

MINUTES

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2:00 PM

AUGUST 30, 2016

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Transportation Planner; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department; Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jessa Berna, Planner; Frank Warchol, Police Department, Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Five Hundred Five Lafayette Road, LLC, Owner, and Lens Doctors, Applicant**, for property located at **605 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a proposed 2-story office building, with a footprint of 7,000 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 14,000 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 229 as Lot 9 and lies within the Gateway (G) District. (This application was postponed at the August 2, 2016 TAC Meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone the application to the October 4, 2016 meeting. Mr. Roediger seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Walker then took Application C out of order because it was also postponed. (Please see Application C).

B. The application of **Seacoast Trust, LLP, Owner, and Stonegate NH Construction, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **150 Route 1 By-Pass**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a 246' x 85' 3-story multi-family building with a footprint of 17,667 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 53,000 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 231 as Lot 58 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the August 2, 2016 TAC Meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney Rob Ciandella was present on behalf of the applicant and stated that he had submitted a report from Stonehill Environment and received comments from Mr. Desfosses. He then introduced Tim Stone of Stonehill Environment.

Mr. Stone said he was also a geologist and had prepared a hydrologic report, noting that a big concern from the Commission was how much water would be generated by the foundation drains. Mr. Stone explained that the water funneled through under the by-pass and that silty gravel materials were present. He said the groundwater elevations averaged 32 feet and that the invert was below the water table, resulting in the groundwater continuing to pass from the northeast under the by-pass and discharging into the drainage and ending in Sagamore Creek. Mr. Stone then discussed the issue in detail, estimating that the number of gallons per day draining out of the face of the excavation would be around 100 gallons. He further explained the calculations from average storms in a year and the type of flow from the storms and estimated that an average of 300 gallons a day would result. He summarized that it would be a reduction of 300 gallons per day overall.

Regarding the issue of whether a spring could be on site, Mr. Stone said they had no evidence of it.

Mr. Pezzullo asked whether Mr. Stone's calculations were based on work done by someone else. Mr. Stone said the soil borings were done by another company, so they had water level data collected on site and the actual geologic logs prepared from the borings to make an assumption with.

Mr. Britz said he had not seen a lot of the groundwater maps and noted that one looked like 29.5 and the other 30.5. He asked whether it was typical for groundwater depths to change that quickly. Mr. Stone replied that the groundwater contours were closer and the gradient was a bit steeper, and it would decrease toward the southern end. Based on those levels, he said three feet of water would be above the drain on the building's north corner and one foot of water on the south corner, resulting in four feet across the entire face. He said four feet was a conservative number and that the numbers would decrease once the system re-stabilized after the draining system was installed.

Mr. Pezzullo asked whether there were any calculations of the area of watershed, and Mr. Stone said they had not done any.

Cory Belden of Altus Engineering approached the podium and stated that they would first install the drainage for the project, which would be done through the raingardens and would take a month to construct. The next step would be to excavate and construct the building foundations, which would probably take another month. He said the groundwater would begin to flush into the foundation drains and the storm drain system and the stabilization process would start. Mr. Belden said they also looked at the overall drainage for the site and would reduce 15,000 s.f. of impervious area, which would also reduce the volume of surface water into the storm drain system due to the additional landscape areas. Those areas would have ground cover to help with absorption and evaporation. He noted that they had initial calculations based on their models. Analyzing a number of different storms, they looked at the volume reduction and were reducing water going into the storm drain system that would also go into the ground water system. He said they used a 50% analysis, part of it absorbed by the plant and the

rest by the ground water system, and that they were seeing very large reductions based on that model and had a reduction of approximately 110,000 gallons per year.

Mr. Belden noted that there were other minor changes, including revising the driveway entrance, thereby reducing the impervious area on the site, and reducing the shoulder to six feet on Middle Road. He said they were still waiting for direction on the water line installation.

Chairperson Walker asked whether there were any guidelines on the water lines, and Mr. Desfosses said there were not.

Mr. Roediger asked whether there was a bollard on the pedestrian path. Mr. Belden said there was one near the middle of the path. Mr. Roediger suggested that there be a bollard on the other end of the path as well. He confirmed that it would be maintained in the winter and also suggested that a bollard be placed near the Middle Road section.

Mr. Taintor asked whether the path had an easement for pedestrian and bicycle utility. Eric Katz of Stonegate NH Construction approached the podium and stated that there was an encroachment issue regarding the adjacent property's garage. He said he discussed the lot line adjustment with the property owner and suggested an easement in exchange for going over the property. Mr. Taintor confirmed that the lot line revision would be ready to go before the Planning Board and noted that it didn't have to go before TAC as long as there was no access easement involved.

Mr. Taintor also noted that there was no parking plan showing the required parking spaces. Chairperson Walker said it wasn't granted a waiver.

Mr. Katz asked for clarification on the access easement and lot line adjustment, saying that the lot line adjustment was to correct the encroachment and the easement could be provided as part of the application, so he assumed they would be separate issues. Mr. Taintor agreed but said the Subdivision Regulations stated that it had to be referred to TAC, so the Commission would have to see the easement defined on the site plan and the subdivision plan.

Mr. Britz asked whether the raingarden areas were removed from the impervious, noting that the areas looked very low in the raingarden. Mr. Belden said the raingarden was at the north end, the bottom elevation was 31 feet, and the rim for the overflow structures was 31.75 feet. He said Raingarden #2's bottom elevation was 30 feet and the rim was 30.75 feet. Mr. Britz asked about the outlet pipe. Mr. Belden said it would be much lower because it would be within the raingarden with a 6-inch underdrain, about 2.5 feet below the raingarden. He further explained how it would work. Mr. Taintor said he was confused about the elevations, pointing out that what the architect called the front elevation was really the rear elevation. He suggested that the architect re-label the images for clarity before the application went before the Planning Board.

Mr. Taintor also noted that there were four doors on the rear elevation facing the bypass and asked if they were required for emergency egress. Mr. Katz explained that there were two egress stairs and individual unit doors. Mr. Taintor said he saw only four doors. Chairperson Walker asked whether some of the doors didn't face outward, and Mr. Katz said all the doors faced outward. It was further discussed and discovered that there were missing doors.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Taintor moved for discussion to recommend approval with stipulations, and Mr. Marsilia seconded.

Mr. Desfosses stated that there appeared to be a lot of progress made on the drainage site, but the applicant had not submitted the comprehensive study that was requested the previous month to show all the groundwater. He said it needed to be finalized and include all the calculations discussed that day. Mr. Desfosses said the limitation section should be removed because the Commission wanted concrete data, and that the data from Stonehill should be included. He also noted that it would have to be reviewed by a second party and that they would get a second engineer to review the drainage study to ensure that it was appropriate. He said there were still a few site plan issues to decide as well.

Chairperson Walker asked the Commission how they felt about a stipulation of approval. Mr. Pezzullo said it was an incomplete analysis, but Mr. Desfosses said the calculations were done and he would review them and send them out. Mr. Pezzullo said there were other issues that the Commission needed to address, such as the grading on the site and the driveway going down to below the existing groundwater elevation. He said it could increase what went off site. They further discussed it.

Chairperson Walker said the Commission needed to be clear about what they expected in the hydrologic report and confirm it with the applicant. Mr. Pezzullo said the submittal needed to be complete and not based on assumptions.

Mr. Taintor withdrew his motion and moved to postpone the application to the October 4, 2016 meeting. Mr. Marsilia seconded.

Chairperson Walker summarized that the postponement was to get more information relating to the hydrologic report. She said they would also send it out for peer review. She urged the applicant to confirm all the specifics as soon as possible with the Department of Public Works.

Attorney Ciandella asked for further clarification. Chairperson Walker stated that the missing information was the drainage concern. She noted that other items were minor adjustments to the site plan that would be approved as a stipulation before the Planning Board review. She said the exterior doors, the interior parking plan, and the lot line easement shown on the plan were separate.

Mr. Taintor said a lot of the items were very minor and could be on a revised site plan instead of a stipulation. Chairperson Walker suggested that the applicant adjust their site plan and return in October. She also noted that, regarding the hydrologic issues, it was still important to return in October to see if a conditional approval would be recommended. Mr. Desfosses said there would also be a peer review. Mr. Taintor advised that the subdivision issue be taken care of at the same time

The motion to postpone the application to the October 4, 2016 meeting passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Alden Watson Properties. LLC, Owner**, for property located at **56 Lois Street, Milton and Dixie Pappas, Owners**, for property located **off Lois Street**, and **Ann N. Grimбилas Trust, Owner**, for property located **off Lois Street**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots and to extend the Lois Street right-of-way, as follows:

1. Proposed lot #1 having an area of 42,189 ± s.f. (0.9685 acres) and 100.8’ of continuous street frontage on Lois Street;
2. Proposed lot #2 having an area of 119,264 ± s.f. (2.7379 acres) and 20’ of continuous street frontage on Lois Street;
3. Map 232, Lot 12 decreasing in area from 12,000 ± s.f. to 8,825 ± s.f. with 120’ of continuous street frontage on Lois Street;
4. Map 232, Lot 13 decreasing in area from 13,473 ± s.f. to 11,073 ± s.f. with 120’ of continuous street frontage on Lois Street; and
5. A street right-of-way will be created to extend Lois Street, having an area of 10,970 ± s.f.

Said properties are shown on Assessors Map 232 as Lots 8, 12 and 13 and are located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District where the minimum lot area is 15,000 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage is 100’.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone the application to the October 4, 2016 meeting, and Mr. Britz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn at 3:00 p.m. was made, seconded and passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee