

ACTION SHEET

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

AUGUST 5, 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; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief

**ALSO PRESENT:** Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

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

A. The application of **Minnow Realty Investors, III, LLC, Owner** and **City of Portsmouth, Applicant**, for property located at **3000 Lafayette Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 13,260 s.f. footprint Fire Station, after the demolition of existing buildings, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 292 as Lot 12 and lies within the General Business and proposed Municipal District. (This application was postponed at the July 1, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

**Voted to recommend Site Review approval** with the following stipulations:

- 1.) That an executive summary to the drainage study shall be prepared for review by DPW so that it is easier to read;
- 2.) That the applicant shall review and make certain that they took into account the abutters roof (dry cleaners) when they sized the outlet structure for the catch basin in front of the fire station;
- 3.) That the applicant shall list the mounting heights for the luminars on the Site Plans;
- 4.) That the water main extension that will run along the front of the project shall be a 10" water service, rather than the 12" water service shown on the Site Plans;
- 5.) That the water service shall end with a gate valve so they can extend it later if needed, and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 6.) That the 1 1/2" water line going out the intersection, right before the water gate valve, should be tapped into the 10" water main;
- 7.) That the 8" fire service entering the property shall have a gate valve for the hydrant and a gate valve for the fire service right before it enters the building (so that either one can be turned off without effecting the other for repairs or maintenance), and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 8.) That the domestic water service shall be tapped on the downtown side of the fire service, and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 9.) That the applicant shall provide the City with a letter of concurrence from NHDOT on the Stormwater Plan;

- 10.) That the Landscape Plan shall be reviewed for any conflicts with the drainage swale in the back of the property;
- 11.) That Note 12 on Sheet C-5 (Site Utility Plan) shall include wording at the end as follows: "and NH Water Well Board Requirements";
- 12.) That Note 1 on Sheet C-4 shall include the record number;
- 13.) That the mast arm shown on the Site Plan shall be outside the new DOT right of way line;
- 14.) That the applicant shall review any conflicts with the proposed or existing utilities with the proposed conduit from the mast arm next to the firehouse;
- 15.) That the Fire Chief shall determine whether a signal pre-emption button shall be included inside the building and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 16.) That the applicant shall obtain specifications for the fire equipment for approval by NHDOT and the City;
- 17.) That the face sequence diagram shall be revised to represent what is actually shown on the Site Plan;
- 18.) That an additional pre-emption strobe shall be placed on the Longmeadow Road mast arm;
- 19.) That the note referring to the pre-emption receivers shall be changed to indicate that they should be put on the mast arms rather than the signal poles;
- 20.) That the proposed fire signal head shall have 12" lenses and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 21.) That the Applicant's traffic engineer shall confirm why the phases were changed on the signal and as a result the controller will need to be changed;
- 22.) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by the Applicant for review and approval by the City, prior to the issuance of a building permit, to include protection of the catch basins in and around the site;
- 23.) That the parking spaces shall be 9' wide and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 24.) That the driveway permit shall be approved by NHDOT prior to the commencement of any construction;
- 25.) That the pre-emption plan shall be approved by NHDOT and DPW prior to the commencement of any construction;
- 26.) That the applicant shall work with the Police Department Communications Center to conduct a site survey regarding radio communications;
- 27.) That all underground utilities shall be clearly identified on the Site Plans;

.....

B. The application of **Old Tex Mex, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **3510 and 3518 Lafayette Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 4,275 ± s.f. warehouse building with a 1,400 ± s.f. mezzanine office, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 297 as Lots 7 and 8 and lies within the Single Residence A district. (This application was postponed at the July 1, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

**Voted to postpone** this application to the September 2<sup>nd</sup> TAC meeting.

Concerns of the Committee:

- 1.) That an agreement with the neighboring property owner regarding the proposed berm will be required for review and approval by the City;
- 2.) That the owner of the adjacent property will be required to join the application for the next meeting and abutters will need to be notified;
- 3.) That the applicant should address the issue of how the berm will affect the wetlands in the area;
- 4.) That the proposed berm should be shaded so that it is clear that it goes beyond the 53 contour;
- 5.) That there are a lot of call out boxes on the plan that fall over contour lines which make it difficult to determine where a proposed contour is supposed to be tying in. Grading needs to be clearly identified;

- 6.) That the No Parking signs on the ends of the fence should have a left or right arrow, as appropriate, and the sign in the middle should have a double arrow;
- 7.) That the standard parking sign is half the size of the proposed parking signs on the fence and the smaller signs may fit better with the house;
- 8.) That the “revegetated” area needs to be more specific and should identify exactly what will be planted;

.....

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

C. The application of **Parade Office, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street (as proposed subdivided Lot 3)**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a four-story 67,460 ± s.f. building, plus one basement level parking garage, consisting of 158,500 ± s.f. of office space, 43,080 ± s.f. of retail space and 12,000 ± s.f. of restaurant space, after the demolition of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B District, the Historic District A and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD);

Voted **postpone to a time indefinite**.

.....

D. The application of **Seacoast Trust LLP, Owner**, for property located at **150 Route One Bypass**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 5,208 s.f. one-story addition to an existing building, relocate a storage shed, and add two parking spaces to an existing parking area, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 231as Lot 58 and lies within a Single Residence B (SRB) District.

**Voted** to recommend Site Review **approval** with the following stipulations:

- 1.) That the arborvitae along the southwest side of the property shall be removed from the Existing Conditions Plan;
- 2.) That the Site Plans should reflect a sidewalk and entrance walk into the new addition where it currently says “remove curb and pavement”;
- 3.) That the “No Parking” sign shall be removed from the Site Plan in front of the proposed addition;
- 4.) That a painted crosswalk from the north parking lot to the existing building shall be added to the Site Plan;
- 5.) That a stop line shall be added to the Site Plan at the end of the driveway, 4’ from the road, or adjacent to the stop sign;
- 6.) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by the Applicant and approved by the City, prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 7.) That the water line should come straight out of the building and turn once it comes out the foundation, rather than having it turn underneath the building, and be so noted on the Site Plan;
- 8.) That the stipulations from the February 21, 2002 approval shall be incorporated as part of this Site Review approval, and are as follows:
  - a.) That the water meter be relocated to where the existing water line enters the new foundation;
  - b.) That if a fire service is needed, the applicant shall acquire the necessary easements over private property for the fire service to come in from Hillside Drive;
  - c.) That in terms of site lighting, all lighting shall be down-shielded, including the PSNH light; and

- d.) That the site plan indicate a “no parking:” sign in an appropriate location to ensure direct vehicular access to a public way.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 2:55 p.m.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse,  
Administrative Assistant, Planning Department