorney McNeill confirmed that the DES issues are activated regarding the Shoreland Protection Act. He has had discussions with the Attorney General's office regarding the zone with 0 setbacks. There are various remedies available from DES however a decision has not been reached at this point. They would like to continue with DES approval being a condition of Site Review approval.

Mr. Holden asked if a question of jurisdiction was still pending? Attorney McNeill confirmed they were still working on that issue.

The Chair asked 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. Holden suggested that a motion be made. Mr. Allen made a motion to approve with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen referred to a March 22nd letter from Altus Engineering to David Holden and he felt there was a misunderstanding. Mr. Allen stressed that the City does not have the ability to guarantee supply water based on the replacement of a small section of pipe. The City does fire flow tests and will determine what the system has in a particular area and will give that information to the mechanical designer. Mr. Allen understood that Mr. Weinrieb is working to get that information and it is just now becoming clear. It is the intent that the City will work with the developer. If there could be some improvements that would allow the developer not to use fire flow pumps then they could use some of that money to do a mutually beneficial improvement in that area. It appears, given the height of the building and what fire flow needs, they will probably need that fire flow pump. Mr. Allen explained that essentially they will have a stipulation that they do replace that water line in front of the property and that is more as a result of them tearing up that section for construction. That is a very old water line so they will be able to have a reliable line and, in the future as upgrades take place, that area will not have to be disturbed again.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the stipulation was that they will replace the water line in front of the building, they will have a fire pump unless it is proven that it is not needed. Mr. Allen confirmed that would be dealt with through the building permit application and the Fire Department. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold confirmed that the requirement for the fire pump is based strictly on the flow requirements of the sprinkler system that is installed and they won't know that until the design of the system is completed. Therefore, at this point, all he would say is that the sprinkler system needs to perform as code requires.

Mr. Allen added that they would be working with their mechanical people to size that line and it will probably be a 10" – 12" based on what their water model tells them. To replace that water line will

require some shutdowns and the applicant shall work with the City Water Division on the appropriate scheduling of that work.

Ms. Finnigan stipulated that the traffic mitigations that they have been working on shall be approved by the Director of DPW prior to the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Holden asked that they be incorporated into the Plan Set going to the Planning Board.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold reminded them that the City ordinance requires that the sprinkler systems provide automatic notification of emergency services. Also, they prefer a master box and also a knock box with key access.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the hatchway would have H2O? Mr. Weinrieb confirmed there will be an H2O loading on the hatchway and they will add it to the plan. He also confirmed it would be internal. Mr. Desfosses asked about a grease trap and Mr. Weinrieb confirmed it would be interior. Mr. Holden asked what size it would be and Mr. Weinrieb responded that he didn't know. They don't know how many restaurants or what type there will be. They had indicated earlier that typically the greasetrap was dealt with at the Planning Board as it was exterior but as this will be interior it will be dealt with at the building permit process.

Mr. Allen asked if they looked for external locations? Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that they did and there was no space available.

Mr. Desfosses asked for two minor modifications to details shown on the last page. The pavement cross section should be 4", 2 ½ and 1 ½ and the stone mix under the brick should be 1" rather than 2".

Mr. Holden asked that they stipulate that they have a Construction Management Plan, developed in coordination with Deb Finnigan, the Inspection Department and the City Manager's Office. Mr. Weinrieb indicated that they had included a plan which Mr. Holden felt was a good preliminary effort.

Mr. Holden asked for a stipulation that prior to the issuance of a building permit, all outstanding issues with regard to the coastal process and Shoreline Protection Act are all worked out.

Mr. Holden asked if the size of the water lines were acceptable? Mr. Allen confirmed that Mr. Cravens will look at the lines and that will be adjusted before going to the Planning Board. Therefore, they will need a recommendation on the water line sizes before this going to the Planning Board.

Mr. Holden asked if this project meets the building height requirements and the open space requirements for the district? Attorney McNeill confirmed that it did. Mr. Holden confirmed that they have a Certificate of Appropriateness from the HDC. Mr. Holden felt that the applicant had completed their obligations at this stage.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the hatchway was stainless steel? Mr. Weinrieb did not know at this point. Mr. Desfosses asked for a shop drawing before it goes in.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations.

- 1) That the applicant shall replace the water line along the front property line and the necessity of a fire pump will be reviewed at the time of the building permit application with the Fire Department;
- 2) That a recommendation shall be provided by the City Water Division relative to the water line sizes prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 3) That the City shall work with the applicant’s mechanical engineer to determine what they need for flows and to model the appropriate size of the water line and the applicant shall schedule that through the City Water Division as it shall require shut downs in the area;
- 4) That all traffic mitigations shall be reviewed and approved by the City Traffic Engineer and those notes shall be incorporated into the Site Plan Set prior to the Planning Board meeting on April 20, 2006;
- 5) That the applicant shall provide automatic notification of emergency forces with a Master Box and a Knox Box shall be provided;
- 6) That the Plan Set detail shall be revised to show that the pavement cross section shall to be 4” (2 ½ and 1 ½);
- 7) That the Plan Set detail shall be revised to show the stone mix on the bricks shall be 1” rather than 2”;
- 8) That a Construction Management Plan shall be prepared by the applicant, in coordination with Deb Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, the Building Inspection Office and the City Manager’s Office;
- 9) That prior to the issuance of a building permit, all outstanding issues regarding the coastal process and Shoreline Protection Act shall be completed;
- 10) That a shop drawing of the stainless steel hatchway shall be provided to David Desfosses prior to the issuance of a Building Permit;

The applicant was still concerned about replacing the water line and having that coordinated before the April 20th Planning Board meeting. Mr.Holden confirmed that that should be completed prior to the Planning Board meeting.

.....

2. The application of **Thomas J. Flatley, Owner, and Home Depot, Applicant,** for property located at 500 Spaulding Turnpike wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 1-story 117,193 ± s.f. proposed Home Depot retail store, a 1-story 28,000 ± s.f. garden center and a 19,200 ± s.f. building pad, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 238 as Lot 20 and lies within a General Business District. (This application was tabled from the February 28, 2006 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

David Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table.
Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Malcolm McNeil, appeared on behalf of Home Depot. Also present was Greg Mikolaities and Derek Wyse, from Appledore Engineering, Art Scarneo, of Greenman-Pedersen, their Traffic Enginner, Heather Storlazzi-Ward from Gove Environmental and Dick Kane from the Kane Company.

Attorney McNeill indicated that they appeared on February 28th before TAC and they have responded to the technical concerns from that meeting. Attorney McNeill also pointed out that there is also a proposal for a connection to the site from adjoining property owned by Home Depot. He explained that the previous development plan involved the approval of the Home Depot garden center and an out building close to 20,000 s.f. They received Conditional Use relief for the 100' buffer from the Conservation Commission. At that hearing, an interconnecting roadway was not delineated on the site plan. Pursuant to discussions with the City they have proposed the connector road between the existing Home Depot parking lot and the proposed Home Depot. The drive line has been chosen to stay out of wetlands so no DES wetland relief will be necessary but they are in the 100' buffer which will require relief before from the Conservation Commission and they are scheduled to appear before that Board on April 12th. When then originally appeared before the Conservation Commission and initially started discussions with the City, the traffic study was not based on the connector roadway. During the course meetings with City staff, they were encouraged to install the roadway for the reason of keeping traffic off of Woodbury Avenue and providing the type of connection that Municipalities are increasingly requesting. A similar road exists on the other side of the project. They looked at many alternatives relative to access, they were very concerned about environmental impacts but also wanted to be sure that it would work in terms of truck traffic coming in and out of the site as well as customer traffic on the site. They believe this is a true win with regard to traffic design and mitigation and they hope the Conservation Commission will appreciate their efforts to be responsive to the City with regards to the connector.

Attorney McNeill indicated that the remaining concerns of TAC have been worked through with various departments and have been placed on the Site Plans. They appreciated the input of all City staff as in the end they have a better plan. He will have Greg Mikolaities speak about how and why the roadway was designed and then their Traffic Engineer will give more than an overview of what he did with regard to the initial traffic study and why this connector is a significant improvement.

Mr. Holden agreed with Attorney McNeill and indicated that he felt traffic was one of the most significant aspects of this project, especially in how it could impact Woodbury Avenue.

Greg Mikolaities, of Appledore Engineering, spoke next. He indicated that the proposed roadway will be 24' wide and curbed on both sides. There are a couple of catch basins on each side and 100' of the roadway will be collected in those catch basins. The road breaks down 2% from the existing Home Depot to the proposed Home Depot. All of the collected drainage in the closed drainage system will go through the storm septic which was previously proposed. When they received their prior approval from the Conservation Commission they were indicating a 19,244 s.f. impervious reduction in the buffer zone. This new road adds 4,000 s.f. of impervious in the buffer zone, so even with the connector road and the other improvements on the other Home Depot site, there is still a 15,200 s.f. reduction of impervious surface in the buffer zone.

Mr. Mikolaities quickly reviewed the previous 14 stipulations which have all been addressed:

1. That a space be shown on the Site Plans for a 1,000 gallon external grease trap next to the retail pad;
Space has been shown on Sheet C-4.
2. That all work on the new water system shall be done in accordance with City standards;
This has been noted on the plans.
3. That the 12" service that enters the site shall remain cut off until all demolition work is done;
A note has been added to Sheet C-4.
4. After all of the existing fire and domestic service has been cut, capped and witnessed by the City, it will be reconnected and treated as a new water main going in;
A note has been added to Sheet C-4.
5. That all irrigation be done between the hours of 10:00 pm and 5:00 pm;
This is shown on Note 6 on Sheet C-15 and the time has been corrected to read 5:00 a.m.;

6. That the irrigation system shall include a rain sensor;
This is shown in Table C-15 which shows the materials.
7. That DPW will review whether the garden center can drain into the City sewer system and advise the applicant;
They worked with Dave Allen on this as it was a strong condition of the Conservation Commission. They are coming up with a plan that shows the Garden Center in more detail that shows 50% covered and 50% open. He spoke to David Desfosses about changing the catch basins around so that there are catch basins under the covered portion that would go inside and two catch basins from the open area that would go in the storm drainage. That plan will be forth coming.
Mr. Allen confirmed that was correct and what was important was what was stored in the areas of those catch basins.
Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that it should work out well for all parties concerned.
8. That the notes regarding the water service going to the water meter and then going to the pad are pointing to the wrong lines and should be switched so that the contractor is not confused;
That was revised on Sheet C-4.
9. That the note on the Landscape Plan be changed to require 6" loam, rather than 4";
This has been added to Sheet C-5, Note 6.
10. That a detail be provided on the signage being proposed at Brady Drive and Woodbury Avenue;
The architect will be providing that information to the Committee.
11. That turning movements be provided for the parking lot;
They added Sheets 13-A, 13-B and 12-C showing turning movements. As a result of their meeting this morning, they will be revising that a little.
12. That a Knox Box and a Master Box for the automatic notification of emergency forces shall be installed;
That will be on the architectural plan.
13. That a meeting be held between DPW, the Planning Department and the applicant prior to the next TAC meeting to review traffic issues;
That was done.
14. That the applicant agreed to discuss design related issues with the Technical Advisory Committee and the Planning Board;
That was done.

Mr. Holden felt it would also be helpful if they convened the hearing on the access drive so that they could have discussion on both.

3. The application of **Home Depot USA, Inc., Owner and Applicant**, for property located off **Durgin Lane** wherein Site Review approval is requested to create an access drive, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 239 as Lot 16 and lies within a General Business District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney Malcolm McNeill confirmed that Home Depot is the applicant for this component of the review and they are cooperating with the City regarding the connector road which is an off site improvement. Attorney McNeill displayed a colored plan and pointed out the roadway.

Art Scarneo, of Greenman-Pedersen, Inc., introduced himself as the applicant's traffic engineer. He indicated they had provided two reports. One was the original impact analysis study, which incorporated the previous use of the office component on the site (no build condition). They did that as the site could be reoccupied by right. They then superimposed the build condition on top of that. Both studies did not incorporate the new connector but they were being conservative in their approach. Without the connector road, traffic would come off the Spaulding Turnpike or Woodbury Avenue or from the Durgin Lane shopping center. They based their traffic study on those locations. With the connector road, they are now able to provide Gosling Road traffic with an access and they have the option of exiting through the cross connector. Mr. Scarneo stated there are tremendous benefits by providing this cross connection. Most planners like to see some means of cross connection because people often have multi-purpose trips. They are also recommending mitigation along Woodbury Avenue by recommending signal and phasing improvements at the Brady Drive and Woodbury Avenue intersections. They are recommending re-striping for turn lanes, signal modifications and re-timing. One light is presently not properly timed. It can be better coordinated.

Mr. Scarneo indicated that Ms. Finnigan had questions regarding their methodology and they have responded to her. Mr. Finnigan confirmed that she spoke to Jim Lynn and her comments were addressed to her satisfaction. She was very happy to see the cross connection, which will alleviate some of the issues on Woodbury Avenue. They are trying to get cross connections in to get people off the main thoroughfare. She felt this was a very good idea and it should relieve some issues.

Mr. Holden asked if it would improve the intersectional workings and the capacity of Woodbury Avenue? Mr. Scarneo stated it would provide for additional capacity and improve operations. Because of the high demand of left turns onto Woodbury and as the timing was currently 15 seconds, there is a very long queue resulting. They are planning on re-timing that signal and coordinating it better. At the Woodbury and Arthur Brady Drive signal, the lane markings are not consistent so they are planning on re-striping that and physically changing some lane designations to allow for additional capacity. It will mitigate the impacts of the project.

Mr. Desfosses asked how they would be coordinating that with the work that is being done by CLD? Ms. Finnigan thought those mitigations were already in the report. Mr. Scarneo confirmed that CLD staff was not doing any physical changes with regards to restriping. They just were doing counts and re-timing. Mr. Holden agreed that was correct and they were just doing re-timing. Mr. Desfosses asked which should be done first? It's sort of a chicken or the egg situation.

Mr. Holden assumed that once the improvements are in place, they could see how they function, just like they did with other applicants. If everything goes forward, Woodbury Avenue and Market Street will be reserved for true traffic and hopefully people stopping at the retail outlets will be off of Woodbury Avenue and on the secondary intersections.

Mr. Scarneo indicated that Appledore did a very good job designing the connector road and it was not convoluted. The 24' road is nicely designed and ends with a nice circulating road back into the new site. It is a true connector road rather than a curb cut to a curb cut.

The Chair asked 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:

Attorney McNeill wanted to make it perfectly clear that the connector has come about as a result of a recommendation of the City and that the project is improved as a result of it. They expect the approval of the Flatley site to be conditioned on the cross section being properly bonded and appropriate construction materials being used. He also wanted to have the record reflect that this Committee endorses the roadway and that it is in the best interest of the City.

Mr. Holden confirmed that was correct. As a result of ongoing discussions, the City has looked towards the possibility of having a connector road constructed. It is an issue that is addressed favorably in the Master Plan to seek these types of connections. The applicant is attempting to do it, notwithstanding the fact that there are environmental issues, and as with most things, there is a collision of competing interests. Mr. Holden felt that the applicant had gone a long ways in addressing those.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve the main Home Depot Site Review application, with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Cravens asked about the domestic water service size. Between the size of the lot and the building going in the back and the water service going in the back, it is about an 1800' run just to get to the back where the water meter will be. Then there is another 1500' run to get over to the restaurant. He asked if that was 2" all the way in? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that the 2" comes out of the back of the Home Depot building to the domestic and goes over to the pad. Mr. Cravens was concerned about the 1500' run and whether a 2" would be sufficient. Mr. Mikolaities felt it was a 6" coming in from the street. They can condition it to be sized by a mechanical engineer. Mr. Holden asked if they should stipulate a size now? Mr. Cravens did not want to tell them what size but wants to make sure it's adequate for their needs, for both the Home Depot and the future restaurant. His condition is that they have it sized by a mechanical engineer and submitted for review and approval by the Water Division. Attorney McNeill indicated that they were not certain that it would be a restaurant. Mr. Cravens stated that he would hate to see all of the paving done and then have a restaurant move in and find that it's not big enough and there is not enough water. Also, in the back where the domestic and fire service comes in, where the fire loop that goes around the back of the building, they would like to have a gate valve put in on either side. That way, if there is ever a break on one side, you still have fire service. And likewise for the fire service that comes off of the concrete pad.

Mr. Desfosses asked about a stormwater pump. Mr. Mikolaities gave the same presentation that he gave to the Conservation Commission. He displayed the Existing Conditions plan and basically it is two big watersheds. He showed the flow into a 36" culvert. There is a small section of pavement with no catch basins. It pitches down, and the sheet flow runs into the wetland. They are now taking the entire site and collecting it in catch basins with sumps to a downstream defender unit. The building itself is going into a separate drainage system with some infiltration. They are balancing flow treatment posts. The pad in the out parcel will roof drain clean water. There will be less than 1% of impact to the wetlands. Currently all drainage is untreated and they will now treat the entire parcel and they are also curbing the interconnecting roadway.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they have oil and water separators? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that they all have catch basins and deep sumps. Also they have agreed to the sweeping of the parking lot. Mr. Desfosses asked if that was part of their Stormwater Management plan and he also asked that an annual maintenance report be filed with DPW to make sure the site is being cleaned and maintained. He would also like to verify the number of spaces on the pad site are enough. Mr. Mikolaities referred to Sheet C-2, at the lower right hand corner, where it states that the required spaces are 658 and they are proposing 732. That number is a little more aggressive than the City but is based on Home Depot criteria. Mr. Desfosses indicated that he was talking specifically the pad site? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed it was now based on general retail. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that they have 109 spaces on that side of the access road, just for the pad. He noticed that there was no sidewalk or crosswalk to the other part of the site. He asked if there was a reason why that wasn't added? Mr. Mikolaities indicated they could add a sidewalk.

Mr. Desfosses also asked for a crosswalk lining up going into the Home Depot. Mr. Mikolaities suggested bringing it up on the island.

Mr. Desfosses asked what they had found out about the x marks in the garden center and whether they were the low spots? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that they were. There are two catch basins underneath the covered portion of the building, which should be sufficient.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the existing 12' driveway that is being dissected by the new access road and whether it would be staying? Mr. Mikolaities states that was an abandoned road and they were not proposing anything. Mr. Desfosses asked if that was a possible area for mitigation between the access road? That might be one thing to talk about. He was not making it a stipulation but it was just an idea.

Mr. Desfosses also made a stipulation that he review and approve the final modified plans prior to the Planning Board meeting so that he can see the new driveway queue up and the crosswalks and the other items which they discussed.

Mr. Allen was all set as long as they get to see the details on the storm drains.

Mr. Holden confirmed that all of the 14 conditions from the February 28th meeting have been addressed.

Captain Ferland asked about overhead street lighting on the access road and sidewalks? Mr. Mikolaities indicated that there was no proposal for lighting or sidewalks but they were open for discussion. Captain Fernald indicated it was a problem with no sidewalks on the Saturn Road. He would like to see a sidewalk as well as overhead lighting. Mr. Holden asked if they have some lighting from the Home Depot parking lot? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that they have street lighting in the parking lot. Attorney McNeill indicated that they had not planned to put in sidewalks as it would increase the impervious surface. The presumption was that they would do the same as what was done for the Saturn side. It is intending to be primarily a vehicular road. Home Depot's request would be to emulate what is on the Saturn side. Perhaps they could discuss enhancing the lighting on the existing Home Depot lot and the back of the Home Depot building to assist.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that she would like to see the proposal for off site traffic mitigation, to show what improvements will be. It should be part of the plan set. Mr. Mikolaities indicated they would get plans from GPI and include them.

Ms. Finnigan stated she would like to make sure she sees turning maneuvers. She also wanted to confirm that the construction of the roadway will be done by Home Depot and not by the city? Attorney McNeill confirmed that Home Depot would be constructing the roadway.

Ms. Finnigan asked about the traffic island. There was no place for them to stand and she asked if they were proposing a cut through or curbs? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed they would provide a detail on that.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that it was their goal to encourage use of this connector road so she asked about signage for people to know they can do that? Mr. Holden confirmed they would have to work on that. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold felt it was a valuable opportunity to put the cross road in as Woodbury Avenue is a nightmare as far as back up traffic, especially on the weekends, so he supports it.

Mr. Miller asked about the new access road and whether it would drain to the proposed parking and the stormwater system there so that 100% of the stormwater on the access road would drain to the new site and then through the proposed stormwater system. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that was correct with the exception of the first few 100' that are not included, which will go into the buffer zone. They are adding a couple of catch basins but the rest of the roadway goes into the downstream defender.

Mr. Miller felt that from the existing Home Depot, it tends to look pretty dirty with trash and litter. As the roadway is curvy in nature, is there the possibility of taking the street sweeping to the roadway and

doing that as well as the parking lot? Mr. Mikolaities felt that was a good idea. He also mentioned that the new road is all concrete curb at 2% coming down so it is a much cleaner construction.

Mr. Miller stated that he understands the need for road improvement on the traffic pattern. The Conservation Commission concerns are effects on the buffer and they worked hard on the last proposal. He sees both ways and understands the need but it is always hard to see the compromise of the buffer zone. Anything they can do to help would be appreciated. He didn't see any concrete along the old driveway. He thought that was slated to be put back into the buffer? He didn't see it on the existing plans but it would be great to pull it out and remove the old pavement in the buffer area. He would like to make that a Stipulation.

Mr. Holden indicated that normally he would join Captain Fernald in his request for sidewalks, but in this situation he will support not having them. This is primarily because this is a sensitive area and the benefit in getting the driveway connection is important but it is also important that this site still shows a net decrease in paved area so that there is a benefit over the existing conditions. He would like to look at lighting at both lot lines in order to get some illumination on the driveway. He made a condition that all lighting be Dark Sky Friendly in the parking lots. He would like to see a Landscaping plan to be approved by the Planning Department. They have already asked for a schedule for the Stormwater Maintenance Plan and also on the street sweeping. He would also like a stipulation that they have the road profile so that they have a good sense of what will be on the vacant lot. They have some cross easements that shall be approved for content and form by the Legal Department. The issue of lot consolidation shall be addressed by the applicant to the City's determination. He asked if there were any DES approvals required? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed just site specific.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the only other approval would be the Conditional Use on the adjacent lot. Also, the bonding should be designed so that the city has secured the right to access as appropriate for either lot.

Ms. Tillman indicated that on Sheet C-1 & 2 and the overall site plan, Durgin Lane is labeled in the parking lot and it actually ends before that at the cul de sac.

Mr. Cravens noted that on C-5, Note 7 states 6" of loam and seed but some of the detail sheets in the back still say 4" so those should be cleaned up.

The motion to approve Site Review passed unanimously.

- 1) That the domestic water service shall be sized by the applicant's mechanical engineer and submitted for review and approval by the City Water Division;
- 2) That the fire loop that goes around the back of the building, as well as the fire service that goes to the concrete pad, shall have a gate valve on either side;
- 3) That the Stormwater Management Plan shall include the submission of a yearly cleaning report of all catch basins to DPW to assure that the site is being maintained;
- 4) That sidewalks and crosswalks shall be added to the Site Plans, and said Site Plans shall be reviewed by David Desfosses prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 5) That the existing driveway (former) that is dissected by the new access road, shall be removed;
- 6) That a proposal for off-site traffic mitigation measures shall be added to the Site Plans and reviewed and approved by Deborah Finnigan, Traffic Engineer, prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 7) That a detail shall be added to the Site Plans for the island at Arthur Brady Drive, showing curbing and cut throughs;
- 8) That truck turning maneuvers shall be provided to Deborah Finnigan, Traffic Engineer, prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 9) That the applicant shall include the connector drive in their street sweeping schedule;

- 10) That the concrete and pavement from the old driveway located in the wetland buffer area shall be removed from the site;
- 11) That all lighting shall be Dark Sky Friendly;
- 12) That a landscape Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department;
- 13) That a street sweeping schedule shall be provided for approval by the Planning Department;
- 14) That the road profile for the vacant lot shall be provided;
- 15) That cross easements shall be reviewed and approved for content and form by the City Attorney’s Office;
- 16) That the issue of lot consolidation shall be addressed by the applicant, per the City’s determination;
- 17) That the bonding on this project be designed so that the City has secured the right for access to funds as appropriate for either lot;
- 18) That Durgin Lane is labeled incorrectly on the Site Plans and should be revised;
- 19) That the landscape details shall be revised to specify 6” of loam and seed in all locations.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve the (lot with the) access drive. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden stated that the approvals on the other lot should be coordinated with this lot and addressed simultaneously.

Mr. Desfosses indicated he would like to see a lighting plan showing where the lights will be. He wants sufficient light where the new road comes in. Mr. Mikolaities indicated he will show a photometric plan on the poles to show where the light goes.

Mr. Holden asked, in the long run, how would the driveway be maintained? Attorney McNeill stated there would be an agreement between the Flatley Company and Home Depot.

The motion to approve with stipulations passed unanimously.

- 1) That the conditions and stipulations from the Site Review approval for 500 Spaulding Turnpike for the new Home Depot building be reviewed and addressed simultaneously with this approval;
- 2) That a Photometrix Plan shall be provided to David Desfosses for this review and approval, showing in particular sufficient light at each end of the access drive;

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

2. The application of **Harbour Place Group, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **One Harbour Place** wherein Site Review approval is requested to convert the 5th floor of the existing building from business offices to 9 residential units, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105, as Lot 2 and lies within a Central Business A, Historic A and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernard Pelech appeared for the applicant. Attorney Pelech indicated that although advertised as such, there are no related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage or associated site

improvements. There are no changes to the building footprint but just a change in use. He thinks this project is probably exempt from Site Review but he agreed mutually with the Planning Department to come before Site Review. They do not anticipate any changes to the utilities or to the building or the site. They are simply changing the use of the building on the 5th floor of the building.

Dan Batting, site architect and Dan Plummer and Diane Bell from Harborplace LLC. The plan which was submitted by Attorney Pelech was done several years ago. This matter has been before the HDC and was granted a conditional approval subject to determination on type of filler for the balcony.

Mr. Holden asked if there would be any change to the workings or operation of the wharf area. Attorney Pelech was not aware of any changes. Mr. Holden asked if the wharf area was totally unchanged by any action by Site Review? Attorney Pelech indicated that it was unchanged.

Mr. Holden asked if the unmet parking need is met through the parking garage. He was assuming that with this change there would actually be less of a demand? Attorney Pelech confirmed that there would be much less of a demand. The 5th floor is roughly 20,000 s.f. of office space which has the requirement of approximately 80 parking spaces. This change to 9 residential units will reduce the parking requirement to 14 parking spaces.

Mr. Desfosses asked who owns the wharf? Attorney Pelech stated that Harborplace LLC is the owner.

Mr. Cravens asked what type of water pressure do they have and would the water flow be sufficient to supply homes? Attorney Pelech responded that they have good water pressure now on the 5th floor. There is a 2" domestic line and a 6" fire line that comes into the building.

Mr. Cravens realized that there is no heavy demand for the current offices, however, domestic use is different. He was concerned about whether it will be sufficient for nine families to use the water all at the same time in the mornings or evenings?

Dan Batting, architect, indicated they have not looked at the specific mechanical systems.

Mr. Cravens indicated that he doesn't want to receive phone calls from people after they purchase a unit, complaining about their water pressure.

Mr. Desfosses asked if this was a Riverwalk area? Mr. Holden thought it might be but this was not the time to discuss that.

Mr. Cravens indicated he would like to have a stipulation that a mechanical engineer look at the water flow to make sure they have a sufficient supply of pressure for nine residential units. Attorney Pelech indicated they could stipulate that if the pressure needs to be boosted, a pump will be installed.

The Chair asked 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. Desfosses moved to approve with stipulations. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion. Mr. Cravens requested a stipulation that the mechanical engineer look at the water demand on the 5th floor to make sure it was sufficient and if not, that they install the necessary booster pump.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold believed the floor was sprinkled and he was assuming that the demand for residential was less than for an office. He just reiterated that the renovation would require that sprinklers provide adequate water flow for the residential areas.

Mr. Holden asked if there were any coastal issues? Attorney Pelech stated there were not any as it was an existing building.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant’s mechanical engineer shall review the water demand and, if not sufficient, they shall install a booster pump, and this shall be reviewed and approved by the City Water Division;
- 2) That it be determined that the sprinklers provide adequate water flow for the residential area and this shall be reviewed and approved by Deputy Fire Chief Griswold;
- 3) That it be determined whether there are any Shoreline Coastal issues that need to be addressed;

.....

3. The application of **Ned and Bill Properties, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **621--627 Islington Street** wherein Site Review approval is requested to renovate the existing structure into six units, to be used as office, studio and four residential units, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 164 as Lot 6 and lies within a Business District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagon, of Ambit Engineering, appeared along with Bill Savoy, one of the principals of the project. Mr.Chagon stated that this project consists of the renovation of a building on Islington Street and proposes minor improvements to the site. There are no changes proposed to the building footprint. The bulkhead will be eliminated. They will be putting in a new water service, there will be some staging to reside the building, they will re-do the sidewalk to City standard concrete along the entire front. They will re-strip the driveway area, take out some pavement on the west side, adjacent to the building, and then add some to the back. There will be 10 parking spaces on the north side and 5 spaces including the loading zone adjacent to the building on the west side. Also included are improvements for access by persons with disabilities to the ramp. There will be a back enclosure for the dumpster and they will be doing landscaping and adding some shrubs to spruce up the site. The bulk of the work is interior remodeling. They did a trip generation analysis and compared the proposed use of the site office retail/apartments to the proposed use which is 2,700 s.f. of office studio and 4 apartments. The reuse of the site will result in a decrease in vehicle trips on the property. They also prepared a turning movement plan.

Captain Fernald asked if the apartments would be upstairs? Mr. Chagon indicated they were both downstairs and upstairs. Two apartments are on the left side of the front and two are in the back.

Ms. Finnigan stated that she met with the owner and discussed parking. They talked about improvements and came up with some good compromises with this plan. The existing conditions are improved by this plan and she endorses it.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold noted that the plan shows a sprinkler system and knox box are both being installed. They also need automatic notification of emergency forces. They can evaluate the most appropriate way to do that, possibly through a master box.

Mr. Miller asked about the drainage from the pavement. He asked if it all flows from the front to the back of the property? Mr. Chagon indicated that it would not necessarily flow from front to back, but

rather it will flow east to west. There will be a slight reduction in impervious area. They are not proposing to do much with the drainage.

The Chair asked 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. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses requested that all lighting shall be dark sky friendly and they should show City standard concrete detail on the plan. As the stairs are in the right-of-way, they will require City Council license. As those stairs have been hit several times, DPW would like to review the stair material.

Mr. Chagnon confirmed that the steps are going to be replaced and they will make them more durable. The lighting that they are showing are dark sky friendly fixtures. They are currently waiting for a response from the lighting design on whether there will be any pole lighting in the rear.

Mr. Desfosses asked about any roadway signs in the sidewalk. He could see one on the plans. Mr. Chagnon stated there was a "No Parking" sign. Mr. Desfosses asked that a note be added so that the sign gets sleeved.

Mr. Holden asked if they are taking the steps up and it is going to be a referral to the Planning Board for a report back for a recommendation on why they should allow the encroachment, at which time DPW will be asked for their comments. Mr. Holden asked if they would recommend that these encroachments continue or was it possible to change the door?

Mr. Chagnon stated that the applicant has hired Destefano and Assoc who looked at recessing the door but it wouldn't work.

Mr. Holden asked what if TAC indicated no encroachments were allowed. At the Planning Board they could make their own recommendation on that which would take the place of the referral which would keep this moving. Otherwise it's going to take awhile. Mr. Chagnon understood that this would help them as it would get back to them sooner rather than later. Mr. Holden also asked why they would even want to recommend it? Mr. Desfosses stated that they don't want to but there are a lot of things going on along Islington Street right now and steps on the sidewalk aren't good but he wasn't sure what the alternative was. Mr. Holden indicated that they could recommend that the stairs not be in the right-of-way and they are a recommending Committee so the Planning Board can make the final decision when the architect is present to speak to it.

Mr. Desfosses changed his stipulation that the stairs are not recommended to be in right of way but if the Planning Board sees fit to have them, then the material needs to be reviewed and approved by DPW and a City Council license will be required. Mr. Holden suggested adding that the Planning Board act on this at their earliest time. Mr. Holden indicated that should save some time in the long run.

Mr. Chagnon felt that the Planning Board will lead on TAC recommendation. He felt that they might say that this committee is not in favor of steps in the sidewalks but ...

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the Planning Board receives copies of the minutes so they will understand that there was discussion and that the stairs are already existing. Mr. Chagnon understood that as they were existing then TAC was not going to set a precedent. The Planning Board would allow them to make a representation on why they should be allowed. Mr. Desfosses agreed with that. Mr. Holden added that the only way Islington Street gets improved is by these steps.

Mr. Cravens asked where the new water fire protection was going in? Mr. Chagnon indicated it would be in the basement crawl space. Mr. Cravens noticed that the bulkhead has been blocked off so where was the access? Mr. Chagnon indicated the access was from the inside of the building.

Mr. Cravens indicated that he would like to see how that was installed for meter reader access.

Bill Savoy pointed out the stair and staircase area on the plans and indicated it was a full basement, depending on your height.

Mr. Cravens pointed out that the fire and domestic may not look exactly like the way they have it on the plans. The City may bring them in separate from two shut offs. Mr. Allen was not sure about that but they will get an answer to that before the Planning Board meeting.

Captain Fernald would like to see improvements on the sidewalk and have the stairs removed or moved back.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That all lighting shall be Dark Sky Friendly and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 2) That the City standard concrete sidewalk shall be revised on the Site Plans;
- 3) That the applicant shall notify DPW of the removal of the "No Parking" sign so that it can be sleeved;
- 4) That the front stairs are not recommended to be in the City right-of-way, however, should the Planning Board grant approval for them then the building materials for the stairs shall be reviewed and approved by DPW, and a City Council license shall be applied for. Also, TAC recommends that the Planning Board act on this issue as early as possible;
- 5) That the fire and domestic water service connection shall be reviewed by the City Water Division prior to the Planning Board meeting.

.....

II. 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.