

MINUTES OF MEETING  
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

OCTOBER 30, 2007

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works, Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief and Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Deborah Finnigan, Traffic Engineer

.....  
**I. OLD BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Seacoast Trust LLP, Owner**, for property located at **150 Route One Bypass**, wherein Site Review approval is requested for the placement of a 50' x 8' mobile coach to be used for diagnostic services in an existing parking lot, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 231, as Lot 58 and lies within a Single Residence B (SRB) District; (This application was postponed from the October 2, 2007 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 to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Mr. Holden advised the Committee that the applicant is still meeting with abutters and asked to postpone.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 4th. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the December 4<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....  
B. The application of **The Hill Unit Owners Association, Owners**, for property located **off Deer Street, commonly known as "The Hill"**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to add a loading area to be used in common with abutting property owned by Parade Office, LLC, and to add 11 on site parking spaces with the placement of bollards to prohibit traffic flow, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 26 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District A; (This application was postponed from the October 2, 2007 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 to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Corey Colwell, of AMES MSC, presented on behalf of the applicant. He passed out an 11" x 17" color drawing which was identical to the large size drawing they had previously provided. This project was tabled at the October 2<sup>nd</sup> TAC . They were proposing 11 new parking spaces to benefit The Hill and a new loading area on property of The Hill to benefit The Hill and the Hilton Garden Inn. The new parking spaces are shown in blue. The eight dark blue spaces show the deeded spaces by individual unit owners. The light blue spaces are the new proposed spaces. Mr. Colwell reviewed the five comments from last month:

- 1) That they detail the blocked retaining wall. Sheet 3 of the set shows a detail of that retaining wall. They kept it blocked because it is only 2' 24" high and there are two existing retaining walls in the vicinity they are trying to match.
- 2) That they add a sign to the loading zone. On Sheet 1 of 3, in the lower center of the plan, there is a note.
- 3) Add language to detail on bollards. This has been added to Sheet 3.
- 4) There was concern about the bollards being constructed and how snow plows would come in and remove snow without damaging them. He indicated all snow would be removed with a snow blower and they added a note to the plan indicating that on Sheet 3.
- 5) Label the spaces to be eliminated. There are six spaces to be eliminated, or areas where cars are currently parking on site that will no longer be allowed. There is a cross hatching on those areas. There are two at Unit 8-3, one north of 7-6, one south of 7-2, one south of 7-1 and one south of 7-6.

Mr. Colwell indicated that they also understand that this proposal has been an ongoing effort between the Hill and the City. They are willing to address any comments this Committee would propose to improve this plan.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Holden indicated that at the Pre TAC meeting they reviewed the parking layout. The Committee had some concerns on how the parking was oriented. He asked the Committee to walk them through each space to see if they feel the space will function as intended.

Space located at the intersection of High Street, starting at the one way service road, the first space is at the Gerrish House, labeled #3. Mr. Desfosses stated this was the one space they did not have an issue with because there is an area to maneuver into it.

Spaces 7 & 8, to the left of the James Neal house. Mr. Allen noted that the access area to get into those two spaces are only about 7'. The other thing is getting in and out of the spaces with the positioning of

the bollard would be difficult. They would want to see turning radius. Possibly the issue is there are too many bollards. With two cars parked it even becomes more difficult. Mr. Colwell agreed with Mr. Allen's comments. He suggested a row of bollards off the service road. The purpose was to block a car from pulling in and it would serve the same purpose if they moved the bollards southerly another 6'. Mr. Desfosses stated that they are additionally looking for bollards along the property line, extending where the tree is and a bollard in front of each space so double parking would not be allowed. Potentially they could move the spaces to the right a little bit.

Space #6 in front of the Fitch house. Mr. Allen felt they have bollards running right down the length of the cars and there is not enough room to open the car doors. This comment applies to other spaces as well. There might be a different configuration that would work, such as one in the middle of the walkway. This applies to spaces #5 & #4 also. Also, on #6, the walkway width of the way is right up to the steps and they would have no pedestrian access along the walk up to that house.

The series of five spaces as they exit onto the parking lot. Mr. Allen felt the concern with those was that they have a narrow one way road and maybe angle parking would work better or two spaces but there is a tree and he's not sure 3 cars will fit in perpendicular parking. Mr. Colwell noted that the 3 parking spaces adjacent to the Widden house are as they are parked today. They are three regulation size parking spaces but it is not a clean turn because of the service road. It is probably a 3.2 turn.

Across the street, two parallel spaces. Mr. Allen felt that the bollards may inhibit parking in that area. Mr. Colwell suggested moving the bollards to the front of the space rather than the side or perhaps separating the bollards and giving another 3'-4' for maneuverability would make sense. Mr. Allen agreed that would make sense.

Mr. Britz asked if they are removing the spaces with hatching and what will they be putting in those spaces? Mr. Colwell stated it will remain brick as it is today.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the loading zone extends over the area of the service road so do they have the right to pull a truck over the service road? Mr. Colwell stated the service road was for access only so it could happen infrequently. Mr. Desfosses asked that since the loading zone is for both parties, isn't the use of the service road implied? Mr. Colwell explained that only the triangle area is implied. Otherwise, a Hilton Garden delivery would be pulling in and crossing private property. They would separate the two easements and call them a loading easement and an access easement. Mr. Desfosses asked why not just truncate it? Mr. Colwell felt that truncating would just have a Hilton truck crossing private property and they want to eliminate that. It looks odd on the surface but maybe they could separate the easements.

Ms. Tillman asked how they are removing the cross hatched spaces. What would preclude someone from parking next to space #3 or at the Jeremiah Hart house? Mr. Colwell explained that the Jeremiah Hart house would have bollards. Ms. Tillman did not believe that would not prohibit it. Mr. Colwell noted that there is only 2 1/2' of brick and they might pull onto the grass but they didn't think it would be a problem. They could add a bollard inside that space. Ms. Tillman asked about at the intersection of High Street and the service road, next to #3, nothing defines if from the sidewalk all the way over to #3. Mr. Colwell agreed that nothing would preclude it but there wouldn't be enough room. It is a space where you have to pull in and back up to fit so some of the room would be used for maneuvering.

Ms. Tillman noted there was no detail on the type of granite post they are going to use. Mr. Colwell stated it will be a rough finish. Mr. Holden indicated that bollards within 8' of the service road have to be breakaway bollards. Mr. Colwell agreed that if this was a public road they would require separate but this is a service road and infrequently used.

Mr. Holden assumed they could be ready with a revised plan for the December 4<sup>th</sup>. Pre-TAC? Mr. Colwell stated that they could be ready for that date.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone this application to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting on December 4<sup>th</sup>. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the December 4<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting passed unanimously.

Mr. Holden advised Mr. Colwell that they could also schedule a meeting before that if they wanted to.

.....  
**II. NEW BUSINESS**

C. The application of **Saco Avenue Professional Building, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **125 Brewery Lane**, for a second additional one year extension of Site Review Approval which was granted by the Planning Board on October 20, 2005, to construct a 4-story, 64' x 240', 15,500 ± s.f., 48-unit residential building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 154 as Lot 2 and lies within a Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Attorney Christopher Keenan appeared on behalf of the owner. He mentioned that the date of approval should be November 17, 2005 in the description. He stated it is his client's understanding that the City's sewer separation project would be done last spring and summer of 2007. For a lot of reasons which did not have to do with the developer or DPW, this project has not even started and has been put off until the spring of 2008. Otherwise, this project would have been built at this point. DPW didn't have any control over the delays and it has been requested by the City that they not build until the separation project is in process. Some current lines run right through the center of the lot and at this point the newest designs are coming through the middle of the lot again. They could build the building but it would have meant putting in final parking and landscaping and moving the current sewer lines. DPW would then have to tear up the brand new parking lot and landscaping which would have been very expensive. They have been trying to cooperate with the City. They only found out about three weeks ago that the sewer plan had been finalized. They are here today to move forward and they have a complete set of plans on record.

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, indicated they were coming back as approval was two years old. Since the August 2005 TAC approval, he reviewed the project to find out if anything had changed. He found out that the sewer plans were in final form and they revised their plans to implement that final design into their plan set.

Mr. Chagnon went through the Site Plan set dated Oct 15th. The Cover Sheet did not change except for the date. The Boundary Plan on C-1 changed as they incorporated the suggested easements shown on the finalized sewer plans. They were not shown previously as the final location of the sewer had not been determined. There were no changes to the Existing Conditions plan. There were no changes to Sheet C-3.

On Sheet C-4 they added some notes from the November 17, 2005 Planning Board stipulations. #2 was that signage should be added for handicapped accessible parking spaces under the building and they added Note 3 on C-4 that signage would be provided to all ADA spaces. There is a detail showing the ADA space on the detail sheet. There was some discussion at the Planning Board about

directing people to those spaces so he was not sure that signage meets the intent of the Planning Board's request however the stipulation, as written, has been met.

Stipulation #3 was that the lighting should be Dark Sky Friendly which has been noted on Sheet C-4.

Stipulation #4 was that the striping at the intersection of Chevrolet Avenue and Plaza 800 will come all the way up to the stop bar and stop sign. This was not corrected on the plans.

Stipulation #5 was that a bicycle rack was added on C-4 just southwest of the southerly sidewalk coming off of Chevrolet Avenue.

On Sheet C-5, the Utility Plan, is where the majority of the changes occurred. As the sewer plan has been finalized, they have incorporated those plans into their site plan. They rearranged the catch basins so they would drain into the proposed drain, updated the drainage structure and invert table and they need to make a few minor changes, for example, CB A6 and A7 need to be moved off the line so there will be a proper sump and the same thing with CB A9 and A13.

Another issue on this plan is the water service which has not been addressed. There is an 8" main that follows the north side of building C and that height is not clearly noted on the Underwood plans as being removed but they suspect it will have to be removed to facilitate the relocation of the sewer and drainage on that side of the building. They propose an 8" main on the north side coming in and make the same path to the hydrant and then ask to tap for a fire service and domestic service for the proposed building from that main. That would require more waivers and further discussion with DPW. They made minor corrections to sewer connections based on the redesign of the sewer and drainage.

On Sheet C-6, Grading, they made changes in grading to accommodate new catch basin locations which were very minor in nature.

Sheet C-7, Lighting plan, did not change at all and the Detail Sheets did not change except as mentioned earlier.

Mr. Chagnon addressed the additional stipulations from the Planning Board:

- 1) That the traffic impact assessment be \$25,000;
- 6) That the steps at Plaza 800 be reviewed for a determination of what would be appropriate. They are proposing to add sidewalk along Brewery Lane and propose a connection to the Plaza 800 sidewalk to provide a safe travelway for someone to go down Brewery Lane and to Plaza 800. There is a significant grade change there so they had to add some steps;
- 7) That DPW review the parking spaces on Brewery Lane. At the August 2005 TAC meeting they requested that the Planning Board make a decision. There was a letter from Steve Parkinson and Deborah Finnigan and then the Planning Board sent it back to DPW for a decision.

The dumpster area has been enlarged to include recycling bins.

That concluded the Planning Board stipulations and Mr. Chagnon turned the presentation over to

Dirk Grotenhuis, of HTA, Kimball Chase, did the traffic review. They issued a report in Feb 2005 indicating that the traffic generated by the project was fairly slight relative to the level of service out to Islington Street. The \$25,000 Impact Fee was agreed upon. That was reviewed by an independent consultant for the City and Deb Finnigan was just coming on board at that time. Traffic & Safety reviewed this and sidewalks were addressed. They were asked to look at Cass Street a little better so they included that in their report. Generally the report indicates 44 vehicle trips at peak pm and any fees should be attributed to off site improvements, as suggested in the report. Mr. Holden asked, given we have moved out 2 years, under the built conditions, does it change any of the conclusions he

reached? Mr. Grotenhuis responded it did not change his conclusion. The increase used in their analysis was 2% and they added an opening year of 2005 so this scenario would be 2 years later than that. The generated traffic would not increase and 2 years would not change this significantly.

Attorney Keenan indicated that concluded their presentation.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Holden stated that the reason this application is back before them is because it cannot be renewed a third time and per site review criteria it can be brought forward for a public hearing. The criteria is to look at any impacts for water, sewer, traffic or other site related conditions. He did not see any thing that would justify a denial on this but since the time of this approval they are now doing Construction Management & Mitigation Plans and he would deem that one would be appropriate. Secondly, he understands there will be modifications to the plan on the sewer and water side. He leaves it up to the Committee to decide but would entertain a motion to postpone or if it could be taken care of prior to Planning Board meeting they could move it forward.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa was concerned about a 4 story brick and steel building and if fire or police have to go into building, radio frequency may not go through. For any large construction, the police have asked builders to work with the Motorola carrier or the City's Communication Center to do a survey to see if there would be appropriate coverage inside the building for police and fire and to put a repeater inside the building at the construction stage. He requested that be a stipulation.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa made a motion to approve with the stipulation that they work with Communications Supervisor Gil Emery and a survey be done by a Motorola carrier to ascertain whether there is coverage for a frequency inside the building and, if not, a repeater be installed inside the building. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden requested that the applicant work with the Legal and Planning Departments to follow the proper procedure to prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan with the City.

Mr. Allen asked, on the drainage side, that a number of catch basins as being shown on the main line be put off the main line for stormwater treatment purposes. He believed they were 5C, A7, A6, A9 and A13. He also hoped they could get the plans changed prior to the Planning Board meeting that the water line reconfiguration that Mr. Chagnon mentioned and as part of that, where there is a note about easements for maintaining the water lines and sewer lines, that be identified as a private line but the easement gives the City the access they need for a shut off.

Mr. Holden indicated that all stipulations from past approval shall be carried forward.

Mr. Holden indicated they were not able to identify that the upright handicapped signs were on the plans. Mr. Chagnon responded that he can add the locations. The detail talks about the handicapped sign and detail. Ms. Tillman did not see the upright signs on C-4 and she asked Mr. Chagnon to put it on Sheet C-4.

Mr. Holden asked the applicant to work with Deb Finnigan prior to the Planning Board meeting regarding the ADA compliance crosswalks and the parking spaces in conflict with the sidewalks.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold noted that they also need a knox box on the premises as well as the fire alarm and master box.

Mr. Holden indicated that they need a 12” crossbar on Chevrolet Avenue, to be worked out with Deb Finnigan.

Mr. Holden advised Mr. Keenan that they would like to have a meeting on the Construction Management & Mitigation Plan to go over timing and phasing of projects.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa advised the applicant that Gil Emery was the City’s Communications Supervisor and could be reached at 610-7411.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant shall work with Communications Supervisor Gil Emery to have a Motorola carrier conduct a survey to ascertain whether there is coverage for a frequency inside the building and, if not, that a repeater be installed inside the building.
- 2) That the applicant shall work with the City’s Legal and Planning Departments to prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan and a meeting should be held to discuss timing and phasing of projects;
- 3) That a number of catch basins shown on the main line should be put off the main line for stormwater treatment purposes, and revised on the Site Plans prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 4) That the notes on the Site Plans that refer to easements for maintaining the water lines and sewer lines, should identify that as a private line;
- 5) That the upright handicapped signs shall be added to the Site Plans, Sheet C-4;
- 6) That the applicant shall work with Deb Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, prior to the Planning Board meeting regarding the ADA compliance crosswalks, the parking spaces in conflict with the sidewalks and a 12” crossbar on Chevrolet Avenue;
- 7) That a Knox Box shall be required and added to the Site Plans;
- 8) That all stipulations from the November 17, 2005 Site Review approval shall be carried forward.

.....

D. The application of **The Meadowbrook Inn Corp., Owner, and Key Auto Group, Applicant,** for property located at **549 Route One By-Pass (Traffic Circle)**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 5-story 120-room hotel, a 4,500 ± s.f. retail building, a 1,964 ± s.f. retail building, a 1,940 ± s.f. restaurant with drive through, a 3,800 ± s.f. restaurant and a 7,000 ± s.f. restaurant, after demolishing the existing buildings, with an accessway off of Coakley Road, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 234 as Lot 51 and lies within the General Business district;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Mike Leo, of VHB, presented on behalf of Key Auto Group. Also present were Anthony and James DiLorenzo, Attorney Bill Tanguay from McNeill & Taylor, Nick Sanders from VHB and Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects. Mr. Leo stated that the property is 18 acres in size adjacent to the Portsmouth Traffic Circle. They are proposing a 120 room hotel, a large retail building, and a couple of restaurants including fast food restaurants. They have appeared before the Conservation Commission and Planning Board numerous times for a Conditional Use Permit and that was approved once the site was reduced. The site is proposed to have two access points, one off the Route one By Pass, which would be a right in/right out only, and one off of Coakley Road. Truck access lanes are around the back of the building. They have a proposed stormwater management system which was reviewed for Conditional Use including a gravel wetland protection infiltration.

The site has 9/10 of an acre of increased impervious area which is being mitigated through a drainage system to a gravel wetland system. The other buildings drain to a centralized location through the gravel wetland system. They were asked to up the treatment for this site and installed a by pass system so the gravel wetland system doesn't become inundated during storms. They have hoods at specific locations. They originally had a fuel station on the site but that was engineered out of the site. The site has a break in grade so they will have to fill in the back side of the site to bring it up to grade. They have landscaping around the site and the Conditional Use permit requested a specific number of trees. They have wetland buffer plantings all along the back to help mitigate the buffer. They are impacting the wetlands in order to revise the access to the site. Hodgson Brook flows through the center of the site. They have City water and sewer and are connected to the main line. There has been discussion of the sewer on Route one and they are waiting for feedback on that.

He displayed the site and showed the grading and the infiltration system. Roof drains are designed so that the fill they put into the site will accommodate the excess paving they are putting on the site. Because they are filing the rear of the site they will use that to mitigate any increase in volume from the site. He pointed out how the site will drain. Once the gravel wetland fills up to a certain point it will spill over to a water quality inlet where it will be treated. There was an area that was a previous wetland treatment area so that will be in addition to the gravel wetland area. They designed a closed drainage system to handle a 50 year storm. For any larger event, the site is graded so water will make it towards the back, along riprap so that the water would drain back to the Brook without any significant erosion. He pointed out where a coffee shop and a drive thru restaurant are proposed and their traffic flow. He pointed out the other various buildings and their uses. He pointed out truck access from Coakley Avenue which travels around the back of the building. They will exit around the site and maneuver through the site and back out Coakley. The restaurants have their own loading spots. The hotel would also load and unload in the rear of the site. They provided a lighting plan with 25' high poles. There is a fairly significant tree buffer for the residents. There are three signs that currently exist on the site and they provided pictures showing the rehabilitation of those signs. The gas and the electric company will be running new lines on existing poles and the utility will be underground.

Nick Sanders, VHB, Traffic Engineer, gave a brief overview of their conclusions. He pointed out he spoke with Deb Finnigan and she did have a few questions and comments and they are working to address those. They are demolishing the existing hotel and are constructing a new 120 room hotel, 25,500 s.f. of retail space, 7,000 s.f. of restaurant space, 3800 s.f. of fast food space with a drive thru and 1900 s.f. for a coffee shop. Access to the site will be provided through a right in/right out on US Route One By-Pass and the second provides full access onto Coakley Road. They are moving the existing Coakley Road access back about 250' from the signalized intersection. The study area which was delineated at a scoping meeting with NHDOT and the City of Portsmouth indicated they would limit their study to US Route One By from the from traffic circle south, intersection of Coakley Road and Cottage Street, Borthwick Avenue and Greenleaf Avenue. From Coakley, through Cottage Street to Woodbury Avenue including the interchange at the US Route One By Pass, the intersection of Dennett Street and Woodbury and the intersection of Dennett Street and Bartlett, and the intersection of Woodbury Avenue and Clinton and finally the signalized intersection of Islington and Bartlett Street. Turning movement counts were collected at weekday evening peak hours and Saturday mid day peak hours. That data was collected in July 2006 as well as January and February of 2007. Those counts were seasonally adjusted for summer month conditions. Once that peak hour data was adjusted, it was adjusted to a 2009 opening year condition as well as a 10 year forecast representing 2019. That brought them to their no build traffic. In order to evaluate the impacts of the proposed development, they then looked at trip generations. They applied those rates to come up with a total trip generation number. Additionally they had a data source which VHB had collected for the coffee shop which was used. All of that information indicated that they are proposing 320 peak hour trips during weekday evenings and 515 trips during Saturday midday peak hours. Most of these trips are already on the By Pass and are merely pulling into their site. Essentially with that rate applied, they are looking at 120



pass by trips in the weekday evenings and 190 during Saturday midday conditions. That suggests that there will only be 200 additional trips during the weekday evening and 325 during Saturday midday condition.

Mr. Sanders indicated that to the north of US Route One By-Pass will be the most substantial increase in traffic. In the no build 2019 there are just about 4800 vehicles circulating in the traffic circle. In a built condition there will be just over 4900, or an increase of about 2% and the Saturday increase would be about 5%. South of Greenleaf Avenue they are looking at an increase of 15% - 25% peak hour trips, or 1% increase in traffic. Cottage Street would be about a 20-30 volume increase per hour or approximately 20 – 30% increase per hour and represents a slightly higher increase as it is a low traveled road. Finally, on Bartlett Street they are looking at a nominal increase. In conclusion, the traffic demands of the proposed development are not anticipated to substantially increase the operations at any of the intersections. They are proposing some roadway improvements, specifically they are proposing to relocate the existing driveway from 50' to about 250' from Route One to provide for additional stacking room and that satisfies the queue under any condition through the 2019 year. Secondly they are proposing a southbound turn lane into the site at the right in/right out only exit. That will allow cars to get out of the main lanes of traffic. Finally they are investigating the feasibility of installing turn lanes at Coakley and Cottage Street. Ideally they could construct protective signal phasing and are investigating the feasibility of that.

Mr. Desfosses asked about a Coakley Road pedestrian signal? Mr. Sanders indicated they are not proposing one. Mr. Desfosses asked if they have approached the State to see if they would allow that? Mr. Sanders indicated they have not.

Mr. Desfosses asked why the other side of Coakley Road is not shown on the plans. Mr. Leo explained that when they started their drawing they didn't have it but they will add it.

Mr. Desfosses asked where the Port Inn driveway is in relation to their driveway? They will affect the queue for them. Mr. Sanders indicated that their driveway is essentially right on top of the proposed driveway.

The Chair called for public speakers.

Al Romano , 3 Coakley Road. He didn't hear the entries of traffic on Coakley Road that Mr. Sanders presented however he indicated that trying to get out of Coakley Road now is extremely bad. He distributed pictures to the Committee and the applicant. One was taken last week and another yesterday afternoon at 5:00 pm. The photos gave an idea of the back up from the By-Pass. The light timing at that intersection is very quick now and there will not be enough time to even take care of the queue. He spoke to NHDOT today and there was no request to increase the times of the lights. Coakley Road only has one entrance and exit and if there was a bad accident they will not be able to get in or out. He has mentioned the pedestrian crosswalk and light to the Police Chief and he feels they will need crosswalks. If they have separate lights for Cottage and Coakley, as the applicant mentioned, it will hold up traffic even more.

Mr. Sanders addressed Mr. Romano's questions. Mr. Holden asked him to give a sense of what if any increase on Coakley Road they anticipate. Mr. Sanders stated that he did not include that in his summary table. Generally at that intersection, the traffic increases will be 5 – 10% during weekday evenings and Saturday weekday hours. The resident was concerned about the volume specifically on Coakley Road. They are not anticipating a significant amount of traffic coming to and from the residential neighborhood. The remainder of traffic would be going to the east on Coakley Road. He would have to get back to him on exactly what that number is. Mr. Holden asked if they could also get a sense of what delays are for existing conditions and as built conditions. Mr. Sanders stated that the intersection operation at Coakley and Cottage during 2009 will be level C & B with delays ranging

between 21 – 17 seconds and that takes into consideration the mainline operation as well as the side streets. Specifically for the side streets, he will get back to them.

Mr. Holden indicated that another question has been whether they had done anything about looking at tweaking the sequence times? Mr. Sanders stated they did. In investigating whether left turn lanes would be appropriate, they looked at modifying the signal timing and even if those improvements were not implemented, they could look to fine tuning the intersections.

Mr. Holden asked about emergency access? Is that sufficient width so they can maneuver around in there? Mr. Sanders indicated they would have to review the turning truck templates. Mr. Allen felt the issue was more that there is no other outlet as it is a “lollipop”.

Mr. Romano stated that he wasn't concerned about the traffic coming from the residential area but was concerned about traffic coming from the development. There will be tractor trailers coming in and he asked if they will be blocking the queue?

The Chair asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Allen had a number of questions that Ms. Finnigan had raised and he suspects they will be postponing for her responses but he read them for the record:

- 1) The current mitigation proposal is to add a lane on Coakley and Cottage. Ms. Finnigan had suggested to Robin Bousa that they should look for other projects to contribute to whether in addition to or instead of.
- 2) The Capacity Analysis Tables should have queue length and storage lengths in them;
- 3) Restaurant A and Retail A – is there enough parking to satisfy the demand? She does not want vehicles waiting in the travelway and blocking through traffic. Also, will the queue from Restaurant A back into the travelway off of Coakley?
- 4) What impact will closing the right in/out have on the business in the development from an operational standpoint? Do the proposed businesses know of this probability?
- 5) Verify the sight distance of the right out on the By Pass to the site, Coakley Road at the By Pass and the new access/egress to the site from Coakley. Also, will any of the “Barlo Signs” block the sight distance? Do they need a permit for these signs?
- 6) What are the proposed businesses? Particularly Restaurant A due to concerns of queuing and parking.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Sanders where they stand with DOT and driveway permits? Mr. Sanders stated they will be submitting a driveway permit for this study. They will submit the traffic study to the district office and they will forward it along. They will have comments for them and they will respond. Mr. Holden assumed that meant that the existing driveway cuts will be relocated and reconfigured. Mr. Sanders responded if the future DOT By Pass plan goes forward, then yes. Mr. Holden asked if they have done an assumption if they are only going to be served from Coakley Road as to what that does to that intersection? Mr. Sanders stated, at the request of Deb Finnigan, she asked them to evaluate access to this site based on the DOT Route One Pass which would suggest that the right in/right out access would be eliminated and there would be right in/right out access only at Coakley and then full access would be provided between Coakley Road and Borthwick Avenue and that was analyzed in the Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Holden asked how did the level of service change in build condition 10 years out? Mr. Sanders indicated there is no degradation of service. Operationally with those improvements in place, the levels of service were in the range of C with approximately 25 – 20 second delays, with or without their project. That is with Cottage Street as a right in/right out. Mr. Holden didn't understand how the lights at that intersection could handle much

additional traffic. Mr. Sanders indicated his recollection between the two intersections was that the available storage would satisfy the need. Mr. Holden found that difficult to believe.

Mr. Desfosses felt they need to take a good look at how they will get pedestrians from off site to the site. Pedestrians may be coming from the neighborhoods to go to the new restaurants. He was a little shocked they don't know what the queue on Coakley Road will be as that is the most pressing issue. Mr. Sanders stated that the queue on Coakley Road will not exceed a couple 100'. Mr. Desfosses stated he was talking about the fact that they don't know what the level of service is on Coakley Road, the driveway for the other development across the street isn't shown and there appears to be a lot of work traffic wise. Mr. Holden assumed this will go through more than one meeting but the Committee is giving Mr. Sanders a sense of what they are looking for.

Mr. Desfosses noted that there is no light level to speak of at the Coakley Rad intersection. Assuming pedestrian activity they will be asking for some lighting. Also, lighting on the plans does not meet current requirements. Total maximum height from ground to light source is 24' and they have 28'. Mr. Holden added they need to deal with how to maneuver pedestrians around safely and they will probably be looking for some sidewalk connections.

Mr. Holden felt this should go to Traffic & Safety and they should start that now. He recommended that they get with Deborah Finnigan to get on the Traffic & Safety Agenda to get their comments back.

Mr. Allen mentioned that he thought the City was trying to get parking behind the buildings? He asked if that had been addressed? Mr. Holden indicated that they went through the Conditional Use process and it was very difficult so they really can't be moving buildings around. A pedestrian or safety issue would be different.

Mr. Holden assumed the next site plan will document the Coakley Road right of way and show driveways. He was curious about the signs and asked if they are all currently permitted? Mr. Leo was not sure. Mr. Holden felt the Planning Board should approve their master plan for their signs so they need to make sure they are permitted. Mr. Desfosses felt they might have sight issues with the new sign as it is much wider than the existing sign and may affect site distance. Mr. Holden indicated they will decide whether to do the master sign plan as part of this process or as part of BOA.

Mr. Holden asked if there were going to be any transformers on site for power? Mr. Leo stated he has not worked that out with the electric company yet. Mr. Holden noted that is a site issue so they should start addressing it now.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if they know what will be going into Retail A & B? Mr. Leo stated they did not at this time. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa requested that they contact their Communications Supervisor, Gil Emery, 610-7411, to have a survey done by a Motorola carrier to see if radio transmissions are free and clear to make sure police and fire can communicate inside the building and if not, they need to install a repeater inside the buildings.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold was concerned about water supply and if it was adequate for sprinkler protection. Any buildings that are sprinklered need auto notification of emergency sources and knock boxes.

Mr. Cravens stated that they require separate services entering the property for fire and domestic service. They have to be gated out on to the public right of way. From there they go in one building and they get one shared city water meter. From there is goes to the other buildings. They only allow one domestic water service and one water meter per legally subdivided lot. They can purchase water meters and monitor them on their own but the City only reads one meter.

The size of the main on Coakley Road needs to be something bigger than 8". They are tapping a 20 there. They are thinking of having them cross the Route One By Pass over to Cottage Street with this main because it would be a good time to have it done and the size of the main would be determined by DPW at a later time.

Mr. Cravens asked if there will be irrigation for landscaping? Mr. Leo stated there will be some limited areas for the restaurant and the hotel. Mr. Cravens stated the City has an ordinance that loam has to be at least 6" deep, using smart controllers for the irrigation control system and irrigation times are between 10:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m.

Mr. Cravens also indicated they will need some figures on the water usage for a capacity use surcharge.

Mr. Allen noted they were not showing any sewerage services coming out of the retail B building. Elevations show food uses which will require a grease trap and details are required. Mr. Allen also felt that they may want to look at their grading at their entrance to Coakley Road as there are funky contours and lines that don't make sense and they are sloping 1-1 into the wetlands.

Mike Parsonts, of NH Soil Consultants, was present to help the TAC Committee understand what the Planning Board approved for Conditional Use. The plan showed the buffer area and the planting zone that they will be doing. He pointed out the gravel wetland system, planted wetland vegetation which is part of the ground wetland system, transition vegetation, upland vegetation and existing plantings. Some of the project is within the 100' buffer and this was the agreement which was worked out with the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board. They have 54,100 s.f. of transition zone bed, 55,000 of upland and 7945 s.f. of wetland vegetation. The wetland impacts that were approved were at the entrance based on the need to push the entrance back from the By Pass (7396 s.f. impact) and is on a corner of the wetland area and is a low impact area. The second area is a small isolated pocket which is currently a mowed lawn (1964 s.f. impact). All other wetland areas were avoided with direct impact. The State Wetland Permit application is still pending for those two areas. \$20,000 will be put towards the Hodgson Watershed Committee for impacts to the Brook.

Mr. Holden asked if the existing condition is much improved upon? Mr. Parsons confirmed that was correct as there was no treatment at all coming off the site now. Mr. Holden added that they will cover over 90% of all storms. Mr. Britz mentioned that one item that was discussed at both Conservation Commission and Planning Board was that there should be a maintenance plan for both of the wetland buffer plan and the gravel wetland. He asked what was the timing on the wetland buffer plantings and where on the gravel wetlands will they identify the maintenance. He also asked if they have recommended anything for the installation of both items? Mr. Leo stated they will be providing a stormwater maintenance inspection schedule to the City and it will call out what they see necessary for inspection. Gravel wetland construction and gravel wetlands are fairly new to the area and they will include an inspector be out at key times during construction to make sure it is installed correctly. Mr. Britz asked, in terms of never having a gravel wetland in Portsmouth before, beyond site bonding, how will they insure it will remain functional in the next 75+ years. Mr. Leo stated that in the gravel itself they can do a boring and see if the system is clogged. It may be 10 or 20 years but they can come back and excavate the area.

Mr. Holden stated they should see building elevations.

Lisa DeStefano, of DeStefano Architect, stated that they were brought on to work with the developer and the construction company to explore alternatives in design that would give them an opportunity to layer onto the building more than the prototype might have had. When they started with the building it had a false pitched roof on top of it. They simplified the building in doing a five story vertical building which allowed them to accent the base mill top of architecture of the building and layers of materials to give some depth to the building and they can hide their mechanicals on top of the building. On

average at the highest point their building is 55.4” from the average grade. There is no back to the building as they have their service road going all the way around. They have the brick façade and bump out all around. They were given a prospective rendering of the building with an entrance piece coming out and the retail building in the back ground. They tried to break up some of the elevation facade. They then looked at the larger retail building and with the strange shape of the building they are looking head on and at angles. Because of the visibility, they went with anchors that are larger with in-fills in between. They will look for awnings to give some protection to people approaching the facades. On both ends of the building they have interest for the approach of those facades. They are working with the contractors to see what will give them the best longevity for the façade. The last building is their small retail building and was designed knowing they have retail on both sides. This building is seen from all four directions and they have put in window openings on all sides so there are no blank walls.

Mr. Desfosses indicated he only found one dumpster location and asked how the trash will be handled for the hotel? Miss DeStefano stated they are looking at a dumpster location between the hotel and the large retail building which is not as visible to the public. Mr. Desfosses asked if it would have access from the back access road? Ms. DeStefano confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Britz wanted to bring up that the Conservation Commission made a request that the site be a sustainable site. Given the size of the structure and project, have they looked at a LEED building or green building techniques? Ms. DeStefano responded that they are not far enough into the building design to know how far they will take that. They probably won’t be LEED certified but it certainly is first and foremost on their minds. She is finding that there are simple procedures they can use to point them in that direction. Mr. Britz wanted to bring this up early on in the project.

The Chair called for speakers to address the additional testimony.

Mr. Holden invited them to attend Pre-TAC on December 4, 2007 at 9:00 a.m. and then they will return that same date for the TAC meeting at 2:00 pm.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone to December 4, 2007 at 2:00 pm. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting on December 4, 2007 passed unanimously.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 4:15 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse  
Administrative Assistant  
Planning Department