

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

**2:00 PM**

**JANUARY 12, 2010**

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Rick Taintor, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; Deborah Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Deputy Chief, Fire Department and David Ferland, Police Chief

.....

**I. OLD BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Catalpa Realty Trust, Owner**, for property located at **249 Islington Street**, wherein a second one year extension of Site Plan Approval received on February 21, 2008 is requested to construct a 41' x 61' three story addition to an existing building, after the demolition of the existing rear section, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 138 as Lot 43 and lies within the Central Business B district and the Historic District A. (This application was postponed from the January 5, 2010 TAC meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Christian Smith, Engineer with Beals Associates, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Also present were Scott Gove and Steve McPhee, members of Catalpa Realty Trust. Mr. Smith stated there are no changes since their last approval and they were just looking for an additional extension. They were delayed due to the economic conditions.

There was a comment about the #5 parking stall on the plans so he reviewed the previous minutes and determined that they had conducted a site walk and he set up cones, backed his Ford Explorer out of the spot with about a three point turn and he believes the consensus was that because this is a private parking lot they would just put up a compact car stall sign on the space and utilize it as such. He had thought that Deb Finnigan had written a memo on that but no one can find it. (Note: Following the meeting, the memo dated 1/9/08 was located in the Planning Department file for this project).

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 for purposes of this meeting.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Taintor stated that the previous extension carried forward the stipulations from the February 18, 2008 approval and some items may have been done as corrections to the Site Plans. He suggested a motion to approve a second one year extension with the stipulations from the February 21, 2008 approval and with any administrative changes that the Planning Department may make to reflect changes that have already been made on the plan.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to approve a second one year extension with Mr. Taintor's stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses brought up an item that was not addressed in the original approval. The City is now rebuilding the McDonough Street area and this site is in Phase 2 which is currently slated for construction this year or next year. He is concerned about the damage that might be done if the building addition is not completed before the City repaves the street and puts in all the sidewalks and then the developer comes along and makes multiple cuts in the street for sewer and water work. He feels asking the developer to repave their portion of the street and the sidewalk on their side of the street would be appropriate. That should be an additional stipulation, to repair or rebuild the street and sidewalk if the City completes its work before the development begins, to the City's satisfaction. Mr. Allen added that there should be a limit of work shown on Site Plan from the property line to Islington Street.

Mr. Smith asked the Chair if he could address that. He indicated that with the original application and design approval they were compelled to do that because the sidewalk is currently in pretty bad shape. The entire section up to Islington Street was to be re-done as part of this project. Mr. Taintor read the previous stipulation that indicated that "the applicant shall replace the sidewalk on the Cornwall Street side addition to the building and the sidewalks shall be brick and in conformance with City standards." Mr. Taintor felt they should expand that to include the street as well as the sidewalk.

The motion to approve an additional one year extension passed unanimously with the following stipulations (including subsequent administrative changes by the Planning Department):

Conditions Precedent

(to be completed prior to final site plan approval)

1. The site plan shall show proposed grading in the area of the doorway adjacent to Cornwall Street, demonstrating a solid surface path to the sidewalk.

Conditions Subsequent

(to be completed after final site plan approval and prior to release of site plan security):

2. The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
3. Parking space #5 shall be designated as a compact space, with a permanent sign saying "compact cars only" and pavement markings saying "compact."

- 4. If the City undertakes street and sidewalk improvements along Cornell Street prior to completion of the applicant’s project, the applicant shall be responsible for repaving the street and rebuilding the sidewalk to the City standards between Islington Street and the northerly property line.

.....

B. The application of **Summit Land Development, Applicant**, for property located at **207 International Drive**, wherein Site Plan approval is requested to construct a 4-story 6,557 ± s.f. addition to the existing 4-story office building and parking lot expansion of 198 spaces, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 315 as Lot 4 and lies within the Airport Business and Commercial District. (This application was postponed from the January 5, 2010 TAC meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Phillip Corbett, of Hoyle Tanner, indicated that they incorporated comments from the January 5<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting as well as their meeting last Thursday, January 8<sup>th</sup> at DPW. He indicated he would go through their list of revisions.

Mr. Taintor indicated it was a long list of revisions and asked if they wanted to go through them individually. Mr. Desfosses felt the applicant has done a response and they should go through it.

Referencing the applicant’s letter of January 11<sup>th</sup>:

Comment #7 – Mr. Taintor asked about the snow storage being on the north side of the plan. Mr. Corbett stated it should be “west”. Snow storage is the clouded area added to Sheet C-6. Snow storage is also shown along the north of the new lot on Sheet C-7. Mr. Taintor asked if that area would drain directly into the wetlands? Mr. Corbett stated it sloped up and there is a small berm between the wetlands.

Ms. Finnigan referred to the crosswalks and curb ramps. She requested that they show on the plan the armor-tile as well as painted “cross walk ahead” symbols on the pavement 200’ from the crosswalk in each direction because it is a mid-block crossing.

Comment #16. Mr. Taintor asked about the trees shown in the middle of the existing parking lot. On Sheet C-5 & C-8 there are still trees shown. Mr. Corbett agreed the existing trees are shown but previously there was a tree that was shown that was in the parking lot from an old existing conditions plan. Mr. Taintor stated on Sheet C-5 on the existing parking lot there is an existing 10” pine in the middle of a travel aisle. Mr. Corbett confirmed that they missed that one and it will be removed.

Mr. Taintor referred to Sheet C-7 and asked about the fences which were added to stop cars from going into the swales. Part of each fence is blocking an opening in the curb and some is duplicating the curb. Mr. Corbett explained that the fences were added primarily to prevent plowing of snow into the swales

rather than to prevent vehicles from driving into the swales. Mr. Desfosses agreed with the fence layout.

On Page 3 of the PDA comments, Mr. Taintor, they noted that wheel stops or curbing stop may inhibit sheet flow and they were proposing taller vegetation grasses and shrubs to delineate the edges. In the planting plan, Sheet C-11, they are planting the island and he asked if the entire area is filled with switch grass? Mr. Corbett confirmed that was their intent. Mr. Desfosses asked if the other plants in the island are the type of plants that wouldn't mind being covered with the grasses? Mr. Corbett stated that DES has a recommended plant list that is meant for bioretention areas.

Mr. Allen noted that they are disagreeing over the City's recommendation of a one way sign at the circle drive so he felt the Committee should probably make a formal recommendation on that. Mr. Corbett felt it was fairly obvious which way to go around the circle and if they put signage up it may confuse people about the main entrance. Just using pavement markings would be better and it seems to have operated well so far. Ms. Finnigan stated she was okay with that.

Mr. Taintor asked about the exception to existing and proposed water and sewer flows? Mr. Allen confirmed that is typically how that is handled.

Response #27. Mr. Desfosses felt that typically freeboard is supposed to be 1' even. Mr. Corbett agreed it was 1' for ten year. They don't usually provide 50' and 100' but since they asked, they provided it. They did follow up with the PDA since Thursday's meeting and they are comfortable with their responses.

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 for purposes of this meeting.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend Site Review Approval with stipulations.

Mr. Taintor requested that the tree that is not there be removed from the plans.

Ms. Finnigan referred to the crossing symbols for pavement markings on either side of crosswalk on Sheet C-6 and noted that she is not sure the pedestrian sign can be seen coming eastbound. It looks a little far out. She asked them to verify that.

Ms. Finnigan referred to the concrete retaining wall and noted the hand rail doesn't say where the need for that hand rail ends. Also, on the detail for the retaining wall she asked if it is all going to be the same height as depicted in the detail? Mr. Corbett stated it will vary depending on the grade.

Ms. Finnigan requested that the armor-tile panels be shown on the plans at the crosswalks.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Sheet C-7 towards the detention pond where there are miscellaneous extraneous notes on the plan. They should either remove those notes or add what they go to so that it

is clear. Mr. Corbett indicated they are the surface features and building set back lines. He'll remove them.

Ms. Finnigan asked if the parking bumpers at curb breaks are shown on the plan? Mr. Corbett will remove that note on Sheet C-7.

Ms. Finnigan notes that on the Landscaping Plan, Sheet C-11, the proposed trees have a large spread. Will they be trimmed back to stay within the island? Eventually those trees will be in the parking spaces hindering parking. Mr. Corbett stated they will maintain the parking spaces. Ms. Finnigan stated she would like confirmation that the trees are appropriate for the islands.

Dirk Grotenhuis, of Hoyle Tanner, stated they have selected some of those trees specifically for parking lots in the past and some are on the larger size but if they are on the back of the island they should not be an issue. They will make sure they are out of the front curve radius. Ms. Finnigan asked to keep them out of the middle islands as well as she is just as concerned about the doors opening. Mr. Grotenhuis confirmed those are all ornamental trees which are fairly small and slow growing.

Out of curiosity, Ms. Finnigan asked about the 28" maple tree labeled on the adjacent property and why it was labeled? Mr. Grotenhuis felt it was an existing tree and by leaving it on the plan it may help them keep the tree there. They will add a note for clarification.

Ms. Finnigan noted that the Typical Equipment Pad Detail and Typical Dumpster Pad with Fence Details are exactly the same and she asked if that was intentional. Mr. Corbett stated they are all the same.

Lastly, Ms. Finnigan requested a CMMP

Mr. Desfosses asked for the standard landscaping note, indicating the landscaping on this plan shall be maintained and trees that die shall be replaced in kind.

The motion to recommend Site Review Approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:.

Conditions Precedent

(to be completed prior to final site plan approval)

- 1) On Sheet C5, remove existing "10" pine" shown in the middle of the travel aisle.
- 2) On Sheets C5 and C6, show the Armor-tile detectable warning panel, as well as painted "Crosswalk Ahead" symbols on the pavement 200 feet before both crosswalks.
- 3) Verify the sight distance to make sure the pedestrian sign at the crosswalk on International Drive (Sheet C6) can be seen by eastbound vehicles.
- 4) Add a detail for the retaining wall on the back of the addition (Sheet C6), showing where the handrail ends and indicating that the handrail height varies depending on the grade.
- 5) On Sheet C7, remove miscellaneous symbols and labels south of the detention pond.
- 6) On Sheet C7, remove superfluous notes ("Install parking bumpers at curb breaks," "Building setback line," etc.) and callout lines.

- 7) On Sheet C10, add a note stating “All landscaping shown on this plan is to be maintained in a healthy state and replaced if it dies or is damaged. No landscaping shown on this plan shall be removed or altered without prior approval of the Portsmouth Planning Department. Failure to maintain the landscaping may result in revocation of Site Plan Approval.”
- 8) On Sheet C11, General Note #1, change “C9” to “C10”.
- 9) On Sheet C11, review proposed tree species in parking lot islands and confirm that the spread at maturity will not interfere with parking (including vehicle door swings).
- 10) On Sheet C11, indicate whether the “Existing 28" Maple” located on abutting property is proposed to remain.

Conditions Subsequent

(to be completed after final site plan approval and prior to release of site plan security)

- 11) The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) for review and approval by the City, prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 12) The applicant shall be responsible to perform a radio-strength test with a Motorola Service Shop to ensure sufficient signal strength within any structure included in the project to support adequate radio coverage for emergency personnel. The expense for the test shall be the responsibility of the applicant, whether or not the test indicates that amplifiers are necessary to ensure this communication. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that cost, too, shall be the responsibility of the applicant. All testing and all installations shall be coordinated between the applicant and the police/fire communications supervisor.

.....

**II. ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 2:35 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse  
Administrative Assistant

.