

**MINUTES**

**SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**2:00 PM**

**MARCH 31, 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 Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking & Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Portsmouth Fire Department; and Michael Schwartz, Portsmouth Police Department

.....  
**I. OLD BUSINESS**

A. 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 March 3, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE**

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone Site Plan Approval to the May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone Site Plan Approval to the May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....  
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. (This application was postponed at the March 3, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Mark Gross with MFH Design Consultants was present to speak to the application. The project Environmental Consultant contacted NH DES to discuss an alternative method for dealing with the AUR. NH DES is amenable to eliminating much of the chainlink fence. The fence will be located along the drive-thru for the Taco Bell and will extend to the front of the AUR where the arborvitae hedge will be. The applicant felt that this will be an effective way to prevent access to this area. The chain link fence will go only as far back as the treeline and the treeline will provide buffer beyond that. The driveway will show pavement markings along with signage which will delineate the driveway. There will be a double yellow line with a stop bar and a stop sign which will identify the egress and the entrance into the existing driveway. The application is currently under review by District 6 of the NH DOT. With regard to the permit, there were no restrictions put on turning out of the driveway. NH DOT indicated to the property owner that restrictions would apply if the driveway were to be upgraded at any point in time in the future with a median.

In terms of the sewer (Utilities Plan), there was an issue about the existing service being too shallow. What they are proposing is to put in a new 8" service on a flatter slope with more depth. There will need to be a trench permit. They will need to obtain permission from Advance Auto who has a land lease with the owner. As far as the wetland delineation, there is still an issue with snow cover at the site so the delineation cannot be completed at this time. However, at the end of this week, or next week, a site visit is planned for finalizing the delineation in order to submit it to the Conservation Commission by April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2015. Mr. Gross reports that the applicant has spoken with the owner who said that the condo association had no interest in granting access to Meadowbrook Road.

Heather Monticup of GPI Engineers was present to speak to the application. Ms. Monticup spoke to the outstanding traffic issues. The Coast Bus Stop location has been checked. The current location is on a utility pole in front of the site. The applicant felt (based on research) that it can be taken off the pole and moved 45' closer to the traffic signal. She stated that Coast is amenable to moving the bus stop. However, they wanted things that the applicant cannot accommodate such as a bus pullout. She stated that there is not enough room to create a pullout. The applicant felt that the stop should stay within the wide-striped shoulder. If the City would like to move the stop, the applicant has no problem with that. The sidewalk request by TAC has been accommodated. NH DOT will be replacing a lot of signal loops in the state and that will include the intersection (Route 1, Southgate Plaza and Springbrook Circle) at this site. The signalized intersection should then work better. Local collision data has been obtained from the Portsmouth Police Department. There were 8 crashes at the signalized intersection and none reported at the Advance Auto Parts driveway (which is the intersection in this project). All auto accidents occurred in dry conditions. Six crashes were rear end crashes and two were cross movement crashes. The applicant reached out to the State Police Department regarding the pedestrian fatality which was due to the pedestrian not using the crosswalk when he was struck. All project information has been submitted to NH DOT. There were no comments on the traffic study. They are looking for a new plan from the applicant that shows the location of the sidewalk if they are going to relocate the bus stop and what the cost would be. There are no driveway restrictions at the site from NH DOT. Mr. Gross pointed out that they will be adding a sidewalk going from the sidewalk that will be installed on Route 1 up to the site (will include ramps). This will make this area accessible.

Mr. Eby stated that it looks like the sidewalk is on the abutter's property on the plans.

Mr. Gross stated that they will address this. This detail needs to be revised.

Ms. Walker inquired as to whether it is within the NH DOT easement area.

Mr. Gross will check on this.

Mr. Eby stated that the bus stop should be moved 40'-45' so that it is closer to the signal. He felt that it should be lined up with the sidewalk.

Mr. Gross stated that they will do this.

Mr. Eby still has a problem with the driveway. His recommendation to NH DOT will be for right turns only out of the site. Left turns in would be acceptable, but not left turns out of the site. There would be a lot of vehicles turning left out of Taco Bell and access to the driveway would likely be blocked.

Ms. Monticup is concerned with allowing only right turns out of the site. She felt that this will cause people to make U-Turns after making the allowed right turn, or would cause them to use the Burger King property. She would rather the vehicles cue up (staying on site to make the turn) rather than to have to have them turn right and make a turn somewhere else off site in order to end up going left.

Mr. Eby stated that the driveway queue is very short in this area. One or two cars backed up will block access into the Auto parts business.

Ms. Monticup inquired about installing a sign stating "Do Not Block This Area".

Mr. Eby stated that this type of sign typically does not work. He stated that there may not be many cars now coming out of the auto parts business but with the addition of a Taco Bell, there would be many more cars coming out onto Route 1.

Mr. Gross stated the general thought was that approaching the condo association about the signal would be a moot point and that is why the applicant did not pursue this. Furthermore, he felt that it would not be beneficial to the condo association to fix the signal.

Ms. Walker stated that if the situation were presented to them in such a way that assures them they will benefit from this and that the signal will be improved, they would be more likely to accept it. However, the TAC cannot force the applicant to approach the association. On the Coast bus stop, there is no need to provide a pull-out. But at a minimum, there should be a shelter placed there. This will benefit everyone. People will be waiting at a bus stop in a highly trafficked area.

Mr. Gross reiterated that NH DOT will be fixing the loops at this signal.

Mr. Desfosses stated that this would most likely not be good enough. Those loops have been repaired and changed and the signal still shows no improvement. This has been done many times and every year the signal fails.

Ms. Walker wished to address the Coast Bus Stop again. The City sits on the Board of Directors for Coast. They work in coordination with their staff. She saw the email correspondence. It was agreed that there is no need to provide a pullout there because of the infrequency of Coast stops but at a minimum, it would be helpful to have a shelter in this location because there would be an increase in frequency of use of the stop.

Ms. Monticup stated that based on the research they did, the bus currently stops at the site 21 times/day. If the applicant was to put a shelter there, it would be on the street side.

Ms. Walker stated that it really isn't the frequency of stops, but rather that people will be standing in close proximity to a heavily trafficked area.

Ms. Monticup stated that she cannot commit to this, but that she and Mr. Gross will talk to Charter Foods to determine if they will accommodate this.

Ms. Walker stated that this will probably be a stipulation of approval.

Mr. Desfosses inquired if the sewer wasn't going to be used, would the applicant be removing it from under Route 1. The reason for the pedestrian sign (even though it isn't at the signal) is that there are frequent crossers in this area, particularly in summer (Water Country). Regarding the fencing in the AUR area, he felt that what would be most beneficial is for the applicant to create a fence that is in line with the back of the dumpster enclosure that goes from the stonewall at Springbrook Circle to the AUR area (in effect isolating the entire wetland area). Any rubbish could be caught before it goes into the wetland area. He also asked for identification of snow storage areas.

Mr. Taintor stated that on Sheet C1, there is a snow storage area next to the stone wall.

Mr. Gross stated that they would also utilize the area to the right of the exit as a snow storage area. He will ensure these areas are on the plans.

Mr. Desfosses stated that there should not be snow storage in the bioretention area and a note to this effect should be on the plans. There should also be a note on the plans stating that stormwater, sanitary sewer, and portable water connection permits are needed from DPW.

Mr. Pezzullo commented on the 1,500 gallon grease trap. There is a slightly different detail on the baffle. For the inlet T's, bring them down below the surface of the water. He will provide them with information in order to update this detail. Regarding the fencing in the AUR, the applicant should put a gate to access the drainage pipe.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the fence should be a 6' fence.

Mr. Britz stated that because the silt fence is in a wetland buffer, a silt sock (that degrades over time) would be better.

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**

Ms. Walker stated that she supports the right turn only out of the site.

Mr. Taintor stated that there is also the Springbrook Drive issue, although this cannot be required.

Mr. Eby felt that right turns only from the site should be required and there should be video detection installed at the signal in order to monitor operation.

Mr. Taintor stated that 2 sides of the driveway are on a public way and 2 sides are on a private way, and wondered where responsibility for monitoring of the signal lies (wholly, or in part, with the state).

Mr. Desfosses stated that this responsibility rests wholly with the state; however at this site, it is somewhat problematic because of the 2 private drives. Year after year, the state only replaces/fixes the loops and that at the first frost cycle, they fail and they tend to fail every year.

Mr. Taintor stated that for the last Southgate application approval, there were some general improvements to the intersection, but not on the signal itself.

Mr. Rice made a motion to recommend Site Plan Approval with the following stipulations. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

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

1. The site plans shall be amended as follows:
  - (a) The site driveway shall be restricted to right turns exiting the site.
  - (b) The sidewalk along the parcel frontage shall extend from the site driveway to the pedestrian signal at the crosswalk, shall be handicapped accessible, and shall include a connection to the building. With or without an easement.
  - (c) The bus stop shall be located approximately 40-50 feet closer to Springbrook Circle, and shall include a shelter.
  - (d) The plan shall show adequate area for snow storage, which shall not be in the bioretention area.
  - (e) The chain link fence in the AUR shall be 6' tall and shall include a gate for maintenance access.
  - (f) Fencing shall be added along the back of the site.
  - (h) The new sewer force main on site and the new sewer service in Lafayette Road shall be moved to the location of the existing service, and the existing service shall be removed.
  - (h) The silt fence shall be replaced with silt socks.
  - (i) The grease trap detail shall be changed to the DPW standard.
2. The applicant shall be responsible for upgrading the traffic signal at the intersection of Lafayette Road, Springbrook Circle and the Southgate Plaza drive to all-way video detection.
3. The applicant shall apply for and obtain connection permits from the Department of Public Works for stormwater, sanitary sewer and water.

.....

C. The application of **Northern New England Conference of Seventh Day Adventist, Owner**, for property located at **861 Middle Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct an 18' x 33' addition to the front of the existing church, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 232 as Lot 120 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) district. (This application was postponed at the March 3, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Christopher Berry with Berry Surveying and Engineering was present to speak to the application. Since meeting with TAC last month, the applicant has added a number of details to the plan set and has addressed as many comments/issues as possible. Mr. Berry provided an update of the revisions. They have redeveloped the site in a more orderly fashion. The plan is to add an 18' X 33' addition off the front of the proposed church structure. There is a 2-way in and a 2-way out of the site in 2 locations. The rear site would be within the existing footprint. The dumpster has been moved due to the proximity of the residential area in the former location. They have added parking spaces to the side of the church parking lot. An elevator will be installed to make the site ADA compliant. There will be ADA parking spaces close to the elevator site. They will provide a pedestrian walkway in the front, down the side of the church and into the back. The front of the church will have a small covered stoop and some landscaping in the front. They were asked to reevaluate the lighting on site. The lighting will now be stout and residential in style. Less light will be splashed around the site. The lights are now 12' high (much lower than they were previously). Details for this can be found on the Lighting Plan.

They are restricted to 25% coverage of the existing site but they are already over this. There is a porous pavement material at the back of the site providing a clean transition area and this will allow them to come in under the requirement for impervious surfaces. They will re-infiltrate and treat stormwater that is not currently being treated. A raingarden is proposed. There is a small gully that comes down through the middle of the site. It will not be impeded at all by the development. Peak and Volumetric flows at the site will be reduced. Mr. Berry addressed questions from the last meeting regarding occupancy of the church. They are working with a code specialist. They are not increasing the number of people that are coming to and from the church. This number remains at 100. An easement was requested by DPW at the last meeting. The applicant is willing to provide the easement. They need to hear from TAC regarding details on what it will be used for. The sewer has been videoed. Most of it is an AC pipe that ties into a sewer system on Pearson Street. Some of it has been replaced with PVC. They can update the existing Conditions Plan to depict exactly where that system is located. Further updates are not required at this time. They do not need a fire sprinkler system for the site. They do not need to provide a fire alarm to the structure/addition. Electric service will be taken from the existing pole onsite and brought into the building. This is a revision from last month.

They have put together a Landscaping Plan for TAC review. There will be plantings. Snow storage areas are shown onsite.

Ms. Walker inquired about impervious surface area and whether the applicant is using this interchangeably as open space. The requirement does not allow parking areas to be classified as open

space even if they are pervious surfaces. She also inquired about zoning calculations for building and open space coverage. It is helpful to have that clearly shown on the Plan Set. There was a discrepancy on Sheet 5; it shows total impervious area as 18,028' and on Sheet 8, there is a different number listed. She asked that the applicant review those numbers.

Mr. Berry stated that open space area is not being used interchangeably with parking surfaces.

Ms. Walker inquired as to why 36 spaces are being provided when the requirement is 25 parking spaces. This is more than 120% of the requirement.

Mr. Berry stated that they will hear from their code specialist soon whether or not they need to remove parking spaces.

Mr. Eby inquired if there is a designated spot to park the school bus.

Mr. Berry stated that there is not a designated spot on the site plan for that at this time. He will talk with the applicant. They would rather not designate a separate spot for this.

Mr. Eby stated that the "Do Not Enter" signs at the street have a 1-way arrow. This is not necessary, and perhaps a friendlier "Enter Here" sign might suit the site a little better. In addition, at the driveway on the left, there is an R61L sign. This should be an R62 sign (which is a 1-way with an arrow). At the exiting driveway, the "Do Not Enter" sign should be to the right of the driveway as you look at it. To the right of the church, the pavement arrow can be moved up to the end of the isle. The "Do Not Enter" sign in this area should be on the right (there should be at least one on the right) facing the parking lot. The "Wrong Way Sign" half way down the driveway is not needed (this is more for highway on ramps). The "No parking Fire Lane" sign should be an R7 not an R8 Series (red lettering).

Mr. Pezzullo asked about dimensions that he doesn't see on the drawing; the widths of the entrance and exit.

Mr. Berry stated that he will correct this.

Mr. Pezzullo also stated that the drive going to the back parking lot should depict a dimension.

Mr. Berry stated that this is 12' and that it does show on the drawing.

Mr. Pezzullo inquired if the occupant load question hasn't been solved yet, how will the necessity of a sprinkler system be determined.

Mr. Berry stated that code specialist inspected the structure and stated that 300 is the threshold for this occupancy type. Egress points have also been met. There will be far less than 300 so they do not need a sprinkler system.

Mr. Howe stated that the assembly space downstairs increases the occupancy load. If there is no sprinkler system, the applicant will be limiting themselves to the kinds of activities that can take place.

Dances downstairs, or fun houses, things of that nature may not be allowed. He requested the numbers for occupancy.

Roy Elso who lives in the Riverbrook Condominium development, on Middle Road, was present to speak to the application. He stated that there is currently a runoff problem. He is concerned with adding parking and that this will create more run-off.

Mr. Pezzullo stated that the applicant shows full mitigation of the onsite stormwater runoff issues. DPW has reviewed the drainage study. The applicant has a study showing that they will be discharging less run-off.

Mr. Berry stated that they are very aware of the concern of upstream (Pearson Street) as well as downstream (condo association) abutters. There is a topographic breakdown shown on the watershed sheet provided in the drainage analysis. There will be times the site will be wet seasonally. There are some concerns on Pearson Street about restricted flow. They will stay away from the centralized area in order to address this concern. Through the use of infiltration design and porous pavement, as well as through the raingarden, they will reduce volume and peak flow. The existing peak runoff is 1 cubic feet per second and it is being reduced to 0.82 cubic feet per second for the 2-year event. For the 100-year event (the extreme event that they design for) it is 9 cubic feet per second at peak flow and that is being reduced to 7.3 cubic feet per second. Volumetrically, at the 2-year event, the existing flow is 1.4 acre feet. This will be reduced to 1.2 acre feet. At the 100-year event, it is 1.05 acre feet and the proposed is 0.95 acre feet. These are significant reductions in volumetric terms. Peak volume and rate leaving the raingarden is very small. They do not typically require a level spreader in an area such as this. But due to the concern downstream of the abutters, they did not want to channelize water in this area more than they have to so they proposed a stone lined level spreader. This will take the flow in, create a trough and then spill it evenly over the lip of the spreader to distribute water in order to reduce the flow even further.

Mr. Taintor simplified this point by stating that the applicant is reducing peak flow at the 2 year and 100 year events and they are channeling/spreading water flow out away from the condo development.

Ms. Walker stated that the parking issue needs to be resolved. This could change the Site Plan (enough that TAC would need to have further input) and she wondered if the application needs to be postponed to wait for the answer about this.

There was some additional discussion around occupancy.

Mr. Berry stated that it was his understanding that because it is a church space, the upstairs and downstairs occupancy numbers are not added together because only one space is used at a time.

Ms. Walker stated that this is not true. If there is classroom space and assembly space, they are calculated separately.

Mr. Eby also stated that there should be a bus space shown out back.



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**

Since occupancy remains an unknown at this point, it was decided by TAC that they would approve the application conditionally in order to avoid it coming back to TAC for review.

Mr. Howe would like to see a sprinkler system and stated that if the occupancy increases above 100, then the number of parking spaces must change and a sprinkler system should be added. Without a sprinkler system, there are limitations on what the space can be used for. This is in the code.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve the Site Plan conditionally if the applicant stays within the occupancy and parking limits. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

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

1. The applicant shall have a code specialist determine the occupancy capacity of the building for parking and sprinkler system requirements, and shall confirm these determinations with the Inspections and Fire Departments.
2. The zoning calculations (e.g., yards, coverage, off-street parking, open space, occupancy, etc.) shall be added to the site plan.
3. The discrepancy between impervious surface percentages shown on different plan sheets shall be resolved.
4. An appropriate parking area for the school bus shall be shown on the plan.
5. The plan shall address the directional and informational sign changes identified by the Parking and Traffic Engineer.
6. The applicant shall provide an easement to the City at the rear of the site for snow storage and possibly drainage for the end of Pearson Street.

.....

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

A. The application of **Old Tex Mex, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **290 Heritage Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 110' x 250' two story steel frame building with a footprint of 27,683 ± and gross floor area of 40,211 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 275 as Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

John Chagnon, Joe Mulledy and Steve Ricker of Ambit Engineering were present to speak to the application. Mike Brown, project applicant, was also present. The lot is a vacant lot on Heritage Avenue and the site is a large hill. The lot will serve as the Insurcomm headquarters. The propose plan will have two 2-way driveways along the north and south frontage on Heritage Avenue. There will be 93 parking spaces and 4 of them will be ADA accessible. There will be pedestrian entrances on both sides. There is a small wetland in the back (a result of prior over excavation of soil material). They are proposing a new doghouse drain manhole on Heritage Avenue. This will be the only tie to the City's closed pipe system on Heritage Avenue. Two raingardens are proposed. There is a place for additional run-off to attenuate the peak increase in flow. There is a complete drainage analysis that has been submitted. They are decreasing overall peak flow in every event and decreasing volumes of runoff in all storms. There are no increases in peak runoff or volume as a result of this development. They are using the Cornell version of stormwater runoff amounts (higher amounts than what is typically used). There are street trees along the frontage. There are trees on the north and south side of the parking area. There is landscaping along the south side. There is a row of Arborvitae to shield the abutter to the northwest.

They have submitted a letter to show the changes they've made as a result of minor drafting changes. They have added 2 waiver requests with associated documentation. The justifications are included in the letter. The result of conducting the stress test of the drainage system was that the infiltration devices did not function as intended. There has been a report submitted stating that the fixes will be easily obtained. The Maintenance Plan now includes dumpster maintenance as requested. A Conditional Use Permit has also been submitted.

Mr. Eby stated that the stop line on the driveway should be 12" wide rather than 6" wide. The vegetation in the area to the north of the north driveway (out of Heritage Avenue to the right) needs to be trimmed back for a better view for motorists.

Ms. Walker stated that 4 vehicle storage spaces are included in the parking calculations. That is not a requirement in the City zoning ordinance. These are parking spaces are striped but in reality are vehicle storage areas.

Mr. Chagnon stated that there will be parked vehicles taking up these spaces. They are not vehicles coming into the site, but they will be taking up spaces so that affects what they can do in terms of the ordinance.

Ms. Walker stated that these are still counted as regular parking spaces. The required number of parking spaces is 81 and this brings the applicant over the limit.

Mr. Taintor stated that in order to avoid confusion and misperception over this, the applicant would not stripe these out as parking spaces. If it were storage of vehicles occupying spaces at a U-Haul for example the spaces wouldn't be counted, just as parked cars at a dealership would not be counted.

Mr. Desfosses stated that these areas could be cross-hatched instead.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the building itself has a number of doorway entrances on the south side. They are garage doors but they are there to facilitate the movement of materials in and out of the garage. This area could be striped off as a loading area in front of the doors and this will change the number of parking spaces. They will take the 4 spaces out of the calculation and not show them as parking spaces.

Mr. Desfosses requested that the overlay of Heritage Avenue be added as requested previously. It would be in the best interest to show a fence around the perimeter of the back side of the site to contain windblown debris from entering the wetland area and raingarden. The Committee will ask for a 6' high chainlink fence around the entire back half of the site. The applicant should also show snow storage on site. He suggested adding a catch basin so that the back driveway does not ice up in winter.

Mr. Chagnon stated that there is a large retaining wall on the back of the site that will keep debris from exiting the site. It is on the other side of the raingarden.

Mr. Desfosses stated that a doghouse manhole will not be permitted and there is no detail note for an inside drop sewer manhole.

Mr. Rice stated that the drop could just be reduced (2').

Mr. Desfosses stated that the limits of the overlay should be from the furthest extent of either driveway. The overlay must take place at least 3 months after the utility work. On Sheet L-1, there should be a note for the raingardens in order to see the details about plantings. The Landscape Plan does not show any plantings in the raingarden. There should be a note on the same sheet about the tree on the southwest corner of the site (Oak tree). That tree should not be cut and should be protected. It will help the streetscape. On Sheet D-1, the wire cages and burlap on trees should be removed from the tree detail. The doghouse manhole details shown on Sheet D-2 should be removed. On Sheet D-3, the sewer manhole steps are not allowed and should be removed from the sheet. He stated that he is a little dismayed to find his name in the drainage report. His attempts were only to shepherd the applicant through the process.

Ms. Walker stated that although she appreciated the bike racks, they are located on the side of the building with low visibility. Her recommendation is to locate them on the opposite side of the building. Normally, they would be located at the entrances where people would see them and use them.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the idea with this was that it would be employees using them so they would know where the racks are located.

Ms. Walker wished to clarify the issue on parking/no parking spaces/loading area.

Mike Brown, project applicant, stated that on the south side of building, there are 2 garage doors. They use those to bring in materials damaged by fire. The parking spaces next to this area are for the applicants use only. These are marked as parking spaces so that no one else uses those spots.

Mr. Taintor stated that these are really loading zones that should be not be parking zones and the note on the plan should be deleted.

Mr. Howe stated that there should be no shrubbery around Fire Department connections.

Mr. Taintor stated that there are a couple of notes that have been discussed that should be on the plans. All utility work on the street is to be supervised by DPW.

Mr. Chagnon stated this is Note11 on Sheet C-3

Mr. Taintor stated that there should be a note on the CMMP.

Mr. Chagnon will put a note on Sheet LC-2 that one was required.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the applicant will also need stormwater, water service and sewer service permits.

Mr. Pezzullo stated that there is a discrepancy on details on DP-4. The pre and post developed discharge rates are depicted as "0".

Mr. Mulledy stated that the existing 25 year event is 1.13 cubic feet per second and the proposed is "0". The change is a reduction. Reductions are across the board.

Mr. Pezzullo stated on the design of the raingardens, an underdrain around the perimeter to control groundwater is indicated. There will be some flow from these. The net will be an increase in flow into the City drain system. After the system is built, there will be a base flow that is not much at times but may be substantial at times. There could be a significant impact downstream post development. This should be accounted for.

Mr. Mulledy stated that the groundwater flow increase is not accounted flow. It was discussed at the workshop. He stated that the groundwater is not likely to be high.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the perimeter drains are to meet DES requirements. The reason that there are groundwater observations in the test pits is due to the ledge at 5'. The groundwater will hit the ledge and run down.

Mr. Pezzullo stated that post-development, the groundwater will still hit this ledge even though the overall amount will be reduced.

Mr. Desfosses stated that post construction monitoring of base flow (3-4 days after a storm event) could be done. This would be fairly easy to quantify. If the flow is over, there might be repercussions. If the flow is under, there is no problem.

Mr. Rice suggested that the designer come up with an option to mitigate this issue post construction.

Mr. Britz stated that if there is a lined raingarden for which the water doesn't leave, why would this measure (perimeter drains) be needed. He understands the need for this if the raingarden is unlined.

Mr. Rice stated that the groundwater shouldn't come up above where the raingarden is now. This would require some fine tuning once the constructed conditions are in place.

Mr. Britz stated that the 3" layer of mulch on top of the raingarden might float away. Riverstone might work better, or at least a hardwood mulch that might not float away. A little mulch and then some stone on top might work.

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**

For clarification, Ms. Walker stated that the maximum number of spaces allowed is 90.

Mr. Britz stated that if fencing goes in back, his recommendation is to put a gate on it.

Mr. Rice made a motion to recommend Site Plan Approval with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

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

1. The site plans shall be revised as follows:
  - (a) Add a 6' chain link fence at the rear of the site to prevent wind-blown debris, leaving a suitable area for snow storage and including a gate for access.
  - (b) Change the width of the stop bars.
  - (c) Designate the area in front of the overhead doors on the south side of the building (currently shown as four parking spaces) as a no-parking area by cross-hatching, and revise the notes and parking calculations accordingly (maximum allowed number of spaces is 90).
  - (d) Changing the drain and sewer details on Sheets D2 and D3.
  - (e) Remove doghouse manhole.
  - (f) Remove vegetation within the Heritage Avenue layout to the north of the site to provide adequate sight distance for exiting vehicles.
  - (g) Show pavement overlay in Heritage Avenue.
2. The applicant shall prepare and implement a post-construction monitoring plan with mitigation measures to be approved by the Department of Public Works. The plan shall include follow-up and a commitment to work with DPW to assure that the stormwater volume and flow rate do not increase. The results of the monitoring will determine what, if any, additional post-construction measures may need to be implemented before bond release.
3. The applicant shall apply for and obtain connection permits from the Department of Public Works for stormwater, sanitary sewer and water.
4. The applicant shall apply for and obtain a sign permit from the Inspections Department for the proposed property sign.

.....  
**III. ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 4:00pm, was seconded and passed unanimously.  
.....

Respectfully submitted,

Toni McLellan  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee