

MINUTES

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2:00 PM

FEBRUARY 3, 2015

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner; Peter Rice, Director, Public Works; Raymond Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineers; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking & Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Deputy Fire Chief; and Mark Newport, Portsmouth Police Department

.....

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Merton Alan Investments, LLC, Owner** and **Robert Graham, Applicant**, for property located on **Bartlett Street and Cate Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 3-story office building with a footprint of 10,000 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 30,000 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 165 as Lot 1 and lies within the Industrial (I) District. (This application was postponed at the December 30, 2014 TAC meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe and Bond was present to speak to the application. The site is currently a vacant lot located at the intersection of Bartlett and Cate Street. The site has some remnant foundations in the back corner, and an old driveway. There is also an existing 7,000 s.f. wetland along Cate Street that will be impacted by this project. The applicant will require NH Department of Environmental Services approval for the project (this has been submitted). The proposal is for a 3-story office building with a footprint of 10,000 s.f. with 30,000 s.f. (3 stories) of office space. There will be 120 parking spaces located at the back of the site and frontage along Cate Street. The applicant has worked through some design issues. The project will require variances for setbacks (constraints due to the uniqueness of the site). Since the last submittal in November, the building has been moved back (as far as it can go without digging into the slope along the railroad tracks) as recommended by TAC. The rear of the building is now located in the rear setback. The project is located in the Industrial District so a front setback is needed.

The site is currently being looked at for rezoning. Site data is included based on the current Industrial District as well as the proposed Gateway District. The site may also be subject to further review and

change based on what takes place at the City Design Charrette in February. There are plans to install a raingarden (as part of the Stormwater Management Design) and decorative landscaping. This enhanced corner will be a focal point of the site. The applicant met with TAC and they have provided a recommendation to NH Department of Environmental Services of approval with the stipulation that snow and salt applications be managed in accordance with NH Department of Environmental Management Practices. The applicant also met with Dave Desfosses on January 15, 2015 and as a result of that meeting the applicant has set the curb line and sidewalk back and created a right of way. The applicant is giving 7,000 s.f. of the land to the City for widening of the roadway in this location. That widening (42') at the intersection of Cate and Bartlett Streets will allow for two designated turning lanes, and two 5' bike lanes. This is not yet shown on the plan (at the direction of the applicant). However, sketches of this design were provided today to TAC. The applicant will work with the City to complete the widening.

The property will have two raingardens (one in the front and one in back) in accordance with Department of Environmental Services standards and guidelines. Stormwater will be collected, treated and discharged to City streets at a rate equal to or less than the current volume for the existing conditions. The applicant has included a Photometrics Plan in the packet for today as well as cut sheets and a Drainage Plan that depicts peak rates and volumes. All of the utilities will be tapped from Cate Street. There will be three LED fixtures in the parking area. With the lighting design, light will not spill across the Railroad tracks. The Landscape Plan shows landscaping along the perimeter as well as street trees along Cate Street.

Mr. Taintor read an email from an abutter (The Button Factory). The abutter is requesting a fence along the property line where it abuts the railroad tracks to prevent pedestrian cut-through traffic on his property.

Mr. Desfosses asked the applicant to ensure that the lighting is dark-sky friendly and that the fixtures are high enough so that residents across the railroad tracks will not see the bulbs. The current height of the poles is 20'. He requested that the applicant do a study to determine whether the residents will see the bulbs.

Mr. Rice stated that the work for the widening of the road would be incumbent on the developer (to rebuild that section of the road) independent of the work by the City of Portsmouth.

Mr. Taintor stated that the conceptual design for the road depicts a long unprotected crossing. He inquired as to whether a refuge/raised median can be put at the intersection so that pedestrians don't have to cross a wide intersection.

It was pointed out that a raised median may make turns in and out of the intersection difficult.

Mr. Crimmins stated that they are happy to work with the City to ensure the plan is to the liking of the Planning Department and the DPW.

Mr. Taintor pointed out that with regard to the widening, a 30' front yard has been noted, but in fact it will be reduced to a 15' front yard with the proposed lot line revision. In order to approve this plan, a variance will have to be granted to allow the 15' front yard.

Mr. Taintor stated that the transfer of land (1,300 s.f.) from the city to the owner does not seem to be related to the driveway.

Mr. Crimmins stated that the intent was to leave some land so that the driveway could be defined at a later point in time. He stated that the roadway design is not yet complete and is labeled as "approximate" so that the limits of this can be designated at a later time.

Mr. Rice stated that the sidewalk width is shown as 5 ½'. To make it 6', the City of Portsmouth would have to encroach on the applicant's property. Mr. Rice feels the city would be better served with a wider sidewalk given maintenance challenges.

Mr. Desfosses stated that a snow/sidewalk plowing easement would be needed given that there is no extra right of way in this area for snow management.

Mr. Rice stated that currently there are no plans for restaurants in this area. However, he would like the applicant to depict where a future external grease trap would be located (they don't have to actually install the trap, but just depict where it would go).

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger inquired as to whether there was any comment from the Board of Adjustment related to the letter about the fence.

Mr. Taintor stated that they have not seen the letter yet.

Mr. Desfosses verbalized another thought regarding the road alignment. If Bartlett Street is widened or the configuration of the street is changed (specifically the radius coming out of the intersection for the new road), it would be helpful (on the drawing) to take off the corner of the right of way. There would be room then to do a slope easement.

Mr. Eby asked the applicant to ensure that the handicap/van accessible spaces will be 11' wide with a 5' aisle, or 8' wide with an 8' aisle.

Mr. Crimmins will check into this measurement to ensure it is correct.

Mr. Eby inquired as to whether the loading zone was part of this area and wanted to ensure that trucks are not going to be using the handicap accessible area to make their turns into and out of the loading area.

Mr. Crimmins stated that there is a loading zone next to the building as required by the regulations. It is a 12' X 20' area. The loading would occur next to the building (between the dumpster and the building sidewalk to the left of the transformer pad).

Mr. Rice inquired about the Planting Plan for the raingardens.

Mr. Crimmins stated that there is a plan for the planting of the rear raingarden, but no decorative plantings planned to date on the front raingarden. He will work with the Landscape Architect to ensure this happens.

Ms. Walker stated that there is a lot of paving with a lack of accommodation to pedestrians with this project. She realizes the applicant is constrained at this site. However, it is not the most desirable environment when people getting out of their cars must walk across a large paved area.

Mr. Crimmins realizes this and stated that this is something that has been a struggle with this project. They either provide parking lot landscaping, or a sidewalk.

Mr. Eby stated the accessible ramp at the corner of the driveway seems like it is directing people out into Cate Street.

Mr. Crimmins will adjust this on the drawings.

Mr. Desfosses requested that the applicant put in a sidewalk section/stub (between the sidewalks) where the concrete patio is located in the front of the building.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else 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. Desfosses made a motion to grant Site Plan Approval with the stipulations as discussed. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

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

1. The site plans shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Revise the lot corner at the Cate/Bartlett intersection to provide for intersection improvements as part of the redesign of Cate Street.
 - b. Increase the width of the sidewalk along Cate Street from 5.5 feet to 6 feet.
 - c. Provide the City with a sidewalk plowing easement adjacent to the sidewalk.
 - d. Add a direct pedestrian connection from the Cate Street sidewalk to the front door of the building.
 - e. Adjust the accessible ramp at the driveway entrance so that it is oriented across the driveway rather than toward Cate Street.
 - f. Provide a planting plan for the rain garden on the Bartlett Street side of the property, to be reviewed by the Planning Department prior to the Planning Board meeting.
 - g. Show a potential location for an external grease trap if one should be needed in the future.
 - h. Define the limits of the required land transfers and easements necessary to implement the proposed site plan and roadway improvements, including review of the area that is proposed to be transferred by the City to the applicant for driveway construction.

2. The applicant shall review the lighting plan to ensure that there will be no light trespass onto neighboring residential properties, and to prevent glare perceptible to persons on such residential properties.
3. The applicant shall work with the Department of Public Works on the final redesign of Cate Street and on an appropriate sharing of costs for the work (or shall do the work in conjunction with the proposed project).
4. The applicant shall enter into a Memorandum of Agreement with the City regarding land transfers and easements necessary to implement the proposed site plan and roadway improvements, and cost sharing for the improvements to Cate Street.

.....

B. The application of **Moray, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **235 Commerce Way**, and **215 Commerce Way, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **215 Commerce Way**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 4-story office building with a footprint of 28,125 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 112,500 ± s.f., and 640 parking spaces serving the proposed building and an adjacent existing office building (including a parking deck with 161 spaces below grade), with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 216 as Lot 1-8A and Lot 1-8B and lie within the Office Research (OR) District. (This application was postponed at the December 30, 2014 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Rice made a motion to postpone this application until the March 3, 2015 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone the application to the March 3rd, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Rye Corner Gas, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **1150 Sagamore Avenue**, **Two Wentworth House Road LLC, Owner**, for property located at **2 Wentworth House Road**, and the **Bean Group, Applicant**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an abandoned gas station and a single family dwelling and the construction of an 8,000 s.f. professional office building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 201 as Lots 21 and 22 and lies within the Mixed Residential Business (MRB) district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Ted Vrettos, Architect and Construction Manager with Plan Ahead LLC was present to represent the owner Michael Bean of the Bean group. Michael Hamm with Engineering Alliance was also present to speak to the application. The plans have been modified after comments received last week. Currently, there is an existing gas station, no longer in service, on the site. The adjacent lot is a single family dwelling. The proposal is to combine the two lots. Mr. Hamm discussed the modifications made to the plan since last week. The applicant is proposing a single entrance from Sagamore Avenue. An accessory entrance 9' in width will be located in the back. The applicant handed out new modified/updated plans. There are no substantial changes to the plans. The site layout is the same as it was previously. The parking spaces are slightly wider. There is no curbing on the roads as they are state roads. The applicant has been in contact with the NH DOT to discuss this, as well as a culvert. Regarding the Grading and Drainage Plan, it was decided that the applicant would utilize a subsurface infiltration facility. The roof and parking lot runoff will be conveyed to the drainage system. Part of this design includes a septic system with tanks, a pump chamber and a leeching facility in the auxiliary parking area. There was discussion about offsets from the leeching facility for the septic to the stormwater system. The interpretation by the State is that this would be a minimum 35' offset. They are currently at a little over 37'. The Utility Plan shows the septic system. The water service for the gas station currently comes in on Sagamore Avenue. The preference is to install a new water main as the previous is old.

The suggestion for the Landscape Plan is to increase the amount of landscaping along the road. They did have low growing perennials but the revised plans show changes to more shrubby plantings, a few shade trees. In addition, some smaller shrubs and ground covers have been added focusing on native plantings. The revised plans also show screening (as required in the MRB District) dependent upon soil conditions, which are uncertain at the moment. The alternative to this is a 6' high fence, which may be a better option for several reasons.

Mr. Taintor stated that there are no specifications for the screening plantings noted in the plans.

Mr. Hamm stated that this is the case until the soil conditions are a known. Shade tolerant plantings will be necessary; possibly evergreen shrubs.

Mr. Taintor stated that "Mixed Residential" is not a "Residential" classification in terms of zoning so the requirement for "screening" may not be there.

Mr. Hamm stated that the Lighting Plan shows pole mounted fixtures. The fixtures are fully shielded to ensure that the light stays on the subject parcel. They are full cut-off fixtures that are dark-sky friendly. Mounting heights have been corrected on the updated plans.

Mr. Taintor asked that the note on the plans state that the lighting shall comply with the City Ordinance (to replace the current note that states that lighting may not comply with ordinances).

Mr. Desfosses stated that one of the projects currently underway is running low pressure sewer in the area of this project. There are plans for other projects taking place in the same area to run low-pressure systems to the sewer system. DPW will be working with the applicant to change the planned septic system under the parking lot to a low pressure sewer.

Mr. Vrettos stated that that applicant is happy to work with the City to install the low-pressure system, but they do not have a handle on costs.

Mr. Desfosses stated that a shared cost between the applicant and the City can be determined. He stated that if access to a municipal sewer system is available, the opportunity should be taken, particularly for a business. If the currently planned leech fields were to fail, the applicant would lose a lot of their parking for a period of time. The applicant wouldn't have to buy the chambers or be concerned about a septic tank and having it pumped (as well as other associated issues) if tying into the municipal sewer system.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger inquired about the size of the old water line being abandoned.

Mr. Hamm is uncertain, but thinks the line may be 1 – 1 ¼' for domestic use at the gas station and house.

Deputy Chief Roediger asked that the applicant consider a yard hydrant. It could be placed as you pull into the property on the left-hand side. This would be convenient to the shut-off and other lines.

The applicant is willing to consider this option.

Ms. Walker inquired as to whether trash collection for this site has been resolved. They will have internal receptacles, but no outer dumpster sites.

Mr. Rice stated that there is City trash collection (curbside) in this area. There are restrictions on how much commercial trash can be generated, and there must be recycling and totes. The limits on volume for trash is in the City ordinance under Solid Waste.

The applicant anticipates a high volume of recyclables (paper).

Mr. Taintor stated that there are no sidewalks and that pedestrian access is desirable in this area.

Ms. Walker stated that this was in fact discussed at the last meeting (when Mr. Taintor was absent) and that if sidewalks go in, they would be across the street.

Mr. Rice stated that there will be bike paths.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the presence of a curb will most definitely be part of this plan and needs to be defined.

The applicant stated that they have had trouble scheduling a meeting with NH DOT.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the applicant should draw this (the curbing) up as suggested at the last meeting. He would be happy to join the applicant in meeting with the NH DOT. He requested that the applicant draw up plans and send them to him for approval.

Ms. Walker stated that this area is part of the Scenic Byway for which a Corridor Management Plan is under development. Inclusion of bike lanes is an integral part of this plan. Since the applicant is not providing sidewalks and no pedestrian access, and is requesting a waiver for this, it would be a good for the applicant to make accommodations by showing bike paths and formalizing the bike lanes.

Mr. Taintor stated that the applicant will need to have a variance for a second free-standing sign.

Mr. Taintor stated that the current plans retain all existing conditions. There could be a demolition plan in between but typically, the plan would show future conditions only and not existing conditions (that will not be there in the end). The guardrail should also be reflected in the plan.

Mr. Britz asked that the applicant place rip rap around the outlet pipe to protect it.

Mr. Hamm stated that there are building elevations in the revised plan set.

Mr. Taintor requested that doors be added to the 3,000 s.f. business space. With the connections, this will become an 8,000 s.f space in effect (3,000 s.f. and 5,000 s.f.). The two office spaces will not be distinct. 8,000 s.f. would violate the Zoning Ordinance. Otherwise, the applicant should apply for a variance. As is, this plan is not approvable.

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. Desfosses stated that there are enough missing pieces to the application that it should be postponed.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone the application to the next scheduled TAC meeting on March 3rd, 2015. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone this application to the March 3rd, TAC meeting passed unanimously.

Mr. Taintor clarified issues that need to be addressed and changed before the next Planning Board meeting/submission and include:

- 1) Sewer vs. Septic
- 2) Road design
- 3) Curb
- 4) Drainage across the road
- 5) Variances
- 6) Signs
- 7) Doors

.....

B. The application of **Rye Port Properties, Owner**, and **Charter Foods North LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **2299 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 50-seat, 2500 s.f. Taco Bell Restaurant with drive thru, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 272 as Lot 10 and lies within the Gateway district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

No one was present to speak to the application.

Ms. Walker stated that there was discussion around postponement as they had yet to submit needed materials such as the Traffic Study.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application until the next scheduled TAC meeting on March 3rd, 2015. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the application to the March 3rd, 2015 passed unanimously.

.....
C. The application of **Dale W. and Sharyn W. Smith, Owners**, and **Richard Green, Green & Company Real Estate, Applicant**, for property located at **275 Islington Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed residential development consisting of 14 dwelling units in 5 buildings with a total footprint of 10,874 ± s.f., including 27 parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 144 as Lot 8 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) district and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Joe Coronati of Jones and Beach Engineers, Inc., of Stratham along with Rick and Janet Green, Attorney Bernie Pelech, and Architect Wendy Welton were present to speak to the application. There are 5 proposed buildings for townhomes. It is the existing site of the Old Port Traders on Islington Street. The property runs from Rockingham Street on the west side to Islington Street and down Cornwall Street (there is frontage on 3 roads). They are located in the Central Business and Historic Districts. They have been to HDC and the Zoning Board twice.

The proposal is to construct an access road from Cornwall Street to Rockingham Street. Each of the 5 buildings would have garages in the rear that will not be seen from the street. It will be 5 buildings that conform to the character of the historic district. There is the ability with this project to add parking on some of the streets. There is parking on Rockingham Street but none on Cornwall Street. An additional buffer will be provided at the intersections. There will be a sidewalk on Islington and the side streets. The width and style of the sidewalks needs to be discussed. Mr. Green would prefer to have brick sidewalks. There are brickwalk ways coming to the front doors of each of the units. The

applicant proposed a 7' wide sidewalk and would like to keep that width. Alignment of the sidewalk would be on Islington Street. There has been discussion around having an 8' wide sidewalk but that would put a portion of the sidewalk on the applicant's property and they would like to keep the sidewalk off private land as there would be little space to landscape. They would like to dress up the property and have as much room as possible to provide privacy to the residents. They are willing to use brick for the sidewalk or a combination of brick and concrete, but would prefer all brick.

Ms. Walker stated that the parking space size and visible sight line issues were discussed at the last two meetings (particularly at the intersections) and asked the applicant speak to those issues. In addition, at the corner of Cornwall and Islington Streets in front of the property, the bus stop located there is not depicted on the Plans. She asked the applicant note this on the plans.

Mr. Coronati stated that the comment at TAC was to have 20' of no parking at intersections. They will adjust the Islington Street side accordingly. They had worked in a 7th parking space, but that space could be removed. In order to provide a 20' section, they will lose a spot on Cornwall Street, but could lose more. He feels they can achieve what the City would like to see.

Mr. Desfosses inquired as to whether gutters would be provided on the two buildings on Rockingham or Cornwall Streets. The buildings are located directly adjacent to the sidewalks.

Mr. Coronati stated that there has been talk of gutters but the applicant is not proposing to have them. There would be a drip edge along the hip roof. The rest of the roof lines incorporate a stone drip edge on the back of the buildings. The rainwater would run off into the stormwater collection system.

Ms. Welton, Architect for the project, stated that currently they are showing gutters on the buildings on those sides of the buildings but were waiting for this process to determine where gutters can be removed.

Mr. Coronati stated that if there were gutters, there would be nowhere for the downspout(s) to tie into.

Mr. Desfosses stated that this would be no problem if there were a setback, but there is no setback. He sees no protection for people from rain without gutters.

Mr. Coronati stated that a gutter line could be installed on one side, but the other side increases in elevation and it would not be practical to install gutters there (the site drops in elevation from Cornwall Street to Rockingham Street). He stated that it is not uncommon to have roofwater dripping off buildings in downtown Portsmouth and since it is a hip roof it is a small area.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the applicant has made a determination regarding the flow characteristics inside the 6" pipe. Currently all that water is running off the site and is picked up down the street.

Mr. Coronati stated that they kept adding chambers to the pipe until it would hold all the storms including a 50 year and 100 year storm.

Mr. Desfosses stated that there are three other projects that are using this pipe to drain their sump pumps, and that currently up to 30% of the use of that pipe has already been allocated.

Mr. Desfosses inquired into how the applicant is planning on tying into the 6" line.

Mr. Coronati stated that they have a series of manholes to tie into. They are also keeping the 6" line on their property as well.

Mr. Desfosses stated that he would like more time to review the drain study.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger commented that there are a lot of decks above ground level. Looking forward, people (condo residents) will likely be putting grills on those decks which are not code compliant. He asked the applicant consider the installation of grills by hard piping through a fixed gas line.

Ms. Welton stated that the condo development will have bylaws. Any and all residents would not be able to do something such as this without the approval of the condo association. She feels that at this time grills would not be appropriate and may not be allowed. In addition, to do anything to the exterior, HDC must be consulted.

Ms. Walker asked for further clarification on the issue of sidewalk width. She stated that the public sidewalk will be installed by the City of Portsmouth, and a concession that is appropriate for the applicant to make is to add an additional foot of sidewalk on their property to make the sidewalk 6' in width. She also asked that the applicant verify where the Bus Stop is located and make note of that.

Mr. Coronati stated that there are a couple of concerns with widening the sidewalks onto their property and that it is not only a matter of conceding the additional 1' of space. The areas in front of the buildings become smaller than 5' in effect reducing the amount of open space for which they have already had to acquire a variance. The stairwells would encroach on the sidewalks which would not be safe. There are no obstructions to walking on the sidewalk such as mailboxes or utility poles so that a sidewalk that is not quite as wide would be logical.

Mr. Rice stated that a corridor study/design is in the works and this will significantly impact the sidewalks in this area. As part of a more friendly and walkable city, Portsmouth is looking to have wider sidewalks so they will be asking to have the extra foot on the sidewalk width for this project.

Mr. Coronati stated that brick is the preferred material for the sidewalks for aesthetic reasons.

Mr. Taintor stated that the City has a requirement for concrete in this area.

Mr. Rice stated that concrete with brick accents is consistent with the spirit of Council policy and that this condition exists in other areas of the City.

Attorney Bernie Pelech stated that it is his understanding there is a provision (under consideration) where an applicant can seek approval from the City for brick where concrete is now required for sidewalks. If that is possible, they would seek approval from the City Council.

Mr. Rice stated that this provision passed and the applicant would appeal to the Director of Public Works for this approval.

Ms. Walker stated that in many cases, people walking the sidewalks, particularly those that have trouble navigating a sidewalk to begin with, prefer concrete. She recommended that if aesthetics are the only reason the applicant is considering brick, they may want to reconsider.

Mr. Pelech stated that they may be able to compromise regarding the sidewalk by providing an 8' sidewalk in some areas to a 7' sidewalk and a 5' sidewalk in other areas.

The Chair called for public speakers.

Angela Lambert owns the acupuncture business on corner of Cornwall and Islington Streets and was present to speak to the application. She has a concern for elderly patients she sees and stated that the last project down the street from her office had removed all of the 2-hour parking signs. Construction vehicles were parked in those areas where the signs were taken away and it had a major impact on her elderly patients for parking. Her acupuncture office faces the proposed project and although she thinks it will look much better than it currently does, she asked if a sound barrier could be put up during construction to mitigate noise.

Mr. Rice stated that as part of the construction phase, the City can ensure that there would be parking available. He is not familiar with 2-hour parking signs being taken down during construction. Although he is not familiar with any noise barriers that could be erected, noise ordinances must be followed. Mr. Rice asked that Ms. Lambert let the City know if the 2-hour parking signs are removed.

Ms. Walker inquired as to whether there is any possibility of a porous/permeable pavement material that could be used for the sidewalk along certain sections.

Mr. Rice stated that there are materials for this use, but they have their challenges and he would not advocate for it as the City of Portsmouth would be taking over maintenance after the construction phase. This type of material would have special maintenance requirements.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else 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

Deputy Chief Roediger made a motion to approve the application with multiple stipulations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Stipulations that were discussed were 1) Drainage; 2) Sidewalk (8'width); 3) Gutters on the ends of the buildings on both sides of the block, the Rockingham side (with downspouts not dumping into sidewalks); and 4) Changing Site Lines at the Corners (getting as close to 20' as possible) while maintaining 6 parking spaces.

Mr. Desfosses is uncomfortable with using the 6" pipe for the drainage. The applicant needs to ensure there will be adequate capacity because there will be other users of the system. There is a great deal of flow potentially going through this 6" pipe.

Deputy Chief Roediger takes issue with mandating 8' sidewalks (only 1' wider than what the applicant currently is proposing) which would in effect render the plans the applicant has done to date useless. This is something that should have come up previous to this.

Ms. Walker feels strongly that the sidewalk should be 8'. This requires a foot or so to be on the property of the applicant. The plan currently shows a 7' sidewalk. She expressed frustration that the buildings are as close as they are. The applicant has maxed out the site.

Mr. Coronati stated that they would have room for the 8' sidewalk on the Cornwall side. The 7' sidewalk is on the Rockingham side and they would not need an easement for that. The sidewalks taper from Rockingham Street to Cabot Street. Otherwise, parking would have to change. The Rockingham side would start at 7' and taper down to 5'. The applicant is happy to provide 8' on one side and would provide 7' on the other side. He stated that they did not know about the 8' request prior to this and that Site Plan Review Regulations require 5' for sidewalks.

Mr. Desfosses stated that he likes the project, but is uncomfortable with the 6" pipe. The water from the site currently goes down the road and gets picked up at McDonough Street. With this project, it will be taken through a pipe for which it wasn't intended. He wants to ensure there is adequate capacity to handle the additional volume of water. The pipe may have to be replaced, which would be a shame because it is a new pipe.

Ms. Walker stated that the result of the discussion at the last work session (previous to the session last week) was that the applicant would show the delineated open space on the plans.

Mr. Coronati stated that the dark lines of hatching depicted on the plans show the open space. They are now at less than the requirement of 15%. On the plans, it now shows 12.1%. They have to go back to the Zoning Board

Mr. Taintor stated that there is a lot of support for this project in the neighborhood.

Mr. Pelech stated that with regard to how the project got this far in the first place (responding to an earlier remark) is that in the Site Plan Review Regulations, it states that 5' is the requirement for sidewalks. The authority is given to the Planning Board to increase width if they see the need. If the Planning Board sees the need for an 8' sidewalk with this project, the applicant is willing to give that in areas. They went through 2 work sessions with TAC and until the last work session, the applicant did not know about the 8' need for width and feels that providing a 7' wide sidewalk in some areas and an 8' width in other areas is more than reasonable.

Mr. Desfosses disagrees with Mr. Pelech on this issue. Since the applicant must go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, this can be reviewed at a later time if it comes back.

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

1. The site plans shall be revised as follows:
 - a. The Islington Street sidewalk shall be 8 feet wide.
 - b. The end units on Islington Street (at the corners of Cornwall and Rockingham Streets) shall include roof gutters that drain to the closed drainage system.
 - c. The number of parking spaces on Islington Street shall be reduced to 6, with 20 feet of clearance (or as close as possible) from each intersection.
2. The plans are subject to DPW review of the drainage system and any recommendations, which may include replacing the 6" drain line in Cornwall Street.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:15 pm and seconded and passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,



Toni McLellan
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee