

MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

APRIL 1, 2008

**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, Deborah Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **150 Greenleaf Avenue Realty Trust, James G. Boyle, Trustee, owner**, for property located at **150 Greenleaf Avenue**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to revise parking and drainage and add a new parking area and a drainage treatment area, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 243 as Lot 67 and lies within the General Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernard Pelech appeared on behalf of 150 Greenleaf Avenue. With him were Mr. Boyle, the trustee of 150 Greenleaf Avenue, representatives of MSC engineers and Jim Gove their environmental consultant. They were present pursuant to an agreement with the City Legal Department. The basis of this agreement is not showing any non-allowed improvements within the 100' buffer that the City alleges exists and which they allege does not exist. The Superior Court does not think it exists either and the issue is pending before the Supreme Court. At this point, they were going forward with nothing in what would be the 100' buffer that is not allowed. Subsequently, this plan may be a final if the Supreme Court upholds the Superior Court. They would probably be back before the Committee with some minor amendments.

Attorney Pelech explained that this project is for a slight expansion of the parking lot and with a lot of benefits that are going to be beneficial to the neighbors. They have a lighting plan that uses state of the art light fixtures. Drainage and stormwater run off is going to be treated where in the past it hasn't been. They believe it is a great improvement and turned the presentation over to MSC Engineers.

Andrew Nowacki, of MSC .Engineers, stated that he brought handouts describing their approach to the stormwater management, which they have used for the site. There is currently no

stormwater treatment. They are proposing to add vehicle storage spaces in the back area and the side. In order to treat the increased runoff, they are proposing a gravel wetland system that has been tested at the UNH Stormwater Center. A handout on the gravel wetland system was passed out. The way the system works is water passes overland as sheet flow from the parking lot, through a little bit of grass vegetation and into 4 bays where the water collects. The sediment filters out and goes to the wetland area. The water passes down through 2' of material and passes out to the underdrain system. The end result is that the most polluting storms, those of 1" or less, will end up being filtered quite nicely. Along with this layout, it allows as well for an ample snow storage area between the two wetland systems. Also, on the plan set you will find a comprehensive lighting plan that shows no lighting impact outside the property lines as a result of the cut off fixtures being used. They have several detail sheets of the proposed drainage design. They do have a couple of catch basins on site that will direct run off to the sediment bay areas.

Mr. Nowacki stated they are seeing a reduction in the flows at the design storm event. They are proposing two catch basin structures in the front, which will direct drainage off site to an existing stormwater system. Drainage for the remainder of the site will be directed towards the sediment bays. Nearly all of the site goes to the wetland systems. The run off from the entire area and the remainder of the parcel all collects in the site's southwest corner. This location is where they looked at the stormwater model and there is a decrease in run off as a result of the gravel wetlands. The gravel wetlands function as a pond and detain the stormwater with a typical culvert like any pond. They have the dual function of providing treatment.

Mr. Nowacki indicated that there is no change to utilities and no change to water or sewer hook ups. They have also included a landscaping plan that shows the complementary plantings that will allow the site to be aesthetically pleasing.

The Chair called for speakers from the public.

William Mortimer, 235 Hillside Drive, lives across the street from the site. He was present solely to make sure everything Mr. Boyle does is on the up and up and conforms to the City's regulations.

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, but reserved the right to reopen it at a future meeting.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden asked the Committee to deal with the overall site first and asked Attorney Pelech if it was correct that no work is proposed in the buffer area, understanding that the buffer area is in dispute? Attorney Pelech said other than the stormwater retention areas, which are allowed (gravel wetlands), no other work was being done.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee to address the utilities.

Mr. Cravens asked about the water service. He knows where it is on the street but doesn't know where it is on the site or how it gets to the two fire hydrants. Also, there are catch basins going underground and needs to see where those lines are. Mr. Holden confirmed that Mr. Cravens was lacking information on water lines. Mr. Boyle stated that the water is not being moved. The existing sewer and existing water is not being changed. All of the renovations to the building are within the footprint. They did just put in a backflow preventer for the domestic water and putting in a line in for fire service.

Mr. Allen asked if they were adding any other underground utilities as part of this project? Mr. Boyle stated the transformer currently comes from Lois Street and they have talked to PSNH and plan to relocate the power to the site off of Greenleaf as that is a newer system. The power will cross the Comcast property and a new transformer will be added on the Greenleaf side of the building. The old one on the back of the building will be going away. Mr. Allen asked were there going to be some proposed drainage structures as part of this system (stormdrains, catch basins and piping)? Mr. Boyle confirmed those would be in the parking lot. Mr. Allen then explained that was why they had to have underground utilities located on the plans so that designers can work around them. Attorney Pelech stated these will be added to the plans.

Mr. Allen asked about a clouded area on the plan along Greenleaf Avenue with no label. Mr. Moulton confirmed that is left over from a previous plan revision and will be removed.

Mr. Desfosses had questions about the electric utilities. He explained that though they have been working with the City for some time, this plan is very new to the Committee. The underground utility line, which is going to be new and installed by PSNH, is clearly shown in a couple of spots inside of what is clearly labeled as the wetland buffer zone. Mr. Desfosses showed Mr. Boyle what he saw on the plan. Mr. Allen noted there are two transformer pads on the site. Mr. Desfosses saw underground utilities coming off the pole in a location where there aren't underground utilities now. He asked if underground utilities are exempt from the Conditional Use Permit? Mr. Desfosses noted too that it is shown as overhead utilities on one plan and on the proposed plan it shows these going through the buffer zone. Mr. Boyle indicated that PSNH wanted to put it in for a second feed, but he didn't think PSNH needed it. Mr. Holden indicated it was their understanding they were coming off of Greenleaf Avenue, but now it looks like there is work on another line, which is located within the buffer. Based on what Attorney Pelech represented, there was no work in the buffer other than the gravel wetland. Therefore, it either needs to be taken off the plan or they need to address it. Mr. Desfosses also noted that the lighting plan shows 3 new lights in the buffer zone.

Mr. Allen thought they had said they were going to abandon the transformer in the rear. He is confused about new vs. existing. Mr. Boyle said the plan is incorrect. The transformer is actually an existing telecommunications box and they wanted to put the line in for a back up and he was not planning on putting it in. Then, Mr. Allen stated the electrical portion of this plan needs to be updated.

Mr. Allen wanted to confirm what Mr. Boyle was saying. They will not have a transformer in the back and they will not have the line on the Greenleaf side going around to the back transformer. Mr. Moulton confirmed they will have underground utilities. They incorrectly

assumed they could relocate lights in that area as it was already paved. Mr. Allen confirmed the transformer up front was new and it would have to be labeled as a new transformer. The confusion is that they have some light colored lines and need to indicate whether these are proposed or existing.

Mr. Desfosses asked about lighting and where the plan tells how high the light poles are as he can not find it. Mr. Nowacki stated they were 20' and he could add that information to the plan. Mr. Desfosses thought it would be an acceptable height above the ground. Mr. Holden was not certain what the height should be as he did not know what the impact was on the surrounding properties. He needs to know, in relationship to the abutting properties, are residents going to be looking up on the bulb or down on it. Glare has been a problem. Also, is that height measured from the ground or the base?

Mr. Moulton responded that without knowing lot elevations, it would be difficult to say. These are full cut off, dark sky shielded fixtures. The lighting plan shows almost zero spillage off the property line. Mr. Holden noted the plans say there is limited light at the boundary, but it doesn't say anything about glare. Mr. Moulton indicated they would have to try and make that determination based on what they could measure as legal heights across the street. Mr. Holden wanted to make sure they would not adversely impact the neighborhood, who have complained about this problem.

Attorney Pelech felt they were talking about two different things. The standards say you have to have a zero candle power at the property lines and they comply with that and it is not a problem. Mr. Holden indicated there is also a glare standard. Attorney Pelech responded it was very difficult to define if there is one. Certainly you can see the lights from the neighborhood and, like the existing lights that are there can be seen from Hillside Drive, however, there is no light spillage over the property line. Hillside Drive has quite a change in elevation. Some of the homes, down on the by-pass with fences, may actually be looking up at the lights whereas some homes at the top of the drive may be looking down. Mr. Holden confirmed he needed to know that information and how Attorney Pelech had defined it very well. Attorney Pelech confirmed they would provide whatever information they could.

Drainage was the next issue discussed. Mr. Britz asked, in terms of the gravel wetland, who is going to construct it and have they built them before? This is a new technology and he's curious to see how it will be constructed. He applauds them for using this technology but you have provided no information about how it will be built or what maintenance will be done. They can be tricky systems. Mr. Britz indicated he would like to see some type of third party over see the installation.

Mr. Moulton thought it sounded like Mr. Britz was looking for an independent. Mr. Britz confirmed that was correct. Mr. Holden had a problem with the fact that they were assuming that this site is suitable for gravel wetland and wondered on what they were basing this decision on. Mr. Moulton stated they did tests several years ago. The site has a very high water table. Mr. Holden asked them to please provide that information. His concern is whether the site was suitable, how are they going to construct it and how is it going to be maintained. All of these need addressing as the City is getting more involved in stormwater management issues. Mr.

Moulton indicated they will provide more detail. The Committee is looking for a management plan and needs to be sure it is installed correctly. Mr. Allen felt these are so unique that he would suggest someone from the UNH staff who is familiar with these systems to make sure this is the appropriate application. Mr. Britz felt, just looking at the amount of buffer zone it is taking up, he wanted to make sure it's not oversized just to make sure it will work. They have a function in the buffer, but the Committee is always looking at a reduced size and pulling it back from the wetlands. In this instance he isn't sure who would be qualified to make that judgment. They have size details, but what about the other details? Often the first thing out of the box doesn't work very well. It is a great technology, but needs to be used properly.

Mr. Desfosses agreed and has questions about the drainage report that are not answered. Mr. Nowacki indicated that the most maintenance these systems require is mowing the lawn. Mr. Holden interjected that these silt up and need cleaning. If they are mowing the grass and not picking up the clippings, are they shortening the life of it or lengthening it? Mr. Holden has heard that a gravel wetland needs maintenance every 5 years. Mr. Nowacki indicated they could provide that.

Mr. Desfosses noted they are carving these things out of fill in the back side of the parking lot. Mr. Moulton has stated that the ground water is about 2' down. If they are dig 5,6, or 7 feet into the ground, are they going to be drawing groundwater into the pond? Because of the scale of this plan and the wetland system, he was having a difficult time figuring out topography-wise what is going on. He read the study and understands they are reducing the overall flow rate. His question is whether they were increasing volume and, if so, what is the impact to this wetland system they are discharging into as far as Delta Y? Will there be any sort of a volume increase and are they taking groundwater out as part of these gravel wetlands? What is the impact to that system, whatever it is called, just behind the site? These questions are not addressed and it concerns him because the houses sited behind the paperstreet named Joseph Street are very low. What are the potential impacts will this design eliminate them? He would like to go out and take a look at this site before the next meeting. He would like Mr. Nowacki to figure out the answers to his questions by the next meeting.

Mr. Nowacki stated that the underdrain system starts at the bottom and it may be wet most of the time. The underdrain does not go directly out, it daylights. It is a solid pipe and water is going through the system and into the underdrain, which is high, so water will be in that system most of the time. Mr. Desfosses was saying that the bottom of the ponds is elevation 22. He knows from the topography that it looks like the wetland system is about the same elevation. Because of the bank and it is all being cut will they be taking water and creating more volume? More pavement is added so they are obviously create more volume. He wants to know what is going to be the depth increase and he can't tell what is going on because the plan is so "busy". Mr. Nowacki responded that the existing wetland is very flat, but the contours decrease in elevation from north to south. Mr. Desfosses noted that over 1,000' it is going down maybe 2'. He can't really tell where the main channel is located. All he needs is something on paper saying they are not going to flood out anyone on Joseph Street and to see the calculations.

Mr. Nowacki notes they show a decrease in stormwater in a table in the Drainage Report. Mr. Desfosses agreed with that, but was looking for the volume change as the way to figure out what

the Delta Y number will be. Mr. Nowacki stated they can provide those numbers. Mr. Desfosses wants to see flow paths and what all the fingers do and their elevations. If a drop of water comes out of this wetland, where does it go? Sometime before the Site Walk, perhaps this information could be placed on an 8 ½ x 11 colored sheet showing the fingers and flow paths. They are going from 198 to 538 parking spaces so there has to be a change.

Mr. Britz asked about the front part along Greenleaf. He was not clear on the drainage. He sees the two new catch basins going to the main drainline. Where does that area go and is there any treatment for it? Mr. Boyle stated there are no new catch basins going in on the Greenleaf side. Mr. Moulton stated that the two new catch basins pick up the drainage that comes back. Mr. Britz asked if the drainage is still goes to the back of the site and is the parking lot getting torn up? Mr. Moulton stated the front is just being resurfaced. They are expanding the parking and that area, it will probably be torn up. They will add catch basins there to catch some of the run off. Mr. Britz asked what the volume of stormwater is that goes through that system and what percentage of it comes from the site vs. off site? Mr. Moulton stated they did not try to calculate the off site contribution.

Mr. Allen asked about the detail for that structure. The way it is shown in schematics has the connections between the two pre-treatment basins coming off the side and an outlet coming out down at the end. They show the underbasin in the bottom at 19.33 and yet they outlet the underdrain at 22, which is the base elevation of the pond. He asked if they have an upper header going across between those two cleanouts? Is there a pipe connection between them? If so, the pipe from the pre-treatment bay comes in at that same elevation and it seems like it has the potential for short circuiting. Mr. Nowacki indicated that the pipe elevations are not critical and can be altered to avoid short circuiting. There is a possibility of that happening, but it most likely won't. Mr. Allen could see it as less likely to happen if it were configured the same as it is shown in the schematic. Mr. Nowacki stated they would be happy to do that as is actually the closest connection to the outlets and elevations. It would have involved more disturbance to pull it over. Mr. Allen understood, but they are going to need to look at the detail a little better and it has the potential for short circuiting and needs to be addressed because this is a specific application with only a general schematic.

Mr. Tillman asked if the back left portion of the building has a loading dock as it seems to be depressed with a bold line and then coming from it is a drain that goes to the wetland. She asked if it was a trench drain? Mr. Nowacki confirmed the loading dock is not new. The trench drain is new and the walls around it are new. Mr. Nowacki confirmed the only thing going through that drain line is a trench drain. Then, following that drain line to the back corner, it says "break in curve", that takes the surface drainage and brings it to the riprap? Mr. Nowacki confirmed that was correct and explained the only reason the curbing was there is so that the water will be forced into the floor bays. Ms. Tillman asked if there were any roof drains in the building and where do they go? Mr. Boyle stated that they go to the exiting building in the parking lot, in the back by Comcast. Ms. Tillman asked if they are shown on the plan? Mr. Nowacki indicated he will put them on the plan.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the same parking lot and asked what would happen if it snows and the water goes down the channel. Mr. Nowacki felt the elevation is such that if that was a

requirement they could put a structure in there. They assume the snow plowing will get done. Mr. Desfosses asked if it is located in the buffer zone as that could trigger a whole new problem. He asked if they are re-grading that area? Mr. Nowacki stated they are doing very minor re-grading. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that re-grading is not allowed in the buffer. They are not allowed to modify the parking lot in any way, shape or form. Mr. Holden indicated this is the issue they were getting at where the only work being done in the wetland was the gravel wetland and now they are finding a few other things. Mr. Holden asked about the loading berth. They said it was existing, so why do they need the drain? He suggested they evaluate if they need it and report back at the next meeting.

Ms. Finnigan discussed traffic. She asked what was the purpose of adding the additional parking? Mr. Boyle stated the parking spaces on the Greenleaf side were for additional display areas. If someone comes to buy a car, they will park in the striped parking spaces off Greenleaf and all new spots will be for new cars on display. Ms. Finnigan asked if their business will increase because of this change and how will it increase traffic volume? Mr. Boyle indicated the site used to be a school. There were 350 students so his business has been a big reduction of traffic. Ms. Finnigan asked how many cars a day? Mr. Boyle thought 100 cars a day. Ms. Finnigan asked what they would anticipate in the future? Mr. Boyle was unsure. Ms. Finnigan was not comfortable with that answer. She realizes there is a reduction in traffic, but she is concerned this is a lot more parking for vehicles to be sold. How does that affect people coming to view the cars? How will that affect traffic at the intersection of Greenleaf? Mr. Boyle stated that many of his competitors are forced to rent storage lots all around the City so there are three or four transactions going on. They will have less activity than other dealerships here. Ms. Finnigan didn't believe that answered her question. She is not comfortable with that information. Mr. Holden thought ITE might have that information. Ms. Finnigan indicated she did not get a chance to look at it. There is probably one for a dealership. Mr. Boyle indicated he is expecting an increase in business, but they have greatly reduced the former use of the property and the National Auto Dealers Association has traffic studies showing that car dealers reduce traffic at a location. Ms. Finnigan indicated she would like to see that. Mr. Holden indicated he would also like to see what they thought the existing condition was when it was used as a school because that would be a point of comparison. Mr. Boyle stated that the Southern NH University had 350 night students and there were other businesses in the building. Mr. Holden felt that would be an opportunity to demonstrate the existing conditions.

Ms. Finnigan asked about the by pass side of the building, they are putting in display pads. It looks like the handicapped spaces may be existing and that another ramp is needed between the southerly set of ramps. She is not sure the person in a wheelchair using the proposed ramps could get off of the sidewalk because the wall is in the way. They need to be ADA compliant. Mr. Boyle thought they may relocate these spaces to the north side of the building. Mr. Desfosses brought to their attention that the federal law says that the handicapped spaces need to be placed closest to the main entrance. Ms. Finnigan has a question about the hatching along Greenleaf Avenue. It is not labeled and she does not know what it is. It starts at the driveway and goes to the east and then to the north. Mr. Moulton stated that is a drainage easement to the City.

Ms. Finnigan indicated they will need to do a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP), including the construction sequencing and the technical inspector. They will need to show the stormwater protection plan and any proposed items need to be included on the plan.

Just as a general comment, Ms. Finnigan had a very difficult time determining what was existing vs. proposed on the plan set and that these should be improved upon. Ms. Finnigan referred to the Landscaping Plan, under Note 6, refers to a requirement of the Hampton Conservation Commission. Mr. Nowacki stated he would edit the note. Ms. Finnigan asked them to add something to the plans about replacing trees if they die. They should also confirm that the trees they propose are not on the endangered species list. Lastly, on Sheet C6 of 6, Ms. Finnigan noted that they need a sign post detail.

Ms. Tillman thought it would be helpful if they had an elevation of that wall as it appears to be more of an arch and they can pass through the center of the wall and that is not illustrated on the plans. Mr. Desfosses didn't believe it was even a wall. Attorney Pelech indicated they will provide a rendering of it. Mr. Holden noted that the Site Review Regulations require elevations.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked if the display cars facing the by-pass would be readily visible? Mr. Boyle confirmed they were. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa then asked about the spots they are proposing towards the back and whether these will have display lighting? He would ask them to put as much light on the cars as possible for security. The officers like to be able to see really well when on patrol.

Ms. Finnigan noted on the exiting plan for the parking, some say 14 spaces and the proposed says 15 spaces. Are they now smaller? Mr. Boyle stated they were not smaller. Ms. Finnigan then asked them to correct that. She asked if any of the islands are changing? Mr. Boyle stated they are not. Ms. Finnigan noted the proposed plan shows the island closest to the building smaller than the existing plan. She also asked them what they are doing to curbing, etc. They need to show what they are doing.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold noted that the aisle widths are currently acceptable so as long as they maintain the clearances for fire trucks he is all set.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee if they were in agreement that a Site Walk would be a good idea. The Committee agreed it would be helpful. Mr. Holden indicated they had also talked about an independent review for the gravel wetland and the drainage. Mr. Holden asked Ms. Finnigan if she felt they needed an independent in terms of traffic. Ms. Finnigan stated she would like to look at the materials first. She asked the applicant to get that information to her as soon as possible. Mr. Holden assumed that Traffic & Safety would be involved. He asked if it would be appropriate, when the traffic study is prepared, that the applicant be invited to attend Traffic & Safety. Ms. Finnigan agreed with that and advised the applicant that they are doing their agenda meeting tomorrow and the next meeting is on April 10th. Mr. Boyle should contact Ms. Finnigan to get on that schedule.

Mr. Holden asked about the sewer line in the back of the property. He assumed it is a public sewer line and that it should be labeled as such. It is also his understanding that the Court

Agreement indicated certain notes would be added to the plans. The wording needs to be worked on and they should work with Mr. Holden and the Legal Department on that change.

Mr. Holden asked if they could be ready for the next meeting? Attorney Pelech asked when they would schedule the Site Walk? It was the general consensus of the Committee to postpone this meeting to April 29th at 10:00 a.m. for a Site Walk at 150 Greenleaf Avenue and to then reconvene as the Technical Advisory Committee at 2:00 pm that same date. Mr. Holden will open up the public hearing to allow for new information to be presented.

Mr. Cravens had one more item on the landscaping plan. Regarding their description of the water conservation practices, are they trying to use the definition of Smart controllers as part of their irrigation practices? They have it just about except for one part which is the Smart controller self-adjusts the watering frequency based on soil moisture. The City is requesting that Smart controllers be used on irrigation systems. Attorney Pelech confirmed they would do that.

Mr. Holden confirmed that there will not be an independent consultant at this time for traffic. In terms of getting a suitable independent for the gravel wetland and for drainage, he assumed the normal course would be for the applicant and the City to agree on a name to be worked out to everyone's satisfaction, payment would be made by the applicant to cover the cost associated and they will get together to get this in place and to get the person working on it.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone to a Site Walk on April 29th, 2008 at 10:00 a.m. for an on site and to reconvene this meeting again at 2:00 pm the same day in the Eileen Dondero Foley Council Chambers. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:20 pm.
.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant