

MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

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

OCTOBER 3, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician; Debbie Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief; and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief

ALSO PRESENT: n/a

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Moray, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **235 Commerce Way**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 25,666 ± s.f. 3-story office building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 216 as Lot 1-8B and lies within the Office Research/ Mariner's Village district. (This application was tabled at the September 5, 2006 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

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

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton of AMES MSC introduced himself as the site engineer for the project. He explained that this project started in July when comments were made by the Committee. This is the last site on Commerce Way, across from the Homewood Suites Hotel. They did a Lot Line Relocation on the lot. The proposal is for a 3-story 77,000 office building, with associated site issues.

Mr. Moulton reviewed the comments from the previous TAC meeting.

- 1) That the landscaping area between the lots be shown in more detail and that a fence detail for this area be provided in the detail sheet;
- After talking with the owner, they decided to widen the area between the parking lots and construct a retaining wall to separate them. As part of the proposal, they will be presenting again later on in the meeting regarding the parking revision on the adjacent lot. The 10' wide landscaped area and guardrail will be sufficient protection between the lots.

- 2) That a Coast Bus Shelter detail be added, unless Coast advises the applicant that the bus shelter is no longer needed, and if so, this should be confirmed in writing with the City;
 - They confirmed with Coast that it would be nice to have but is not required as the road does not receive much traffic. At this time they would request to eliminate the shelter from the plan. Ms. Finnigan indicated that she called Coast and left a message but didn't hear back so she will follow up on that. Mr. Holden didn't believe there was a shelter in the entire area. He suggested keeping the public hearing open and address the issue later.
- 3) That the vegetative swale in the wetland buffer be reviewed for alternative treatments and a report shall be provided at the next TAC meeting;
 - At a previous meeting it was suggested that they look at a gravel wetland. They took a look and found they could size an appropriate wetland and they placed it down the buffer area of the lot. It is designed in accordance with the UNH criteria. This will be an enhancement to the stormwater treatment.
- 4) That a note be added to the Site Plans that all irrigated areas shall have 6" of loam;
 - 6" of loam was noted on Sheet 8 of the Site Plan set.
- 5) That Dennis Moulton will work with Tom Cravens to review the possibilities of using the Rainstorm system for reuse with the irrigation system;
 - Since their previous presentation, Mr. Moulton indicated that their client has asked him to replace the Rainstorm system with an underground storage system, similar to that used at the Atlantic Heights subdivision. Therefore, that item is no longer applicable to this application.
- 6) That the sidewalk detail be approved as to content and form by DPW and that will be refined further by the Agreement with the City;
 - This issue goes back to the sidewalks on Commerce Way and Mr. Moulton was not familiar with what had transpired and Mr. Kane was not present to address this matter. Mr. Holden stated that he didn't know any more than Mr. Moulton did.
- 7) That a determination be made as to whether the wetlands are jurisdictional;
 - Mr. Moulton believed that they agreed that they were jurisdictional and they do not need a Conditional Use. Mr. Britz was in agreement with Mr. Moulton. This stipulation can be eliminated.
- 8) That the applicant meet with the Legal Department and the Planning Department to complete a proposal for constructing the sidewalks along the length of Commerce Way in two phases, detailing how contributions or funds shall be set aside for this process;

- Mr. Moulton had no new information on this but hoped that his client will continue negotiations with the City.
- 9) That the meeting with the City also include any outstanding issues that may be brought to the City's attention, such as street ownership and the undergrounding of utilities;
- Mr. Moulton had no new information on this but hoped that his client will continue negotiations with the City.
- 10) That a street sweeping schedule be added to the Stormwater Management Plan;
- Mr. Moulton indicated that a note was added to Sheet 4, stating it will be performed twice a year.
- 11) That a report be presented to DPW that outlines the existing or proposed maintenance schedule of the Commerce Way stormwater system;
- Mr. Moulton believed this falls under the purview of the City's Agreement on Commerce way.
- 12) That the proposed alignment of the driveways of this site and the hotel site cross the street shall be further discussed to address future concerns and resolution;
- They were requested to verify the exact location of the hotel and it is exactly where they expected it to be. The driveways are not aligned now and are 20' off.
- 13) That the installation of the Rainstorm 3 system be supervised by a representative of Invisible Structures, Inc. (ISI) and a summary report of its installation be provided to DPW;
- They are no longer using this system so this stipulation can be eliminated.
- 14) That the City will work with the applicant on the issue of drainage from snow melting on the site;
- The entire drainage system has been designed to cover a 100 year storm so this is sufficient to cover run off for that type of event.
- 15) That the applicant shall prepare an updated drainage report;
- This report was included in their packets for their review.
- 16) That an amendment to a previously approved Site Plan shall be prepared as it relates to the 83 parking spaces which are being eliminated from this lot, but were being used by the adjacent lot;
- This is addressed in a separate Amended Site Review application later on the Agenda for 215 Commerce Way.

17) That the Grading Plan and the site features shall be separated for clarity;

- Mr. Moulton stated that they added another sheet to the Plan Set.

18) That a stop bar and a stop sign be added to the site for egress;

- This was done.

19) That the Stop Sign detail be revised to show a minimum of 7' from the bottom of the stop sign to the ground;

- Mr. Moulton indicated this was done.

20) That the islands be increased in size to allow for increased landscaping;

- They looked at their parking configuration to allow for landscape strips and when loading areas are diverted to parking, the landscape strip will extend all the way up. They also eliminated sidewalks along the building.

21) That a Photometrix Plan be prepared;

- A Photometrix Plan was included in the Site Plan set.

22) That any damage to the roadway as a result of construction of this project shall be repaired to City specifications.

- Mr. Moulton confirmed this was agreed to as part of the project.

Mr. Holden had 7 additional stipulations from an earlier letter.

That water conservation details be added to the plans, per the requirement of Tom Cravens, also to include an irrigation system.

- Mr. Moulton indicated there were notes that addressed that on Sheet C-5.

That a hydrant be installed in accordance with City Water Division regulations.

- Mr. Cravens indicated that was all set however he would like to see a good as built drawing on that as they don't want anyone to mistake where the hydrant is being relocated.

They were looking to have the size and the type of the water main identified on the Site Plan.

- Mr. Cravens confirmed that had been done.

That a knox box and master fire alarm box be installed.

- Those were added to the Site Plans.

That the height of the light poles be reduced.

- Mr. Moulton confirmed they are down to 16' now.

The finished grade shall be shown on the Site Plans.

- That was done.

Mr. Holden indicated that the last time, almost two years ago, there was not a motion to approve but it was tabled subject to all of the above items.

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. Allen asked for a review of the drainage system. He appreciates the gravel wetland as it is supposed to be a very good system and it will be interesting to see if we get the same results that they do out of that. Regarding the gravel subsurface retention areas, he asked for a review. He noticed catch basins in the middle of one of them and he asked for a detail. They are relying on the pipe and there is no positive connecting pipe that runs in between the gravel sub areas. He would expect some sort of overflow situation that would have allowed positive connection into the drainage system in the event that the gravel system gets blinded.

Mr. Moulton indicated that the site is quite ledgy. They anticipate having to blast out the retention areas in some fashion. They are reusing the ledge for stormwater storage. They would over blast the area by 1' to provide a sump in each storage area for accumulation of sediments and then the catch basins would be piped into the gravel stone filled retention area. The retention areas are connected by 4" pipes which should allow adequate retention. The outlet for the whole system goes through an outlet control structure which allows water to pull out. For the lower storm, 1-2 year event, most of the flow occurs in the lower outlet, thus allowing a slow rate which enhances the treatment. A large storm allows water to by-pass that outlet and go into the gravel wetland. It will overwhelm the wetland in terms of treatment but there is an overflow into the wetland system for that purpose. As to concerns on the blockages, they can work with the City on the details. One catch basin is inside the rock areas and is a leaching catch basin. There is not a detail on that. Mr. Allen asked what goes over the face of the 24" connection pipes? Mr. Moulton indicated they can put a screen over them. Mr. Allen added they don't want to have a failsafe and they should have a positive connection all the way through the structure. Mr. Desfosses agreed and was also concerned this system could pick up ground water and drain into the ground. There were no test pit logs. Mr. Moulton confirmed that they cannot perform them because of the ledge. Mr. Desfosses' greatest concern was the lack of ability to clean this in case sediment accumulates. Atlantic Heights is a much smaller scale and is in an area with an existing grade. The other thing is if they don't get enough rain, is there enough water to support a wetland? He felt it was very important to know what they were designing on. He was not comfortable with it at all. Mr. Moulton stated that the wetland across from the site shows poorly drained soils. The trial wetland

design is a pool of water up to the wetland soil. The outlet is at the top of the wetland soil. It is not designed to drain. The storm events fill it up. Mr. Desfosses felt that now is the time to look at it and determine what is going on. Mr. Moulton felt they are asking him to perform an enormous amount of testing. Mr. Allen stated that the UNH system is in a clay bowl. He felt that these points are well made and some test pits are necessary.

Mr. Britz added that Mr. Desfosses' concern is that the wetland will die and his concern is that the wetland will be overwhelmed. How will they maintain it to keep the wetland in there. Mr. Moulton indicated they will use siltation. The outlets will reduce some of the sediment. The gravel storage system itself has a sump to help with the sediment. Long term maintenance needs to be addressed in any system. There are notes that the gravel be inspected.

Mr. Holden felt that rarely do they have two systems proposed to handle the run off on a site. Why did they switch to a subsurface system? Mr. Moulton indicated that Mr. Kane became familiar with the substorage system and he felt it was a better system and requested the change. Mr. Moulton didn't see why it wouldn't work. Mr. Allen asked if there is there an example of this system that has been in effect for awhile? Mr. Moulton stated that the first one he proposed was in Atlantic Heights. Mr. Holden stated they worked with the applicant at great length on the other system and a fair amount of information was presented to convince TAC on the system. The applicant went a long ways in convincing them that it was an appropriate system and the Committee has basically approved it. He does not see the same level of comfort with this system. Mr. Moulton stated there is no manufacturer on a stone storage system. He doesn't believe this new system is all that innovative and has been used in similar installations.

Mr. Desfosses would like to see data from the site before designing something. They are using educated guesses. He feels they need to connect the pipes within the system and he would like to know what's in the ground.

Mr. Holden asked, in worse case scenario, if the system fails, what happens? Mr. Moulton indicated they would excavate and replace the system. Mr. Holden asked what the impacts were of a failed system? Mr. Moulton stated greater sedimentation downstream. Mr. Allen added they would also have a flooded parking lot. Mr. Britz felt the ground water issue would be continuous.

Mr. Desfosses felt that they have plenty of time as they still don't have an answer on the sidewalk.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee members to list out their concerns.

Mr. Desfosses felt testing should be done on all proposed leaching underground storm areas. Also, all of the underground piping systems should be connected. Mr. Allen appreciated the concept and idea of this system but felt they had unanswered questions and required more details on a clean out system for the piping and more information on how the pipe is going to terminate in the stone bed.

Mr. Holden reviewed the stipulations from the July 10, 2006 letter of decision and determined that the following stipulations were still outstanding: #2, #6, #8, #9, #12, but Traffic & Safety will provide a report back on the proposed driveway alignment, #14, #15, #18, #19, #20, and #22.

Mr. Cravens referred to the back of the building where the water services and electric and gas were located. Their planting plan shows a tree right in that area and they should eliminate the tree and plant something else.

Mr. Desfosses indicated there is curbing on Portsmouth Boulevard and he did not see a curbing plan. He would need a detail on that. They also show a 4" reveal on that curb and they need to show the curb ending directly across the street from where it ends on the first site. It should be a condition that they repair any portion of Portsmouth Boulevard that is destroyed and it should be noted on the plan. They are not showing a silt fence along the connector road between the two sites. The stop bar going on to Commerce Way is crooked. The stop sign detail on the back page is 12' from the road and it should be no further than 6'. The Photometrics Plan shows the lights between the buildings shining on both lots which means they are assuming the lots will stay in common ownership forever and he did not feel that was appropriate. The Photometrix Plan should show as close to 0 as possible on the lot line. Mr. Holden requested that they set up the lights so they are aiming at their own property. Mr. Desfosses suggested spacing the lights out twice as far on each lot which would achieve the same result.

Mr. Britz asked about the gravel wetland/level spreader. He asked if it was at the end of the lot? Mr. Moulton stated it continue further which was not shown on the plan. Mr. Britz asked what would happen in that section? Mr. Moulton stated it was an undeveloped lot. Mr. Holden confirmed it was the open space for this lot. Mr. Moulton stated that it drains to Portsmouth Boulevard to a low area, crosses the track and eventually to the river. It will be addressed in future development. Mr. Britz asked because at the edge of the lot there is a small area of phragmites coming in so he can see it getting degraded. He mentioned that he appreciates the gravel wetland and asked if it was from the UNH design? Mr. Holden felt clarifying on the Site Plan how the open space was going to be handled would be helpful. It's the open space that is allowing them to do what they are doing on the rest of the lot, which is fairly intensive. Mr. Moulton reminded the Committee that they had originally asked that he get as much stormwater to flow in that direction as possible to alleviate drainage problems in the Demoulas lot so they designed the site to flow in that direction and increasing it in the rear. Now he's not sure what direction he should go in. Mr. Britz indicated that his goal was to keep it as a natural wetland area and not have it be degraded by invasive plants. It is a unique lot as the open space is a long narrow section at the end of the site. Mr. Holden felt that if the drainage system fails, this is where the impact will be. So, they need the proposed conditions.

The motion to **table** to the next regular meeting on October 31st passed unanimously, with the following recommendations:

Outstanding Stipulations from the July 5, 2006 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1) That the landscaping area between the lots be shown in more detail and that a fence detail for this area be provided in the detail sheet;

- 2) That the sidewalk detail be approved as to content and form by DPW and that will be refined further by the Agreement with the City;
- 3) That the applicant meet with the Legal Department and the Planning Department to complete a proposal for constructing the sidewalks along the length of Commerce Way in two phases, detailing how contributions or funds shall be set aside for this process;
- 4) That the meeting with the City also include any outstanding issues that may be brought to the City's attention, such as street ownership and the undergrounding of utilities;
- 5) That the proposed alignment of the driveways of this site and the hotel site across the street shall be reviewed by the Traffic & Safety Committee and a report shall be provided to the Committee;
- 6) That the City will work with the applicant on the issue of drainage from snow melting on the site;
- 7) That the applicant shall prepare an updated drainage report;
- 8) That a stop bar and a stop sign be added to the site for egress;
- 9) That the Stop Sign detail be revised to show a minimum of 7' from the bottom of the stop sign to the ground;
- 10) That the islands be increased in size to allow for increased landscaping;
- 11) That any damage to the roadway as a result of construction of this project shall be repaired to City specifications.

Additional stipulations from the October 3, 2006 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 12) That testing should be done on all proposed underground detention areas;
- 13) That all underground stormwater piping systems should be connected in the detention areas;
- 14) That the trees in the back of the building near the water and utility services should be eliminated and replaced with other landscaping;
- 15) That there should be a street curbing detail, and the curbing should end directly across the street from where it ended on the hotel site;
- 16) That any portion of Portsmouth Boulevard that is destroyed or damaged during construction shall be repaired by the contractor and that should be so noted on the Site Plans by whatever method is chosen by DPW;
- 17) That the stop bar on Commerce Way needs to be straightened on the Site Plan;
- 18) That the stop sign detail should be amended to show the sign no further than 6' from the road;
- 19) That the lights shall be adjusted so as not to shine on adjacent lots; and
- 20) That the Site Plan should include the entire lot, showing specifically how the open space will be handled.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, Owner**, for property located at **400 Little Harbor Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to widen an access driveway and provide public parking, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 203 as Lot 8 and lies within a Rural Residential district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Paul Doshier, Vice President of the Society for the Protection of NH Forests, addressed the Committee. He indicated that The Creek Farm property is off of Little Harbor Road, next to land held in a conservation easement with the State of NH. The Creek Farm Cottage is currently leased to the Shoals Marine Lab who will be approaching the City for some changes and additions to the building to help with their needs. The other building is a carriage house from 1973, which is over an empty garage. They bought this land from the former owners because they wanted it open to the public for outdoor recreation. Therefore, they are now working on the access road and a small parking area so that the public can go across the land. They are trying to retain the very rural character of this property.

Eric Weinrieb, of Altus Engineering, handed out a revised plan. He pointed out the gravel parking area that exists and explained they are proposing a 24' wide gravel driveway and parking area to allow 2-way access and head-in parking. The handicapped accessible space and the slight area of the entrance to the roadway are the only areas that would not be gravel. From a grading perspective, he designed the site to follow the existing contours. They will put in permanent stone rip rap filters to minimize the run off through the site. The high point of the roadway system will be in the clearing area, where the water will sheet flow in both directions. The intent is not to concentrate the flow and to use Best Management Practices by spreading the run off out across the existing areas. They are not proposing to cut any trees other than the minimum to widen the area.

Moving to the access area, they met with City staff on site and they are proposing to have pull-out areas onto Little Harbor Road so that people can come into the site through the stone post. They are proposing one pull out area there and another one further down, both with adequate site distance. The hand out was an addendum as a result of Pre-TAC comments. They are proposing a minimum 20' of flat area to allow two fire trucks to pass.

Mr. Weinrieb indicated there will be some minor construction in the wetlands protection district during construction. There will be minor grading around the pull out areas. They are trying to minimize the impact to the site, keeping a 4' wide clear zone on both sides. They will cut the vegetation but not specimen trees. They will increase the canopy to a 14' minimum, but a 16' preferred.

Mr. Allen asked how long the pull out areas are? Mr. Weinrieb indicated that they are 70', 50' and 70'.

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:

Ms. Finnigan indicated that she spoke to Steve Parkinson, Director of Public Works, and he had the following comments. The driveway into the parking lot needs to go to the top of the hill and should be done in pavement. He was also concerned about putting in another riprap stone filter strip on the southerly side. Ms. Finnigan showed Mr. Weinrieb on her copy of the plan where she was referring to. Mr. Weinrieb indicated that was a temporary road. Ms. Finnigan indicated that she would like a permanent one.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that she was abstaining from voting but requested that the comments from DPW be included as stipulations.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that Mr. Parkinson's last comment was on the pull outs. He did not want them to be 90 degrees but rather wants them flared out.

Mr. Holden asked who would be responsible for plowing this access driveway? Mr. Doscher confirmed it would be the Forest Society. They would contract with a plower. Mr. Holden asked if any trash that was generated would be brought to Little Harbor Road? Mr. Doscher stated that their policy is that their facilities are carry in/carry out and people are responsible for their own trash. Mr. Holden requested that a note be added to the Site Plan that the maintenance and plowing of the road is not a public responsibility.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stated that the 20' pullouts meet the Fire Department requirement. They feel that is appropriate as they will be able to control access on the road during an emergency. 20' is consistent with the uniform fire code.

Mr. Holden added a condition that a report be submitted from the Director of Public Works in regards to the accuracy of this plan for the Planning Board at the October 19th meeting.

The motion to recommend **approval** passed unanimously, with the following **stipulations**, with Ms. Finnigan abstaining from the vote.

- 1) That the driveway into the parking lot shall go to the top of the hill and should be paved;
- 2) That another riprap stone filter strip be added on the southerly side;
- 3) That the temporary road shall be a permanent road;
- 4) That the pull outs shall be flared out rather than 90 degrees;
- 5) That a report from the Director of Public Works be submitted for the Planning Board meeting on October 19, 2006;
- 6) That a note be added to the Site Plan indicating that the maintenance and plowing of the road is not a public responsibility;

.....

B. The application of **Portsmouth Hospital Office Building Association, Owner**, for property located at **330 Borthwick Avenue (Jackson Gray Medical Office Building)**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to expand an existing asphalt parking lot by 50 parking spaces into a vacant wooded area, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 240 as Lot 2-2 and lies within an Office Research district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Stephen Towne, of Oak Point Associates, addressed the Committee on behalf of Jackson Gray Condo Association. He stated this was a very small project but one that is well needed. It consists of 50 parking spaces being added to the rear of the property and the area is currently wooded. Earlier this year the applicant and the Portsmouth Hospital did a Lot Line Adjustment to acquire some additional land to help with the parking expansion. There is a small wetland in the corner of the parking lot and they propose to fill it. They met with Peter Britz and in an attempt to utilize the property and to maximize the parking, they will continue the existing parking pattern. They applied to the NH Wetlands Board and received a letter of completeness so that process is underway. They are also scheduled before the Conservation Commission on October 11th to review the State permit application. They are not proposing any additional handicapped parking as they will be above the minimum. They will add one light pole to match the existing poles in the parking lot. There will be a minor addition to the drainage. They will be adding one catch basin, across the parking lot adjacent to the existing curve. They will put the drainage into the existing pipe. They calculated a 10 year flow as very minimal so they didn't do any stormwater management. The drainage goes out to a long swale out front that will control run off to the wetland. That would be a very minor increase. Mr. Towne indicated that Tom Magruder was also present, representing Evergreen Management.

Ms. Finnigan asked if they currently have stop lines and stop bars at the driveways? Mr. Towne confirmed that they do. Ms. Finnigan asked about landscaping on the islands? Mr. Towne confirmed they are proposing landscaping. Ms. Finnigan stated that the plan says they are adding two islands and two lights. Mr. Towne confirmed that was correct. Mr. Britz asked what the 10' wide buffer was for? Mr. Towne indicated that was part of the agreement regarding the Lot Line Relocation. The Islington Woods Group requested the buffer to assist with an overpass that will eventually go in.

Mr. Allen asked if there is an easement to the City for the sewer line that runs through the parking lot? Mr. Towne indicated that they met with Altus Engineering and their project is going to start at the next manhole. They are making access into that manhole. Mr. Allen felt there should be a permanent easement for that sewer line. Mr. Towne confirmed there was an easement. Mr. Allen also stated, based on recent work that is going on in the vicinity, there is a question to the serviceability of the sewer line that actually runs through this corner of the parking lot and they may be TV'ing that. He would like to keep a condition on the status of that line. He wants to see the video.

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 existing sewer easements be shown on the Site Plan. There should be snorkel hoods on all existing and proposed catch basins. Mr. Desfosses requested that the sidewalk on Borthwick Avenue be extended along the frontage of the property, across the street from their site. He explained that the City is trying to get sidewalks on Borthwick Avenue. Mr. Holden asked if it would be worthwhile to take a look at which side is better? Mr. Desfosses indicated that the sidewalk already exists on the other side. Mr. Holden suggested that the applicant work with Mr. Desfosses and Ms.

Finnigan to make a determination on which side the sidewalk should be on. Mr. Holden confirmed that the sidewalk would be constructed at the expense of the applicant. He further explained that they can request a waiver from the Planning Board but the Site Review Committee will recommend that sidewalks be installed.

Mr. Desfosses asked what type of lighting exists on the site? Mr. Towne believed it was a shoebox style. Ms. Finnigan asked if the lighting was going to be Dark Sky Friendly? Mr. Towne indicated he will attempt to make it Dark Sky Friendly. Mr. Desfosses confirmed it was a requirement of the City. He also asked that they provide the model # for the lights to approve. This would be just on new ones. Mr. Holden also stated that they are obligated to keep light away from their lot lines.

Mr. Allen requested that Public Works meet with the applicant pending review of a condition assessment which they are doing on that section of the sewer line to work on coordinating work in the area if replacement is needed. Mr. Holden asked if they needed a maintenance schedule on the catch basins? Mr. Cravens indicated he would like to see that as this is in a well head protection area and that should be marked on all site plans. Also, all work should follow the Water Protection Guidelines as they are very close to one of the city's wells. They would also request that they put in two monitoring wells, to be installed at each end of the lot. The City will work with the applicant to pick the exact sites. It would not be in the paved area but would be in a grassed area with one in the south end beyond the parking and one by the north entrance, off the road. The applicant will have to get together with the Water Department on installation. They are an EPA type monitoring well with a lock.

Mr. Britz referred to the wetland fill of 630 s.f. and asked if that was a landscaped area? He requested that they install a native conservation seed mix rather than Kentucky blue grass and that they also plant shrubs to help preserve the area. Mr. Towne indicated that was their current snow disposal area so it would have to be pretty hardy to survive. Mr. Britz assured him it would do fine.

Mr. Holden asked if they require State and Federal permits? Mr. Towne confirmed they require a wetland permit. Mr. Holden added a stipulation that the appropriate State and Federal permits be obtained.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if there was a fence in the back area at all? Mr. Towne indicated there was no fence. There is a gas line in the rear so they will have to get approval from the gas company. There is a wooded buffer between the gas line.

Mr. Allen indicated they will go through the normal blasting permit process.

The motion to recommend **approval** passed unanimously with the following **stipulations**:

- 1) That all existing sewer easements be shown on the Site Plans;
- 2) That snorkel hoods be installed on all existing and proposed catch basins;
- 3) That the sidewalk on Borthwick Avenue be extended in front of this site, at the expense of the applicant, the exact location of which to be determined by David Desfosses and Deborah Finnigan;
- 4) That all proposed lighting shall be Dark Sky Friendly and shall not extend over the property line;

- 5) That the applicant shall met with DPW, pending the review of a condition assessment being done on that section of sewer line, to coordinate work in the area if replacement is needed;
- 6) That a maintenance schedule for the catch basins shall be prepared on a schedule to be determined by DPW and said reports shall be filed with DPW for their review;
- 7) That the Site Plans reflect that this is in a Wellhead Protection Area and all work shall follow the Water Protection Guidelines due to the proximity to a City well;
- 8) That the applicant shall work with the City Water Department relative to the installation of two monitoring wells on the site;
- 9) That the applicant plant a native conservation seed mix, rather than Kentucky blue grass, and shrubs in the wetland fill area;
- 10) That all State and Federal permits shall be obtained;

.....

C. The application of **Tain Properties, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **215 Commerce Way**, wherein amended Site Review approval is requested to re-stripe an existing parking area and add a paved aisle to the abutting parcel, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 216 as Lot 1-8A and lies within an Office Research/ Mariner’s Village district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton, of AMES MSC, presented on behalf of the applicant. This is the second part of the project which they discussed earlier regarding parking to the north of the proposed office building. Currently parking extends across the property line by two rows. They propose to reconfigure their parking so it’s perpendicular with an aisle and reduce parking from 229 to 166 for this building. 120 spaces are required per City ordinance. Changes to the lighting will result in separating the two lots. They also propose a connector from one lot to another which will be a 24’ wide access drive. The grade difference is 6%. Part of the changes include landscaped islands. No changes are proposed to the drainage system and the parking is designed so current entrances to the building are not blocked.

Mr. Desfosses asked where does the drainage go now. Mr. Moulton was not sure but he believed the drainage will be reduced due to reduction in pavement. Mr. Desfosses asked about snorkel hoods. Mr. Moulton indicated they will investigate to see if they will fit in. Mr. Desfosses would like them on the catch basins. Mr. Moulton will investigate that.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that the sidewalk problem is the same as on the previous application. Mr. Holden felt that the other project can carry the weigh on that matter.

Ms. Finnigan asked why are they putting in the connector road? Mr. Moulton explained to provide overflow parking between the sites. Ms. Finnigan stated it was not adequate for large trucks and she asked that they put up signs stating no trucks allowed.

Mr. Desfosses asked about walking pathways. Mr. Moulton confirmed those can be installed.

Mr. Britz asked about the parking usage at 215 Commerce Way. Mr. Moulton was unsure.

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. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Ms. Finnigan referred to the signs for the connector road and indicated that it needs to be signed at both ends. Mr. Holden also felt they would need access easements for both properties, to be approved for content and form by the City Attorney.

Mr. Desfosses asked that two pedestrian pathways be installed between the two properties and that all existing catch basins be looked at and any that can be retrofitted with snorkel hoods shall be so provided. The lighting needs to be addressed and the sidewalks on Commerce Way need to be addressed.

Ms. Finnigan noticed that the plans were identical to the 235 Commerce Way application. Mr. Moulton indicated that they were pressed for time but would be separating them out next time.

Mr. Holden asked if there was any vegetation between the buildings. Mr. Moulton indicated that they intend to landscape the entire 10' wide strip. Mr. Holden requested that landscaping be reviewed by Lucy Tillman.

Mr. Allen asked if there would be any curbing around the bumpouts? Mr. Moulton stated there was no curbing currently on the existing pavement. The run off is going to be away from that edge. Mr. Allen asked about the little parking islands. Do they intend to have loam and grass? Mr. Moulton stated that they hadn't shown anything on the landscape plan and they would have to address that. That could be a stipulation that they will work with the City.

Ms. Finnigan asked if the bumpouts were raised, flush or lowered? Mr. Moulton indicated that they would propose raised.

Mr. Allen asked if they will be putting sloped granite curbing on the driveway entrance? They would need a detail on that.

Mr. Allen favored tabling this so that the 235 Commerce Way application could go together with this application.

Mr. Britz made a motion to table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Ms. Finnigan requested a stop sign and stop bar at the exit.

The motion to **table** passed unanimously with the following recommendations:

- 1) That the connector road needs to have signs at both ends;
- 2) That the applicant shall prepare Access Easements for both properties, to be approved for content and form by the City Attorney;
- 3) That two pedestrian pathways be installed between the two properties;
- 4) That all existing catch basins be reviewed and any that can be retrofitted with snorkel hoods shall be provided;
- 5) That the lights shall be adjusted so that they shine as close to the property line as possible;
- 6) That the applicant meet with the Legal Department and the Planning Department to complete a proposal for constructing the sidewalks along the length of Commerce Way in two phases, detailing how contributions or funds shall be set aside for this process;
- 7) That the Landscape Plan be reviewed and approved by Lucy Tillman of the Planning Department, to include a review of the small parking islands;
- 8) That a detail be added to the Site Plans regarding the sloped granite curbing on the driveway entrance;
- 9) That a stop sign and stop bar be added at the exit;

.....
III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:40 p.m.
.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant
Planning Department