

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

2:00 PM

FEBRUARY 2, 2010

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

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

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Durgin Square Holdings, LLC, Owner** and **Urban Retail Properties, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **1600 Woodbury Avenue (Durgin Square Plaza)**, wherein Amended Site Plan Review Approval is requested to revise landscaping and install irrigation in the parking lot area and along Woodbury Avenue, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 238 as Lot 16 and lies within the General Business District.

The Chair read the notice into the record, and then advised the Committee that the applicant had submitted a letter requesting a postponement to the March TAC meeting.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to postpone this application to the March 2, 2010 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone this application to the March 2, 2010 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

B. The application of **Parade Residence Hotel, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **100 Deer Street (formerly a portion of 195 Hanover Street, aka, The Parade Mall)**, wherein Amended Site Plan Review Approval is requested for sidewalk changes in connection with a 11,437 s.f. conference center to be established in space previously approved for retail use, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, lighting, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the General Business B and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Appledore Engineering, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He distributed handouts to the Committee members. Tim Levine, Project Manager, was also present. Mr. Crimmins explained they were changing the use of the previously approved retail space to a conference center and that the site plan amendment request was primarily for sidewalk changes that are a result of interior space changes and door relocations. He walked through the exhibits that he handed out.

The exhibits consisted of pairs of details comparing the approved site plan and the proposed changes: the top plan was what was previously approved and the bottom was the proposed amendment.

- Change #1 is the relocation of the accessible parking sign, to be mounted on the light fixture at the rear of the ADA space to avoid the hotel doorway.
- Change #2 is the relocation of the light pole and also the “hotel drop off only” sign to avoid the entrance to the hotel doorway.
- Change #3 is the replacement of the brick sidewalk with granite pavers below the hotel awning, and realignment of two granite bands along the edge of the proposed pavers.
- Change #4 is the relocation of a planter to be centered between two parking stalls to avoid conflicts with car doors.
- Change #5 is the relocation of three doorways to match the conference center floor plan.
- Change #6 is the relocation of the bench and trash can by pushing them up against the building to avoid the conference center entrances.
- Change #7 is the replacement of three flush planters with one larger planter to avoid the conference center entrances. The planter will be placed in line with the center of the space and the flush drop-off spot will only be in front of the conference center awning.
- Change #8 is the relocation of the previously approved 645 s.f. seating area to a 480 s.f. seating area in front of one of the conference center doorways. The brick sidewalk in this area will be replaced with granite pavers. The seating area will be bordered on two sides by granite bollards 5’ on center, linked with a chain to prevent access, and there will also be a small granite wall.
- Change #9 is the relocation of the light fixture to avoid the conference center doorway.
- Change 10 is a proposed conference center awning with a flush drop-off area. An additional granite band has been added to trim the pavers, and two flower pots are added on either side of the awning poles to provide protection to pedestrians.
- Change #11 is a proposal that the last three spaces will be valet only spaces with a “valet only” sign and a detail of that sign is part of the exhibit.

On the second sheet:

- Change #12 concerned the previously approved retaining wall extending the entire length of the building. Some stairs have been eliminated, and a portion of the retaining wall can be replaced with a granite curb.
- Change #13 is a replacement of a portion of sidewalk between The Hill and the hotel to eliminate hardscape and a duplicate sidewalk.
- Change #14 is an effort to reduce hardscape by reducing the width of the sidewalk that connects from the rear hotel parking area to the emergency access from 7’ to 5’. Per the request of City staff the triangle striping at the hydrant has been replaced with a painted island.

Also included was a detail for the Deer Street sidewalk which was provided at the request of DPW to provide an asphalt pavement base under the brick in the sidewalk cross section along Deer Street.

That summarized the changes they were proposing for Lot 1.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold referred to item #8 regarding the modification of the outdoor seating area. He asked if the door that enters into the outdoor seating area is part of the required egress component. Tim Levine believed it is part of the egress but he will do an analysis of that and let him know. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold explained it was not acceptable to have a chained area unless they have a full width exit all the way out to the sidewalk and the tables cannot be in the way.

Ms. Finnigan referred to the revised Traffic Impact Study and asked when the proposed off-site mitigation will be completed and what impact to the traffic signals will there be based on this analysis. Mr. Crimmins stated they are not anticipating any impact as a result of the proposed changes. The study was prepared to confirm that the proposed change to a conference center use would not create an additional impact. Ms. Finnigan wanted to know when coordination of the signals would be completed, as well an update to the Market/Russell signal. Mr. Taintor stated this plan was based on a different sequencing based on another project that is not going forward. Mr. Crimmins indicated the mitigation would not be done as part of Lot 1 as the traffic not having an impact. Ms. Finnigan's understanding was that the mitigation would be resolved but she never heard back on how that had been resolved. Tim Levine indicated that the signal upgrade was attached as part of the Lot 2 approval. A coordination study will be done as part of the Lot 1 project and they will complete that after they finish the private street. That will be done before opening.

Ms. Finnigan asked for an explanation of the granite wall under change #8. Mr. Crimmins stated the detail was submitted as part of the original package entitled "Conference Center Sidewalk Detail, Sheet 1 of 2".

Ms. Finnigan referred to the space that will be flush with the sidewalk and asked if there is a transition detail. Mr. Crimmins indicated they will prepare one. Mr. Desfosses indicated he would like to have the curb breaks shown on the plan and labeled as being 7' long, or something to that effect.

Ms. Finnigan pointed out on Sheet 2 of 2 where "12" needs to be changed to "14".

Ms. Desfosses asked about the irregular jog in the sidewalk on the second page where the fire door is. Mr. Crimmins responded it was to keep the 5' width. Mr. Desfosses asked if they could taper it so that it goes straight across.

Mr. Taintor noted in area #8 where the seating area is with the bollards around it, they say it is a connecting chain but it is not shown on the plan. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they will update the plan for the Planning Board.

Mr. Taintor asked about the dashed line in the same area whether it simply means an area they are calling out. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct.

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 this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses noted that in the area of Amendment 15 on Sheet 2 of 2 handed out today, the drawing shows the new sidewalk ending just past the hydrant; however, that needs to extend up to where the City stopped construction of its sidewalk, which is the intersection of the sidewalk going into The Hill and the Deer Street sidewalk. That is an additional 8-9 feet. This was discussed at Pre-TAC but was not changed on the plan.

On the same sheet 2 of 2 between Notes 13 and 14, they should “fatten out” the sidewalk so it is not an odd shape.

On the Detail for the sidewalk construction that was passed out today, the title “Deer Street Sidewalk Section Sketch” should be change to “City Street Sidewalk Section Sketch,” as this detail needs to be used everywhere that is to be maintained by the City. Also, on that sketch, there is a gap between the asphalt and the building. The asphalt should extend right up to the building.

Mr. Desfosses recommended that the City not take over responsibility or maintain the sidewalk section on the private street because of the lack of a heavy duty cross section and that they not take over the maintenance of the sidewalks in the future unless they are reconstructed to City standards.

Ms. Finnigan stipulated that the changes shown on today’s handouts, entitled “Lot 1 – Summary of Proposed Revisions”, dated February 2, 2010, supersede the original plan set provided and shall be included in the approved plan set provided to the Planning Board.

Mr. Finnigan requested that the transition of the area in front of the awning be marked on the plan.

Ms. Finnigan noted that on Sheet C-2 on the original plan set, Note #9 says that all work shall conform to the Town of Rye” and she asked that he change that to Portsmouth (Note: Further review confirmed there was no Sheet C-2 and it is believed that Ms. Finnigan was referring to a different project).

Mr. Taintor requested that they confirm the occupancy for exit requirements.

Mr. Allen referred to the retaining wall that is going to be granite curbing. He is still seeing a 3’ drop which is more than a typical curb section. Mr. Crimmins confirmed it was a 1’ drop. The planter height should be 3’ so there is just a 6” reveal. He will modify the plans. It would be a typical curb height of 6” at the bottom of stairs.

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

- 1) The new sidewalk shall extend up Deer Street from the hydrant up to where the City stopped construction of their sidewalk, at the intersection of The Hill and Deer Street (approximately 8-9’).
- 2) The area of sidewalk shown between the hotel and The Hill should be smoothed out so that it is not an odd shape.
- 3) The detail entitled “Deer Street Sidewalk Section Sketch” shall be renamed to “City Street Sidewalk Section Sketch”, and the asphalt should extend right up to the building that the City not take over responsibility or maintain the sidewalk section because of the lack of a heavy duty cross section on the private street and that they not take over the maintenance of the sidewalks in the future unless they are reconstructed to City standards.
- 4) The transition area in front of the awning shall be marked on the Site Plan.

- 5) The applicant shall provide documentation of the occupancy so that the City may evaluate the egress plan.
- 6) The height of the planter shall be 3’ rather than 6’ on the Site Plan.
- 7) That all changes reflected in the handouts entitled “Lot 1 – Summary of Proposed Revisions” dated February 2, 2010 be include in the revised Plan Set provided to the Planning Board.

.....

C. The application of **Maplewood and Vaughan Holding Company, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, wherein Site Plan Review Approval is requested for renovations to an existing office building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, lighting, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 8 and lies within the Central Business B and Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Appledore Engineering, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Also present was Rob Harbison of DeStefano Architects. They are looking for minor site plan changes to an existing parking area which is associated with the existing office building being renovated. They have added lighting, both parking lot and building mounted, as well as for the sign and flag poles. The sidewalks will be lit with flush mounted bollard fixtures.

The jut out on the east side of the building has been removed. The sidewalk will be extended along that portion and they will also be constructing a sidewalk along the three doors in the rear with stairs that go to the parking area. They are proposing two single light fixtures and one triple-light, 175-watt, dark sky compliant fixture in the parking lot.

Mr. Crimmins addressed additional notes on the plan that were not part of the original submission package. They added a note to construct accessible parking spaces with appropriate signage. They have shown a proposed security light over the mechanical door and it is a full cut-off, dark sky compliant fixture, but have not been able to confirm that with the lighting designer so they added Note 15 which states that the Lighting Designer shall confirm that security light is full cut-off dark sky compliant.

Note 16 was added because there is no accessible route from the modified parking area to the lower level doors, and states that lower level occupancy shall not be granted until accessible access has been provided to these three doorways.

Mr. Taintor asked about the proposed gooseneck light and security light (“I”) on the left side of the building and how that matched up with the lighting plan. Rob Harbison referred to the last sheet in the package showing there are two lights on either side of the front entry labeled “G” and adjacent to them are two labeled “J”. The “J” lights are the gooseneck lights and will be lighting sign panels on either side of the front entry on the building face. The “G” lights are up-down lights adjacent to the entry itself. Mr. Taintor was concerned about the “G” light on the west side of the building labeled “gooseneck light.” Mr. Harbison confirmed that light was mislabeled and should be removed.

Mr. Desfosses asked for clarification of what they are approving. Mr. Taintor stated they are approving lighting and parking lot layout. Mr. Desfosses stated this would be the time he would normally ask for sidewalk upgrades and he asked if that was appropriate now. Mr. Taintor suggested the level of work being done at this level is just to provide for occupancy for the existing level so it should not be required today.

Ms. Finnigan asked if there was a tip-down on the striped island between the two accessible spaces. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that it is existing.

Ms. Finnigan asked what the white rectangle between the two painted islands was. Mr. Crimmins stated that it was existing. He will re-stripe that whole lane and probably pick up an additional parking space.

Ms. Finnigan asked that Note 16 include “and approved by the City”.

Mr. Taintor noticed that Note 9 refers to the Town of Rye rather than City of Portsmouth.

Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. Crimmins what the reason was for the retaining wall on either side of the stairs. Mr. Crimmins stated that is a Versa-Lok stair design. Mr. Allen assumed there is more detail than may apply to this particular application. Mr. Crimmins pointed out that the last sheet shows the stairs. They did the same thing at Portwalk.

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 this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion recommend approval with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses requested that the gooseneck light on the west side of the building be removed, that the parking spaces between the painted islands be restriped, that a tip-down be provided for the handicapped spaces if there isn't one already, and that the notes that are shown on the revised plans submitted at this meeting be part of the record showing van-accessible spots and, most importantly, the note that the lower level not be occupied at this time until handicapped accessibility is provided.

Mr. Allen asked them to make the stair detail simpler and more appropriate. Also, he asked that they put the water size and location for their water service and fire service on the Existing Conditions plan.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold asked for a stipulation that they install a Knox box. Mr. Harbison confirmed they are planning an upgrade to have full sprinkler throughout the building. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold added that automatic notification is required for sprinkler systems. He also knows that they have a fire alarm system and a sprinkler system, but the Knox box is important.

Ms. Finnigan asked that Note 9 be revised to state the “City of Portsmouth” as opposed to the “Town of Rye” and Note 16 should include “and approved by the City”.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the reserved area for PSNH at the corner of the lot and whether they are doing any work in the right of way yet. Mr. Crimmins was not aware of any work.

Ms. Finnigan asked Mr. Taintor if they needed a Construction Management Plan. Mr. Taintor did not believe one was necessary.

Mr. Allen assumed that revised Sheet C-2 will be part of the Planning Board Plan set and it will be stamped.

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

- 1) On Sheet C-2, remove the "Proposed Gooseneck Light" on the west side of the building.
- 2) On Sheet C-2, restripe the parking spaces between the painted islands.
- 3) On Sheet C-2, show a tip-down for the handicapped spaces.
- 4) On Sheet C-2, show provision of a Knox Box.
- 5) On Sheet C-2, show existing and proposed water service locations.
- 6) On Sheet C-2, Note 9, change "Town of Rye" to "City of Portsmouth."
- 7) On Sheet C-2, the notes included on the revised plans submitted at the TAC meeting shall included on the revised plans submitted to the Planning Board. These notes address dark-sky lighting and van accessible spaces, and, most importantly, state that the lower level cannot be occupied until handicapped accessible access has been provided.
- 8) On Sheet C-6, show a specific proposed stair detail rather than several alternative details.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 2:45 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant