

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

2:00 PM

FEBRUARY 1, 2011

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Assistant Fire Chief, Carl Roediger, Fire Inspector; Steve Dubois, Deputy Police Chief

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Service Credit Union, Owner**, for property located at **2995 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 23,366 ± s.f. (footprint) 4-story office building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 291 as Lot 1 and lies within the Gateway District. (This application was postponed at the January 4, 2011 TAC Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bradlee Mezquita, of Appledore Engineering, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated that they last appeared before TAC on November 29, 2010. The site is located at the intersections of Lang and Lafayette and Longmeadow and Lafayette. They are proposing a 100,000 s.f. office building which was shaded in orange on the displayed plan. The dark grey areas are proposed pavement, the brown areas are walking paths and the yellow areas are hardscaped sidewalks. They show a parking area on the portion of the property adjacent to Lang Road which will be for future development and will not be constructed as part of the original project.

Mr. Mezquita stated that since November 29th they made several changes to the plans. There was a request that they submit a plan stamped by a wetland scientist which they have done. They added total square footage information to the plan, they corrected discrepancies to footnotes on Sheet C-3 and they showed addition signage relative to traffic circulation out onto Lafayette Road. It was requested that the proposed pavement on the Longmeadow Extension and the access road be increased to 4" depth of bituminous which is shown on the plan. They corrected existing curbing on Lafayette Road on the property side of the utility pole which they now show on the roadway side. They provided an exhibit showing stormwater calculations for the additional volume run off from the site toward the wetlands to the southern portion of the site and they submitted a watershed plan. They had a follow up meeting with Rick Taintor and David Desfosses to go over City sidewalks which have been shown on the plans.

The sidewalk along Lafayette was moved just inside the right-of-way and the sidewalk at the intersection of Lang and Lafayette to their entrance drive was removed. They relocated a fire hydrant and added a note for coordination of the gate as they have not determined what the opening mechanism will be.

As a result of their TAC Work Session that morning, there was a question regarding some areas on the plan. The building footprint is 24,790 s.f. which they show on Sheet C-3-A. (There was a discrepancy with the overhang.) They were asked how many cubic yards of cut and fill there would be. They plan to import about 10,000 s.f., most of which is loam; the remainder of the cut and fill will be within the site limits. There was a request that a portion of Longmeadow have an overlay from the site drive to the signal. They show on Sheet C-3-B that area being reclaimed and reconstructed up to 50-75' from the signal, which is where the current overlay from DOT stops. Cut sheets for lighting were given to David Desfosses for his review. There was a comment about Jersey barriers and the cul de sac removal and those type of issues will be coordination issues after phasing of the actual construction of the roadway has been resolved. They agree to all of the conditions; however, how they show them on the plan will depend on the timing of the construction.

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. Taintor stated they had talked about taking three actions at this meeting. He asked if there is a request for a work session with the Planning Board. Mr. Mezquita stated they will forward a formal request to the Department.

Mr. Taintor explained the three separate actions from TAC. One would be to refer this proposal as presented to the Traffic & Safety Committee. The second would be to recommend in favor of this plan to the Planning Board for the purpose of a work session, noting that TAC cannot recommend approval until after the zoning has been changed with respect to sustainability standards for the Gateway District. The third would be to postpone this application to the March 1st TAC meeting, with the potential to postpone again to a special meeting after the March 7th City Council vote on the zoning amendment.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to refer this matter to the Traffic & Safety Committee. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

The motion to refer the application to the Traffic & Safety Committee passed unanimously.

Mr. Desfosses made a favorable recommendation of the Site Plan to the Planning Board for the purpose of a Work Session, noting that TAC cannot vote to recommend approval until the zoning has been amended regarding sustainability standards. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to make a favorable recommendation of the Site Plan to the Planning Board for the purpose of a Work Session, noting that TAC cannot vote to recommend approval until the zoning has been amended regarding sustainability standards passed unanimously.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this application to the March 1st TAC meeting. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen asked what the reason was for the zoning change. Mr. Taintor explained that this application is coming in under Article 7, Flexible Development, where they have what is called Gateway Planned Development. This gives additional density and other incentives in exchange for meeting other certain standards. One of the standards is compliance with the LEED for Neighborhood Development sustainability standard. The site cannot meet the LEED-ND standards because the location is supposed to be more of an in-fill and this is more rural. They are proposing a change in the zoning to give a variety of opportunities to meet sustainable site development standards. That will go for first reading to the City Council this Monday, second reading two weeks after, and third and final reading on March 7th. Therefore they will be calling a special meeting of TAC on March 8th to finalize this.

The motion to postpone this application to the March 1, 2011 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for site redevelopment to retail, bakery, restaurant and residential uses, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 2 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the January 4, 2011 TAC Meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Steve Kelm, owner, gave a brief introduction to the project. He stated that the existing building was used for offices. Their intent to is to convert the first floor to 15,000 s.f. of retail and the second floor to residential use. They are hoping to start construction in the next month, probably March, and be open in the last summer or early fall. The first floor will be a combination of a marketplace, a small Italian grocery store and possibly a couple of small restaurants. There will also be kiosk space of anywhere between 200 – 300 s.f. of self-contained users serving ice cream, soups and salads or something on a smaller scale. The idea is to be a vibrant downtown market for people to buy food and groceries and bring them home or to stay and eat there. The second floor will be 5 or 6 residential units and they are still working on that design. The building allows them the opportunity to have a lot of outdoor space, including 3 patios on private property rather than City property.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there will be any changes to the outside of the building except lighting. Mr. Kelm responded that 99% of the work is windows and doors and the band that wraps around the roof line to change the architectural design of the building. The footprint will stay the same. The building was built in the 1970's and is very dated. They have gone through the HDC, trying to change the look of the building from a "blah" office building to a more vibrant commercial use. All of the windows are

being taken out and the windows along the front of the building and some on the sides will be taken out and doors will replace them to grant access to the building. The building will be updated structurally to meet current building codes.

Mr. Desfosses asked how people access the core of the building and the shops. Mr. Kelm indicated that the three larger spaces will have access from the outside. The restaurant will have access from the inside and also directly from the outside of the building. A smaller space or a kiosk would not have direct access in and out of the building and people would use one of the three main entrances.

Mr. Taintor asked if the main entrance would be coming off Hanover Street for the common area. Mr. Kelm confirmed the main entrance would go to the common area. There are three main entrances to the common area and three main entrances to the stand alone restaurants.

Fire Inspector Roediger asked how many residential units they plan for the 2nd floor. Mr. Kelm indicated at this time it would be 6 or possibly 7. Once they take away common area they would end up with about 13,000 s.f. for residential. They are not adding another floor or structures to the roof.

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.

Mr. Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, indicated that several issues came up at the morning's TAC Work Session and he addressed those on the revised Site Plans which he handed out to the committee.

Mr. Chagnon stated that Sheet C-1 shows additional catch basins in the parking lot and how they connect to the street.

Sheet C-2 provides an opening for a gate in the proposed wall between the new walkway and patio.

The tip-down at the corner of Hanover and Bridge is detailed on Sheet D-1. He provided a standard sidewalk tip down at the intersection with the Armor-Tile detail. They brought it around the corner a bit as they are expanding to the property line.

The brick sidewalk is now shown along Maplewood, along Hanover and turning on Bridge. There is a brick detail on Sheet D-2.

They show the light poles on Sheet C-3. They are coming off of the relocated pole to a proposed meter pedestal at the corner and then an underground run to five new lights. The lights are detailed on Sheet D-2, using the new Portsmouth downtown standard.

They reduced the width of the dumpster enclosure by 1' to provide more space to open a car door in the adjoining parking space.

On the transition from new brick to concrete sidewalks on Detail F on Sheet D-1, they added a note to put in a 5' panel to connect the existing sidewalk to the new sidewalks.

The gas line relocation is shown on Sheet C-3. They have the new proposed gas service coming off Hanover Street to the corner of the building. They added the meter pedestal note at the pole. Note 9 on Sheet C-3 says they will provide a sprinkler connection per Fire Department specifications on the Bridge Street side of building. It is also keyed over to a location which is in the general location of where they would want to see it.

They added the City standard brick sidewalks and light pole details to Sheet D-2.

The dumpster pad shows some spot grading on the grading plan and it slopes to the back. Notes were added to Detail J because the parking lot slopes the other way so they will have to provide a paved apron at the entrance side. The bottom detail shows how they will reset the curb on the west side and provide a curb on the east side. There currently is a curb on the southerly side. There is also a Note 4 which indicates to the Contractor to insure that no additional stormwater run-off enters the dumpster area.

They changed all of the pipes to be the same Schedule 40 PVC material. The 3' sumps were listed in the drain detail. He specified the grates and he provided cut sheets to the Committee.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Taintor asked if there were any questions from the Committee.

Mr. Allen appreciated the spot grades for the proposed dumpster pad but there is no existing conditions site plan so he doesn't know what they are envisioning. He would prefer, between now and the Planning Board, that they have a more defined detail on the height and the exact configuration. Similarly, they will be setting all of the sidewalk with no existing or proposed position grades so he doesn't know whether there are any grade changes or issues associated with the sidewalk work. Mr. Chagnon indicated that on Detail G on Sheet C-2 he put a note to maintain the existing curb reveal and he felt that would be what they want them to do. He believed Maplewood was done not too long ago.

Mr. Desfosses had some very minor comments. Where it says proposed meter pedestal they need to add the panel board. All of the conduit for the lighting needs to be schedule 80, not 40. All conduit and lighting needs to be installed and supervised by a licensed electrician. The brick detail shows stone dust on top of the asphalt and they don't use that detail anymore. They use a one-third fly pack cement and two thirds sand so it is set dry and mixed in the field and sets up harder.

Mr. Sheehan asked about the catch basin in the dumpster area which still shows as draining into the sewer line going into the grease trap. Mr. Chagnon thought they were still up in the air on that. Mr. Sheehan confirmed they want to have it drain into the sewer line and where it connects into the sewer line coming out of the grease trap there should be a clean-out installed. Mr. Chagnon stated they would probably bring it in just downstream from the grease trap. Mr. Desfosses felt they may need to move the grease trap towards the building a little bit.

Fire Inspector Roediger wasn't sure if there was an existing knox box on the building. If not, he would like one added with the standard note on the plan about an exterior entrance and flush mounting.

Mr. Desfosses asked them to provide internal backflow preventer for the water line going out to the dumpster. Mr. Allen requested that they use 6" pipe on any new sewer service rather than the 4" they are showing.

Mr. Allen made a motion to recommend approval. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen stated the stipulations would include the final grading for the dumpster area to be provided and reviewed and approved by DPW prior to the Planning Board, relocate the outlet from the dumpster area drainage structure to downstream of the grease trap with a clean out and new 6" sewer laterals.

Mr. Chagnon asked if the 6" requirement would also apply to the dumpster location. Mr. Allen felt it should.

Mr. Desfosses requested a stipulation that the conduit for the lighting system be schedule 80, the bricks are to be laid on the sand cement and to City specs. For the panel board they will put in the same as Ceres Street which is a small fiberglass cabinet next to the dumpster.

Fire Inspector Roediger requested a Knox box.

Mr. Taintor stated that the HDC shall review all changes in patio wall materials.

Mr. Desfosses requested that all wiring and the conduit shall be installed under the supervision of a licensed electrician.

Mr. Allen asked if they have provided past use surcharge calculations? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they were on the sheet.

Mr. Taintor requested a CMMP.

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

- 1) Final grading for the dumpster area shall be provided to DPW for review and approval prior to the Planning Board meeting.
- 2) The dumpster area drainage outlet shall be relocated to downstream of the grease trap, with a clean out and new 6" sewer laterals.
- 3) The conduit for the lighting system shall be schedule 80 PVC.
- 4) The detail for the brick layout shall be revised to City standard.
- 5) A panel board shall be provided and DPW shall approve the specs prior to the Planning Board meeting.
- 6) A Knox Box shall be added to the Site Plans, along with a note including installation instructions.
- 7) All wiring and the conduit shall be installed under the supervision of a licensed electrician.
- 8) HDC approval shall be required for changes to the patio wall materials.
- 9) The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan for review and approval by the City.

.....
II. REFERRAL FROM PLANNING BOARD

A. The application of **Richard Bonhomme Realty, LLC, Owner, and Chinburg Builders, Applicant**, for property located on Kearsarge Way, for Preliminary Subdivision Approval to consolidate Lots 118, 119 and 122 as shown on Assessor Map 212, totaling 227,623 s.f. (5.2255 acres), and subdividing the lot into 21 individual lots varying in size from 5,007 s.f. to 14,002 s.f. Said lots lie within the General Residence B (GRB) District. (This application was postponed at the January 4, 2011 TAC Meeting).

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, appearing on behalf of the applicant, requested that this matter be tabled to the next regular TAC meeting.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this matter to the next TAC meeting on March 1, 2011. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the March 1, 2011 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

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

.....
Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant