

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

2:00 PM

JUNE 3, 2014

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner; Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner; Peter Rice, Director, Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Patrick Howe, Fire Inspector;

I. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Taintor asked for a motion to read the first three items in together. Mr. Desfosses made said motion, Mr. Britz seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

A. The application of **Carol S. and Joseph G. McGinty, Owners**, and the **Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, Paul G. Sanderson, Trustee, Owners**, for property located at **300 Spinney Road and off Spinney Road**, wherein Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval (Lot Line Revision) is requested between two lots as follows:

- a. Lot 6 on Assessor Map 169 decreasing in area from 30,000 s.f. to 28,363 s.f. and with continuous street frontage on Spinney Road decreasing from 150 ft. to 132.54 ft.
- b. Lot 24 on Assessor Map 170 increasing in area from 181,725 s.f. to 183,362 s.f. with 139.06 ft. of continuous street frontage on Middle Road.

Said properties are located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District which requires a minimum lot size of 15,000 s.f. and 100 ft. of continuous street frontage.) (This application was postponed at the April 29, 2014 TAC meeting).

B. The application of the **Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, Paul G. Sanderson, Trustee, Owners**, and **Spinney Road Land Holdings, LLC, Applicant**, for property located **off Spinney Road and Middle Road**, for Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide two lots into five lots with a new public right-of-way, with the following: Lot 5 on Assessor Map 167 having 263,937 s.f. (6.06 acres) and Lot 24 on Assessor Map 170 having 183,362 s.f. (4.21 acres), to be consolidated and subdivided into five separate lots ranging in size from 15,500 s.f. (0.36 acre) to 352,414 s.f. (8.09 acres), and all with a minimum of 100 ft. of continuous frontage on the proposed public right-of-way. Said properties are located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District which requires a minimum lot size of 15,000 s.f. and 100 ft. of continuous street frontage. (This application was postponed at the April 29, 2014 TAC meeting).

C. The application of **Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, Owners**, and **Spinney Road Land Holdings, LLC, Applicant**, for property located **off Spinney Road and Middle Road**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section

10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within a wetland buffer to install a rain garden of which a portion is within the wetland buffer, with 3,120 s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 170 as Lot 24 and lies within the Singe Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the April 29, 2014 TAC meeting).

The Chair read the notices into the record.

Mr. Rice made a motion to postpone Items A, B and C under Old Business to the next TAC meeting. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to **postpone** to the June 29, 2014 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **The Aphrodite Georgopolous Revocable Trust of 1999, Owner, and Seacoast Trust, LLP, Applicant**, for property located at **1900 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct two medical office buildings: (1) a 2-story building with a footprint of 12,150 s.f. and gross floor area of 21,000 s.f. plus a 10' x 60' MRI coach, and a proposed 2,050 s.f. future MRI addition to the building; and (2) a 2-story building with a footprint of 10,000 and gross floor area of 20,000 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 267 as Lot 8 and lies within the Office Research (OR) District. (This application was postponed at the April 29, 2014 TAC meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone Site Plan approval to the next TAC meeting. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

The motion to **postpone** Site Plan approval to the June 29, 2014 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Harborcorp, LLC, Owner**, for property located on **Russell Street, Deer Street and Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 5-story mixed use development with a footprint of 66,315 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 375,741 ± s.f., including a hotel/event center with 128,700 s.f. of event center space and 98 hotel rooms, 14 residential condominiums, a 40,660 s.f. retail supermarket, and 580 parking spaces (417 spaces in a garage structure and 163 below-grade spaces serving the retail use); with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 21, Assessor Map 118 as Lot 28 and Assessor Map 124 as Lot 126 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the April 29, 2014 TAC meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone Site Plan approval to a time indefinite. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **402 State St. LLC, Owner, and Blue Water Construction, Applicant**, for property located at **402 State Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to convert a 3-story mixed-use (office-residential) building into 3 dwelling units, demolish existing building components with a total footprint of 689 s.f., and construct additions with a total footprint of 196 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 12 and lies within Character District 4-L (CD4-L), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Jason Beane appeared on behalf of the applicant, Blue Water Construction. He stated they have been into the Planning Department several times to change their site plan and they submitted a revised plan yesterday. They are trying to convert a single family residence to 3 condominium units. Their site plan reflects 3 parking spaces. They are in the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) so they are only required to have one parking space where they are providing three. They are also asking for three additional compact parking spaces for overflow parking.

Mr. Taintor thought this was an office building. Mr. Beane explained that the owner recently received a variance to convert the building to residential. Mr. Taintor explained that as it is not used as a residence they are actually converting an office building to three dwelling units. He also pointed out that the current owner needs to be on the plan and they should check with the owners to see how they want to be represented on the plan. As of yesterday, the owners stated that the plan had not been prepared for them.

Ms. Walker confirmed that there were still some things that needed to be worked out and they will need a variance for the density. She pointed out that there will be other things that they will need to submit in their final TAC submission for DPW to review. Mr. Rice confirmed that the water service needs to be shown. If they are going to have an additional fire service line, in addition to the domestic line, and that will need to be shown. All utilities that are being changed need to be shown. Mr. Rice also stated it needs to be clear if they are doing anything to modify their driveway access, or doing anything that interfaces with City property.

Mr. Rice also stated that as they are gutting the inside and they currently have one line to one meter to serve all three units. If they want separate water meters, they will need to show that they have separate plumbing to each unit. They will need to have enough detail to get approval from the Plumbing Inspector and when they come in for their water application at DPW they will need to have enough documentation for them to see that they are separate. The issue is if somebody has tapped off the line and they are using it and it says water and there is a complaint they don't have the ability to go after somebody if it is a common header. They need to call it out in a note if they are looking for separate meters because they have been running into this issue more and more lately.

Mr. Beane felt that most of the regulations deal with new construction where they are just dealing with existing conditions. Mr. Taintor stated they will need to provide a waiver request for any regulations

they do not feel they need to comply with. He assumed they were making landscaping and paving changes. Mr. Beane stated they are removing some structure and adding green space. Mr. Taintor indicated it was really hard to tell exactly what they are doing with the plans they submitted.

Mr. Rice noted that sewer and gas are not shown on the plan. Ms. Walker indicated that the plans need to be stamped by a NH licensed engineer. Mr. Beane stated they were unable to get inside the building to determine the sewer location.

Mr. Desfosses felt that a major impact was the removal of the structure and the fire line, which will be a pretty significant issue. As the water main is on the other side of State Street, they will have to close down one lane of traffic and dig up the new brick sidewalk. There are also electric lines for the street lights that are not shown on the plans. That will all need to be taken into account because it will definitely be considered as part of the bond. He encouraged the applicants to call the Water Department or Jamie McCarty at DPW for help locating all of the lines.

Mr. Taintor felt that it would be better to have an engineer involved because of the water connection. Mr. Rice confirmed they will need a detail on water showing how they will bed it, they need to show the connection, the value underneath the sidewalk, the size, they will need a trench detail and the pavement and sidewalk repair.

Mr. Beane indicated they were under a time crunch and they were frustrated that these items did not come up at the TAC Work Session. Mr. Rice felt that the information on the plans they received at the time didn't provide them any information to lead them to that conclusion.

Mr. Britz asked what happens at the end of the parking spaces. He asked if it will just be open to the adjacent lot. Mr. Beane gave that some thought because of plowing as the other lot is paved. They are receptive to putting bumpers in but the more they discussed this, it was felt it would behoove both properties to just leave it open and just paint the markings.

Mr. Beane asked if they were satisfied with their parking arrangement. They were using the old zoning and have since found out they are in the new character district. They are filing for a variance, to be heard at the July BOA meeting. Mr. Taintor indicated they will need the variance for any spaces that are provided.

Mr. Cracknell confirmed if they don't show parking spaces and they use the space for parking, it would be in violation of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, if they want to use that space for parking and they don't meet the City's parking requirements for the dimensions, they are technically not allowed. Just because they met the minimum it doesn't mean they can add to it. That is why they asked how many spaces they intend to have and they need to show them on the plan. They would then have to get a variance for the compact spaces. The only confusion they had at the Work Session was whether there was an exemption for compact cars, and there isn't one.

Ms. Walker also felt that, knowing this is going to the BOA, this is the opportunity for TAC to weight in on circulation. Mr. Taintor would like to confer with them after they get the revised plan it and he was wondering if there would be any setback requirements in the CD4-L that didn't exist in CBB. Mr. Cracknell was not aware of any setback requirements.

Mr. Cracknell felt they will also need a detail on the landscaping, which came up at the last meeting. They will need to know what material they are using, what the edging is on each place and they are

now talking about removing the steps on the side, which would be contingent upon HDC approval. Mr. Beane clarified it is one side of the steps although both were drawn. He will clarify that on the drawings. The steps are remaining as there is a door.

Mr. Taintor would like to see them file a revised Site Plan for the July 1st TAC hearing. He was not terribly concerned about the parking plan itself but wants to make sure they don't let them go through the process and miss a variance they need. Mr. Desfosses wanted to make sure they are not backing out of the driveway. Mr. Rice felt it was really tight. This is not a stamped drawing so he doesn't know if the turning radius is correct. Mr. Beane stated they meet the 18' setback off of a parking space and they have drawn in an average radius turn. Ms. Walker stated they don't have a turning radius in the Zoning Ordinance but the aisle width is 18' for one way traffic and 24' for two way traffic. Mr. Rice felt it would be tough in the wintertime with snow. Mr. Desfosses also didn't think they could get six cars in without backing out of the driveway. Mr. Taintor suggested getting rid of space #6 and call it a back up space.

Mr. Taintor felt the Committee has given the applicants guidance and if they have any questions they should call the Planning Department or DPW. They can move forward with the HDC and TAC process and they will need a variance on the dimensions for the three units. TAC could continue to move forward contingent upon getting the BOA variances.

Mr. Beane wanted to review the revisions they were looking for. They included the water main, an engineered drawing, removal of parking space #6, a landscaping plan, information on the sewer location. Mr. Desfosses stated there is underground power in front and that should be shown on the plans so that when putting the water in, they will know it is there. They need to show the gas line, the sewer lateral, proposed water fire service line, and they need to show the location of the water main in the street. Mr. Beane asked if those locations were available through DPW. Mr. Desfosses advised him to contact Jamie McCarty, at DPW, and he can show him a sketch of where the water main is located. He should be able to find everything else in the building basement.

Mr. Taintor advised them to go through the Site Plan regulations and identify the things they need to waive and put those into a letter, to be filed along with the revised site plans.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Cracknell made a motion to postpone this matter to the next TAC hearing on Tuesday, July 1, 2014 at 2:00 pm. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone Site Plan Review approval to the July 1, 2014 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Great Bay Community College, Applicant**, for property located at **320 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 2-story building expansion with a footprint of 20,000 s.f. ±, and a parking lot expansion resulting in a net increase of 21 parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 315 as Lot 4 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe & Bond, was present with Matt Moore and Will Obello, of Great Bay Community College, Tracey Kozac, the project architect and Maria Stowell, of the PDA. This is a 20,000 s.f. building expansion with site improvements on the western side of the school. The expansion itself is 2-stories. They met with the PDA on May 15th and received approval of their conceptual plans. They provided plan sets, drainage analysis, traffic statement (requested by the PDA Board). They attended the TAC Work Session last week and received comments which were incorporated into the site plans.

The expansion is on the western side of the building.

Sheet 3C: The site currently consist of 500+ parking spaces and this project increases them by 21. That does not meet the PDA land control requirements however the PDA put a stipulation of approval on their parking and traffic statement. The college also utilizes a vacant lot for overflow parking. During the fall, which is the busiest time of the year, the overflow lot does get utilized but not the rest of the year. Their traffic statement showed morning and afternoon numbers which showed adequate access. The building expansion is to be used by current student enrollment and will not increase vehicles. They will have special events but not at peak traffic time. VHB did a review of their traffic statement and their conclusion is that the current parking situation is sufficient to support the expansion. Also, as part of the PDA Board approval there were additional stipulations that if a host community event should happen (sporting event) outside their principal use they will be required to get approval from the PDA for that event and parking will be reviewed every year.

Sheet 3C-A: This is a blow up of the addition showing the parking expansion. There is a large concrete area at the entrance which is intended for students to congregate when it is nice outside. Pedestrian connections through the parking lot was addressed by a straight line through the parking lot. Another comment was relative to the current Coast bus route through the parking lot. It comes in, down the southeast drive of the college turns into the main entrance, and exits out southeast of Grafton Drive. They spoke with Coast and showed them the proposed Site Plan and they confirmed this is their route and they just asked to soften the turn at the exit so they increased the radius to 35'.

Sheet 3C-4A: The project is going to be required to have a DES Stormwater Management Plan. That application will be submitted next week with a copy to the City and PDA. They provided a drainage analysis. The proposed project will incorporate in the new parking area with new catch basins and deep sumps.

Sheet 4-B: They are constructing a gravel wetland for the water collected in the parking lot, where it will be detained and treated. It will detain the run off so that the peak rates will be less than or equal to the current rates. This will be the same for the volume.

Utilities, Sheet 5-A: Most utilities will be connected through the existing building. They are proposing a new sanitary sewer service to run down the current exit drive and it will tie into the manhole. That pipe size will not be increased to 8". There is also an exterior gas service that needs to be connected between the two buildings. The building will impact the location of the existing hydrant so they are relocating it. They added turning templates to show that fire trucks can get in and out from the hydrant.

Sheet C-6: Updated Landscape Plan. Robbie Woodburn, Landscape Architect, has been brought on board. She provided the Landscape Plan which addresses comments from the Committee. Those comments include the lack of landscaping around the perimeter of the building addition so they added some trees, shrubs and perennials. They were asked to add additional landscaping along the frontage of Corporate Drive and they have added trees all along the parking area.

There is also a photometric plan provided.

Mr. Walker thought the idea of improving pedestrian access was not captured in the plan. She felt the consideration was how to provide a safer connection and how to go from overflow parking would be better served by wrapping the concrete sidewalk around to other entrance or at least bringing it closer. Mr. Rice concurred. He was envisioning something to access the overflow parking lot. Mr. Crimmins stated they will take a look at doing something to further address that..

Mr. Rice noted on Sheet 5-B they show a sewer line going through the gravel wetland. The insulation doesn't seem to be called out. He asked if they are looking at a 2 ½' or 2 ¾' cover. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that no, that is from the bottom of the gravel wetland is 3.8 and the sewer pipe is 3.2 so there is about 4' of cover. That is an existing condition. They are not changing the base elevation of the detention pond. The bottom of the pond is the same but they are expanding the gravel wetland and that is why they are proposing to insulate the pipe. Mr. Desfosses asked if they performed test pits. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they did not but the purpose was to stay saturated.

Mr. Rice noted that they don't have an actual elevation of the system they are tying into for the new sewer system. The invert elevation has changed since their previous submission. Mr. Crimmins explained that they found record drawings that showed elevations from the PDA office. The line was actually upgraded at one point to the manhole directly downstream from that. They are asking for the elevation to be verified in the field.

Fire Inspector Howe asked about the fire connection in the new building. Mr. Crimmins indicated it is going on the same side of the proposed addition, near the hydrant. Fire Inspector Howe stated he was a little concern about access. They wouldn't want to drag a line over snow.

Fire Inspector Howe asked about other fire protection on other side of the building. He asked if they can pump into either or are they separate systems.

Tracey Kozac stated that she believes there is only one location which is between the addition and the back entrance along the back parking lot. Fire Inspector Howe stated there is one currently where the

addition is going. He drove around the site this morning and there is another one in the rear. He just wants to know if they will be interconnected. Ms. Kozac stated they will determine that.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the Lighting Plan. Mr. Crimmins stated the Photometric Plan was in the back. Mr. Desfosses asked for cast iron handicapped panels. There is a truncated dome detail but it doesn't call out where it is being used. He asked if they are getting into any City drainage. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they are not, it is all on site, and are discharging to the existing culverts.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the hydrants at Pease open the other way so they need to reverse the hydrant. Mr. Rice asked them to confirm that with the City Water Department. Also, the hydrant has a drainage hole which they don't allow.

Mr. Desfosses indicated, as a general idea, moving forward, he sometimes has trouble visualizing what is going on, and it is helpful to have a building plan imposed on top of an existing site. That way you don't have to go back and forth on the plan set. Mr. Crimmins agreed that was a good comment.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they are using dark sky friendly lights. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that they are.

Mr. Taintor indicated that when he spoke to Maria Stowell they discussed moving the parking set back line and she asked the PDA if they would eventually consider that the front line and not the side line. Ms. Stowell responded that she believes she sent him the Memo that went to the Board and that part would be considered a side yard and several spaces were still expanding into the front yard. The Board didn't feel a variance was necessary and as they are the State they are exempt. Their determination was that it is a side yard.

Mr. Taintor asked how this development would affect this. Ms. Stowell stated the College is using that lot for overflow parking. The Board agreed to review parking annually and that would always be considered regarding any new development.

Ms. Walker wanted to acknowledge that once the building is built, they have to deal with it.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Britz made a motion to approve with the stipulations as discussed above. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

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

1. Consideration should be given to providing a connection along the side of the parking lot, to extend to the end of the newly added parking lot.
2. The invert elevation of the receiving manhole shall be confirmed and the slope adjusted accordingly, to be reviewed and approved by DPW.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:10 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Acting Secretary