

MINUTES

**SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**CONFERENCE ROOM A
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

2:00 PM

DECEMBER 5, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planner Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Fire Department. Robert Marsilio, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT:

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **46-64 Maplewood Avenue** (previously 30 Maplewood Avenue), requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 5-story mixed-use building with a footprint of 17,410 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 53,245 ± s.f., including 22 dwelling units and 13,745 ± s.f. of retail use, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 2A and lies within Character District 4 (CD4), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the October 31, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Eby moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of **Goodman Family Real Estate Trust, Owner**, and **Aroma Joe's Coffee, Applicant**, for property located at **1850 Woodbury Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Review for a 785 ± s.f. restaurant/take-out building and 195 ± s.f. attached patio, with drive thru service and a walk-up window, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 239 as Lot 9 and lies within the General Business (GB) District. (This application was postponed at the October 31, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Eby moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Marsilio. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Islington Commons, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **410, 420, and 430 Islington Street**, requesting Site Plan Review to remodel three existing buildings into 4 units (Building #1 with 1,490 \pm s.f. footprint and 2,273 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #2 with 1,130 \pm s.f. footprint and 1,942 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #3 with 2,048 \pm s.f. footprint and 6,531 \pm s.f. gross floor area); and construct 4 duplex buildings for 12 proposed units (Building #4 with 1,998 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,109 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #5 with 1,955 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,063 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #6 with 2,240 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,900 \pm s.f. gross floor area, Building #7 with 2,002 \pm s.f. footprint and 4,549 \pm s.f. gross floor area), with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 145 as Lots 34, 35 and 36 and lie within the Character District 4-L2 (CD4-L2) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the October 31, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Eby moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **James A. Mulvey Revocable Living Trust, Robert J. Bossie Revocable Trust and Peter Brown Living Trust, Owners**, for property located at **150 Spaulding Turnpike**, requesting Site Plan Approval to create a truck sales outlet with vehicle display, vehicle storage, including 9,780 \pm s.f. of pervious bituminous concrete pavement, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage, and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 236 as Lots 34, 35 & 36 and lie within the General Business (GB) District. (This application was postponed at the October 31, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Dana Lynch on behalf of Civil Works and Attorney Bernie Pelech spoke on to the application. Mr. Lynch addressed the following comments from the previous TAC meeting. The first comment related to the need for a driveway permit from NH Department of Transportation (DOT.) The applicants have followed up with the DOT office because the last response they received from the DOT was on September 27, 2017. There has been a change in employment for the DOT contact, so that has been

part of the delay. The TAC comments from this morning indicated that this should be added as a note to the plan. A pre and post drainage evaluation is included. The post drainage may hit other properties. A swale has been added that will cut off the runoff and divert it toward the front of the property. Regarding TAC comment number four, the existing pipes drain from the building. The drainage has been re-designed to take care of the roof drains. One will flow to a rain garden and the overflow from the garden will be directed to an old sub-surface roof drain system. This will end in a yard drain. The other down spouts will also head there. Originally, the applicants were trying to secure permission to drain into a catch basin on a neighboring lot. Instead of doing this the connection to the catch basin will be eliminated and the 4 inch drains will be truncated and capped at the property line. Then a pipe will run from the yard and drain to an outlet in the wetlands. This will eliminate impact to the neighbors drainage system. The drainage analysis was submitted based on the revision on the plans. When the catch basin was eliminated another revision was not submitted because the impact was not going to be different it was just being re-routed. The TAC comments from this morning indicated that a revised report was being requested. This can be submitted. The land on one side of the property has to be re-grated, and that will cut off the drainage that heads to the south. The porous pavement design has been verified and the detail has been included around required pavement thicknesses. An easement will not be needed because runoff will not drain on the neighboring property. A 1000-gallon septic tank has been added to the plans. That septic tank and pump have been sized so that when the pump comes on it flows long enough to flush everything out. There will not be an odor problem. It will be a full flush of the pipe. The tank is vented. The TAC comments requested that this be labeled as a private line. That can be done.

TAC Comments –

- Please update us on the status of the NHDOT highway access permit (note should be added to Site Plan indicating this is a required permit).
 - Mr. Lynch provided this update at the beginning of the presentation.
- Indicate where measures to minimize impervious surface have been implemented
 - Mr. Lynch noted these measures had been labeled and a technical memo has been included to outline the impervious areas in the plan. There is a reduction on the site in the impervious area. Ms. Walker responded that it was not clear where this was addressed based on the checklist. It should be included on the checklist.
- Water from uphill of the site should not drain across the porous paving
 - Mr. Lynch noted this was discussed with Paul Connolly and it is such a small area that it will not have an impact on the porous area. The impervious pavement running around the perimeter will be used by the owner. Mr. Desfosses responded that the comment comes from not wanting to overload the system. Also the water would go across a grass area, which will bring across sediment on the porous pavement and clog it. Adding a curb or berm will help prevent that. Mr. Lynch responded that they should be able to accommodate that. Mr. Pezzullo added that the grass area along Farm Lane could easily be graded to direct the water straight down to the rain garden.
- We need a maintenance plan for this parking lot
 - Mr. Lynch commented that this is included as a note on sheet 9 in the upper right hand corner. Mr. Desfosses responded that it's on the plan but the responsibility and the follow through is not outlined. Mr. Pezzullo agreed that the responsibility of who will

own this should be outlined on the plan. The rain garden and swale should have a plan as well. Mr. Britz added that should be on the site plan so that it will get recorded.

- Plan should reference the force main as private
 - Mr. Lynch commented that this was addressed in the plans.
- Provide updated Drainage Report to reflect revised site stormwater management design.
 - Mr. Lynch questioned if an updated drainage report was still needed. Mr. Pezzullo responded that it was. The rain garden treatment calculations, swale and the sizing of the pipe should be adequate. Those are not in the drainage report right now. Mr. Lynch responded this would be updated.

PUBLIC HEARING

Lenore W Bronson 828 Woodbury Ave spoke to the project. Ms. Bronson lives on the corner of Woodbury Ave and Farm Lane and spoke for neighbors as well as herself. Ms. Bronson had some questions. Will Holloway own this? Mr. Pelech responded they would. Will cars be washed there? There will be impact in the wetland buffer zone; will that impact be dealt with? Will a decision be made for a CUP at the Planning Board level? The BOA granted a variance for this encroachment. As it is the Mazda dealership has their car transporters remove their cars on Farm Lane. They are there on a daily basis. Mazda is pretty good at maneuvering. Nissan not so much they very often drive up Farm Lane. As far as monitoring goes it sounds good on paper, but when you live there the monitoring is not done as much in real life. The other thing is speaking on the basis on what was learned from Donald Green from UNH. Rain gardens still do not remove the pollutants, so the big picture is that pollution stays within there. The question is, is this the right thing to do, to Ms. Bronson it's not. Adding 70 pick up trucks to that property will not decrease traffic. Right now there's very little traffic with the existing buildings and businesses. There is not a lot of in and out traffic. The whole area is very close and this will abut a neighborhood. There is so little open space and so little regard to the wetlands.

Ms. Walker noted that the applicant could respond to questions. Ms. Walker also pointed out that this application did go through the Conservation Commission and will also go through Planning Board. When it goes through Planning that will be another opportunity for Ms. Bronson to speak on this application.

Mr. Eby asked Ms. Bronson if she saw the editorial in the paper today. It raised the question of cutting off Farm Lane from the Turnpike. Would Ms. Bronson be in favor of that? Ms. Bronson responded that originally it was cut off. Ms. Bronson hopes that it will be cut off from the Turnpike again, but a little concerned that it may give the go ahead to commercially develop more of the back area on the other side of Farm Lane. That would majorly affect the neighborhood still even if the road is cutoff.

Mr. Pelech commented that this application appeared before the Conservation Commission and they suggested the rain garden and other drainage efforts. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval for a CUP. All of the issues regarding the wetland were dealt with at the Conservation Commission Meeting. There are no vehicle transporters going to this site. All vehicles will be loaded on Holloway's other location. They will be moved on an individual as needed basis. Mr. Pelech anticipates this would amount to about five vehicles a week. It's basically overflow storage. There will be no car washing on site.

Mr. Cracknell commented that it looks like parking today went from 10 spaces to 12. If the lot is going to be re-stripped then a handicap space should be incorporated, and a bus space for a handicap van should be incorporate. Also why were the trees stopped before the curb cut? Mr. Lynch responded that it was because of the electrical easement. Mr. Cracknell responded that a privet hedge should be added to screen the property further. It should go from the back of the building to the curb cut Mr. Lynch responded that they won't commit to that but will do what they can.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby with the following stipulations (all of these shall be addressed in the plans submitted for Planning Board approval):

1. The Plans shall label the force main and sewer line as private.
2. Add curb or berm on east side of access driveway to direct stormwater into treatment swale and away from porous pavement areas.
3. Grade the grassed area along Farm Lane to direct water into raingarden.
4. Applicant shall submit a comprehensive stormwater management maintenance plan to be referenced in a note on the Site Plan and indicate that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance as outlined.
5. Provide updated drainage report for the redesigned drainage.
6. Any technical memos that have been previously submitted by the applicant to support compliance with Site Plan Review requirements shall be updated and included in the Planning Board submission. The Site Plan Review check list shall also be updated as necessary.
7. Maintain at least 24' for travel lanes between the vehicle display spaces and the curb edge at the entrance off of Spaulding Turnpike; if necessary eliminate spaces.
8. Reduce parking spots in front of the building to 10 and designate at least 1 as a handicap space.
9. Include a privet hedge in the area between trees and the property line on Farm Lane as additional screening.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Bluestone Properties of Rye, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **135 Congress Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct an addition to the rear of the existing building, with a footprint of 1,424 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 2,943 ± s.f., for restaurant expansion and function space, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 126 as Lot 5 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the October 31, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb with Altus Engineering, and Mike Labrie and Pete Labrie from Bluestone Properties spoke to the application. The Property has frontage on Congress Street. It is almost entirely impervious. There is one small ledge with green space. The site is a former YMCA and more recently a restaurant. The upper levels have been neglected for some time. This application has been through the Historic District Commission. There will be no improvements on the Congress Street side. The improvements will be on the back. There will be an addition on the back, which will include a handicap ramp, stairs and a third access to the service entrance. The sidewalk on the property will be reconstructed as part of this project. The applicants are in agreement with the city that they will be allowed to use the sidewalk and that process could take a while. As noted on the existing conditions, there is separate sewer and drainage for the discharge of roof drainage. The applicants are proposing a catch basin in the dumpster pad area. It would drain back into the building to drain out the front and tie into the existing sewer. The area is approximately 10 by 10 and the total runoff would be about 2700 gallons of storm water discharged annually. The design is consistent with the dumpster pad constructed near the Friendly Toast. This will keep it neater and clean. There is an existing water service off the front and is should be adequate for the proposed use.

TAC Comments –

- Proposed easements should be shown on the site plan or a separate easement plan (not on the existing conditions plan).
 - Ms. Walker commented that this was addressed.
- Character District standards shall be included in the submission packet – item 17 on Check List indicates “to be submitted by architect”. This should be on the cover sheet of the site plan set or on the site plan sheet itself.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that it was believed to be optional to file the checklist, but the applicants will work with the architect to include the character district requirements. Ms. Walker confirmed that it is required.
- Please submit a waiver request for the Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan.
 - Mr. Weinrieb noted that a waiver request was submitted earlier, but it had not included the stormwater management plan. Mr. Weinrieb handed out a physical copy in the meeting.
- Confirm that the concrete sidewalk will be graded at no more than 2% cross slope.
 - Mr. Weinrieb confirmed this was included in the plans.
- Provide appropriate documentation/details to support the installation of a 1000 gallon grease trap in the basement (type of grease trap, location, piping/plumbing, etc.).
 - Mr. Weinrieb noted that the applicants were working with a mechanical engineer, a plumbing engineer and the architect. As this plan is refined the Department of Public Works will be looped in to ensure it’s constructed to code. Mr. Weinrieb requested this be included as a condition on the approval.
- Need to address health officer concerns regarding inspection of the grease trap during monthly pump outs. Also, address wash down procedures of grease trap. City engineer and health officer suggested meeting to discuss issues.

Ms. Walker asked if there was any concern about the waiver that was handed out. No one raised a concern.

Mr. Marsilia asked about the protected openings on the west elevation. These are currently blocked off and putting them back as is would not be allowed. Mr. Labrie noted that their understanding was that there were options to add them back in for example with fire rated glass. If they can't satisfy the requirements then the openings would not be added back in. Mr. Marsilia responded that it should be noted that these may or may not be allowed. The unprotected openings have to be consistent with Chapter 6 of the IBC. The only other comment would be that a family restroom would need to be added. Mr. Labrie confirmed that could be added.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the detail for the catch basin is appropriate for the storm water but not for catch basin in dumpster. That should mimic the details for the existing dumpster catch basin. It should be noted on the plan that no kitchens can be below ground.

Mr. Howe noted that this would come up in the Planning Board meeting. After a discussion with the architect the mezzanine floor in the plans doesn't meet the definition of a mezzanine. Mr. Labrie responded that they are changing their plans.

Mr. Pezzullo commented that there had not been anything to document and support that they will be able to install a 1000-gallon tank. Monthly inspections have procedures in place to have that large of a unit washed down and inspected. If there is something there now then, Mr. Pezzullo is not sure if a preliminary design or something to document the requirements for the 1000-gallon grease trap can be met. Ms. Walker responded that this can be a condition of approval, but it should be taken care of before planning. This should be worked out with the City Engineer and Health Office. Mr. Labrie confirmed that was ok. Mr. Weinrieb added that it's premature to present this until the mechanical engineer has a design for it. The interior parts should be detailed on the mechanical engineer plan. Mr. Pezzullo commented that he was not sure when that would happen. Ms. Walker noted that this could be added as a stipulation.

Mr. Marsilia asked if the building was sprinkled now. Mr. Labrie responded partially. Mr. Marsilia asked if the mezzanine was part of the restaurant. Mr. Labrie responded that the current mezzanine would be the second floor servicing the third floor event space. Mr. Marsilia clarified that the third and fourth floor were are part of the event space. Mr. Labrie responded yes, primarily the second and third floors. The fourth floor will be offices. Mr. Marsilia asked if they could have access to inspect the building. Mr. Labrie responded yes.

Ms. Walker questioned if anything needed to be changed in the plans to re-label the mezzanine since it doesn't meet the requirements. Mr. Howe responded yes it should be updated.

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. Desfosses moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations (all of these shall be addressed in the plans submitted for Planning Board approval):

1. Character District standards shall be included on the cover sheet of the site plan set or on the site plan sheet itself.
2. Any unprotected openings on the west side of the building shall comply with Chapter 6 of the International Building Code.
3. The detail for the catch basin located in the dumpster area shall be changed per DPW's specifications for catch basins in similar locations.
4. A note shall be added to the Site Plan that no kitchens are to be located below ground level.
5. The applicant shall provide appropriate documentation/details to support the installation of a 1,000 gallon grease trap in the basement and shall meet with the City Engineer and the Health Officer for review and approval prior to Planning Board submission.
6. All stories of the building should be labeled appropriately according to guidance from the Building and Fire Departments regarding code definitions for a mezzanine.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

F. The application of **Roman Catholic Bishop of Manchester, Owner, and Stonegate NH Construction, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **2075 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of two 3-story, 24-unit residential buildings, both with a footprint of 14,640 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 58,495 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 268 as Lot 7 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the October 31, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb and Corey Belden, of Altus Engineering, Eric Katz, owner, and Attorney FX Bruton, were there to speak to the application. Mr. Bruton commented that the applicants had received the Planning Department's memo today, and hopes that they have addressed the major concerns. The hope is to move this project along and ask that a recommendation to the. Mr. Weinrieb noted that 2075 Lafayette Road is an extensive sea of pavement and building. The team initially received comments from the AOT, but they have not been addressed yet. The intent is to wait until the comments from this meeting to do one revision. A Department of Transportation (DOT) permit application was submitted on August 8, 2017. They received comments from the DOT. It's been a slow process going back and forth with them. One of the biggest issues was the nose of the island was out a little further, but it's been pulled back to allow for better turn radius.

TAC Comments –

- Please submit a Site Review application check list for this application --
<http://files.cityofportsmouth.com/Files/planning/SitePlanApplicationChecklist.pdf>
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that this was submitted that morning.
- If sidewalk was entirely on site, it could use the median island in the driveway as a refuge for pedestrians, shortening the crossing distance of the driveway.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they know there is concern about the Sidewalk location. The sidewalk is on the property and on an area that's part of the 12-foot easement with the DOT. The rain gardens should not be moved back because it will make the area steeper and will look like a forced site. Additionally, the gardens should not come too close to an existing maple on the property. If for some reason during the widening process or for some reason the DOT needs the rain gardens to move, then this can be reexamined.
- The bike racks should be closer to the building entrances.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that the bike racks are shown at two locations on the plan. There was concern that they are not close to the building. This location was chosen based on the pavement grade and where people would be entering the building. These bike racks are for visitors. The residents will have bike storage available to them separately.
- Altus Engineering's response to comment #23: Peter Britz requested all rain gardens have a riverstone bottom. Peter's comment was based on the fact that mulch often floats and either leaves the raingarden or clogs the drain. Preference is for the plantings to remain in the raingarden with secure material to insure that mulch does not float from the raingarden. If the applicant can insure the bark mulch or a suitable substitute will remain in place at the outset of the project and be consistent with future maintenance then Peter's concerns will be satisfied.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that the preference for mulch is because Robby Burns expressed that it is difficult to remove the stone to plant. The applicants can go in either direction. Robust plantings will be more achievable with mulch. If stone was used it may minimize the plantings.
- Please explain your comment responding to item #2 on the cover letter. Sidepaths do not need to be located in the ROW. The sample sidepath shown in the Bike Ped Plan is not a standard, concrete is the preferred surface.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that there was discussion if this should be concrete. The applicant's feeling is that this is not mandatory and they would like to keep it bituminous. Ms. Walker responded it needs to be clear that it is a multi use path.
- Regarding item #4 on cover letter – we will need something in writing from Eversource prior to Planning Board
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they have not reached out to Eversource on this project yet. The intent is to ensure it's a viable project first. If for some reason this needs to move a few feet it should not have a major impact. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed they will start working with Eversource.
- Regarding item #6, the note on the plan should also address the testing of the sewer system to ensure compliance with standards.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that additional notes around the sewer system would be added.
- Please confirm status of NHDOT Driveway Permit application.

- Mr. Weinrieb responded that the DOT permit has been addressed, and asked if there were any concern about the striping on Lafayette Road. The TAC representatives did not have any concerns.
- Regarding item #8, have you discussed this with NHDOT?
- Detail sheet for the retaining wall is C-10, not C-8. Please provide a detail of the privacy fence.
 - Mr. Weinrieb acknowledged that retaining wall was noted on the wrong sheet, and added it should be a cedar fence.
- Regarding item #20, add the explanation of the existing vegetation to remain to the Landscape Plan.
- Off-street parking is calculated for the entire site, not by building. Under proposed zoning, 72 spaces are required and you are proposing 96. You exceed 120% of the minimum required for the site, and therefore will need to apply for a conditional use permit from the Planning Board as specified in the Article 11 amendments to Section 10.1112.52.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that the off street parking was calculated by the site not the building. It was looked at this way in case one building is not constructed. Either way the applicants want to move forward with 96 spaces.
- Bicycle parking under the amended Article 11 requires 1 bicycle space for each 5 dwelling units. Please indicate how you are complying with this requirement.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that it will be clarified there is one bike space for each unit in the notes.
- Pull rain gardens back so that multi use path can be out of the area to be widened by DOT in the future.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that the applicants would like to keep the rain gardens in the mapped out locations.
- Access easement wording to comply with City's legal department requirements.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they would work with the City's Legal Department to secure the easement for the bike path. Ms. Walker questioned what access easement comment was for. Mr. Pezzullo clarified that it was for the water main. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they worked with the DPW for the right of way for the water main. Mr. Pezzullo responded that it is needed for access to shut off the water main etc. It is not needed for the maintenance.
- Request brick or concrete pavers be used for all walkways (versus stamped concrete or bituminous pavement);
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that all the sidewalks proposed on the plan indicated they will be pavers.
- Consider removal of the second walkway to Building 1;
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they are not sure where the second pathway is. Mr. Cracknell clarified that it was the zigzag path. Mr. Weinrieb responded that is the ADA accessible path.
- Use granite cobblestones for channeling in driveway;
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that on the plan it proposes cobblestones or stamped concrete, so that is not an issue.
- Consider a raised crosswalk across the main driveway where the two buildings overlap;
 - Mr. Weinrieb questioned whether or not this was necessary. Mr. Eby responded that it was not a priority.
- Consider smoothing out the curve for the driveway into the basement parking level of Building 1

- Mr. Eby questioned what the distance between the nose of the island and the back of the lot was. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it was probably less than 100 feet.

Mr. Weinrieb noted that the outside does have a uniform curb. Then it is a compound curb to tighten the radius to widen the road out for a better turn radius and access for trash removal. TAC is ok with the compound curb.

Ms. Walker requested clarification on what the walk way material would be. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it would be concrete pavers.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if two generators would be used. Mr. Cates responded that the intent is to use one generator. Mr. Marsilia responded that those should be shown on the plans. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they would be added.

Mr. Howe commented that the applicants will need to ensure the gate and emergency access will be maintained all year round. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that is noted on the plan.

Mr. Britz followed up on the rain garden. Mulch often clogs up the outlet structure. The preference is to have more plantings, but the concern is that the outlets will be plugged. This should be outlined in the maintenance plan. A maintenance plan and schedule should be referenced on C6 and the rain garden maintenance plan should be referenced on C8. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed this would be included on the general notes sheet. Mr. Pezzullo questioned if that indicated who is responsible for the maintenance. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it's going to be the homeowners association, so the plan should be edited to include that.

PUBLIC HEARING

Bill Wagner, 11 Taft Road, lived in Portsmouth since 1957. The project has provided plans and drawings. The neighbors are asking that he would come today and speak in favor of project.

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. Britz moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board, with the following stipulations (all of these shall be addressed in the plans submitted for Planning Board approval), seconded by Mr. Desfosses:

1. The Sidewalk shall be re-labeled as multi-use path and appropriate signage and striping shall be added per MUTCD standards to be reviewed and approved by the City's Transportation and Parking Engineer prior to Planning Board submission. A bituminous surface is acceptable for this purpose. Please include the Planning Director in any correspondence with DPW.
2. Where the proposed multi-use path is located within the NHDOT easement area, applicant shall provide an easement for future relocation of the multi-use path to the applicant's property outside of the NHDOT easement area should that be needed. A draft easement shall be included

- in the Planning Board submission. Please consult with the Planning Department for a sample template.
3. A note shall be added to the site plan to provide for the testing of the sewer system during construction under the supervision of the DPW to ensure compliance with standards.
 4. A detail shall be provided for the privacy fence.
 5. The Landscape Plan shall provide more details about species types and age of the existing vegetation that is to remain on site.
 6. Add information to the parking calculations on Sheet C-2 that outlines compliance with required bicycle parking per the amended Article 11.
 7. A water main access easement shall be provided to the City complying with the requirements of the DPW and Legal departments. A draft of the easement shall be included in the Planning Board submission. Please consult with the Planning Department for a sample template.
 8. The material for the walkways shall be concrete pavers.
 9. The material for the channeling in the driveway shall be granite cobblestones.
 10. Generator locations shall be shown on the plans.
 11. Notes shall be added to the Site Plan notes referencing the sheet/location of the long-term inspection and maintenance schedule (on sheet C-6) and rain garden maintenance notes (on sheet C-8) and indicating that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance as outlined.
 12. A Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Board is required for the proposed parking as specified in Article 11.
 13. A note shall be added to the Site Plan notes indicating there will be year-round access to the emergency access gate.

Mr. Marsilia reminded the applicants that the demolition permit would take time to post and advertise it.

Mr. Cates clarified about the vegetation that will remain. All the trees on site will be located. There was talk about removing some trees. Ms. Walker responded that what was on the existing conditions plan was sufficient, but it should be on the landscaping plan

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

G. The application of **Robert J. Fabbriatore Irrevocable Trust, Owner**, for property located at **177 State Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 2-story addition to a mixed use building, with a footprint of 350 ± s.f., and gross floor area of 498 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107 as Lot 44 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the October 31, 2017 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Eby moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

H. The application of **Deer Street Associates, Owner**, for property located at **165 Deer Street**, (“Lot 3”), requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 5-story mixed use building (including a hotel, restaurant, and 1st floor parking garage) with a footprint of 23,021 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 104,020 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 17 and lies within the CD5 District and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). (This application was postponed at the September 5, 2017 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mike Penny and Bob White spoke to the application. The team received the TAC comments that morning and tried to work them into the presentation where they could. This application was in front of TAC in April 2017. Most changes are on the inside the building. There are some changes to the outside as well. There is collaboration with the GSA project, but the designs are not being done together. There is collaboration with the city with regard to the roadway design for Foundry Place, but it is not symbiotic. These lots are being designed individually. They are independent projects. Demolition has occurred and site is currently being used as paid parking lot. By the time lot 3 gets developed Foundry Place parking will be in place. There is interaction with lot 2 and lot 4. There was a major comment suggesting that lot 4 should be submitted with lot 3. However, they are being developed independently. There is a relationship as far as easements go, but nothing will change the design for lot 3. The infrastructure will stay the same.

Ms. Walker clarified that the comment was made because improvements are being made to lot 4 as part of this project. This is technically two projects because two lots are being developed. There are improvements being made on a different site and it can’t be lumped in with lot 3. It needs to be clear that improvements are being made to two separate lots, and it needs to be advertised correctly. A site plan approval is needed for what the proposal is for right now. It does not need to be the ultimate plan for the future of lot 4, but it does need to include what is being done now.

Mr. Penny continued to speak to the application. The building is going to have a ground floor with a café and hotel lobby. The backside will have parking. The second, third and fourth floors will be hotel rooms and the fifth will be hotel rooms and a bar. The abandoned city sewer will be filled and the two existing poles will be taken down. There will be 92 parking spaces. About 70 of them will be in the garage and then 33 additional. There will be no street parking planned and the only access to the garage will be via valet. Ms. Walker clarified that this project doesn’t need to comply with parking requirements passed the night before.

Mr. Penny continued to speak to the application. The site is almost entirely impervious right now because it's almost entirely parking lot. The demolition plan includes taking down the utility poles as well as removing the buried utilities. A new electrical infrastructure will be built. Overall the site layout takes advantage of the wider sidewalk and public spaces. All other faces of the building have a setback. New sidewalks will be built along Foundry Place up to Deer Street. The garage entrance will be in the back corner of the building. The hotel will have a main entrance, a separate café entrance and an egress on to lot 2. There are several entrances to the hotel lobby on the Foundry Place side. Lot 4 will remain which is why plans include drive around lanes to keep the existing bank operable and give access to the hotel. The community space will be along the front of the building and some of the easement off lot 2 will be community space as well. There was a comment from TAC about whether or not this space was calculated correctly, but we believe it is. Ms. Walker responded that the main question is the area that is a teardrop with tapered ends; that doesn't count. The applicants should reference how the community space should be calculated. Mr. Cracknell added that 50% or more of this space needs to be porous or permeable. Mr. Penny responded all along the back would be permeable. Ms. Walker added that it says that there is 12% open space on the document; so just make sure the plan only highlights what actually counts toward open space.

Mr. Penny continued to speak to the application. The building is set at an elevation 12 to be consistent with 100-year storm elevation. There are grades around it sloping out toward Foundry Place and Deer Street. There is a high point being designed in the middle of the drive around so some will drain to the railroad property. The flat area will drain to railroad as well. It does this today. There is curbing and landscaping along the street. There is a drop off area for the hotel. Then the valets will come out to Deer Street and loop around building once to get to the garage. A pre-development and post-development storm water analysis was performed for this project. The lot 3 post-development peak flows and volume are less than the existing conditions. Infiltration is not achievable because this site has a lot of clay, but it could be incorporated somewhere else. The rooftop and rear of the building will handle rooftop drainage. The driveway runoff will be routed to a new drainage structure before flowing into the city drainage system. The sidewalk flow will flow out onto Foundry Place and wind it's way down to a new city drain grate that will be installed. It will all end up in Mill Pond. TAC questioned if a 3rd party review would be needed for this plan. The drainage plan is pretty straightforward and the applicants feel that a third party review is not warranted. The primary sewer service will be off of Deer Street and enter on the side of the property where there will be grease traps. The extra sewer connection on the Foundry Place side will serve the upper floors. The water will enter the building from Foundry Place. The gas will come in from Deer Street and feed meters at rear of the property. The electric and communication systems will be on a new transformer pad and eventually another transformer for lot 4 and lot 5 will be added. There was a TAC comment about the transformer-screening fence. The applicants thought it met requirements behind a fence. Ms. Walker questioned the purpose of the removable screen. Mr. Penny responded that it would make it easy for Eversource can access the transformer. Ms. Walker commented that it may be specified that transformers should be screened with landscaping. Mr. Cracknell questioned if the removable panels allow technicians to get closer to the transformer vs. a gate. Mr. Penny confirmed that was correct. Ms. Walker clarified that the current criteria may not allow a fence. Everything else should be a waiver. TAC will need to verify in our language what is allowed. Mr. Penny added that the utility details are still being finalized, but they are getting closer to the overall utility design. After that is complete a utility plan will be completed.

Mr. Marsilia requested clarification on grease trap location. Mr. Penny pointed them out on sheet C5.

Mr. Pezzullo questioned where was kitchen one and kitchen two. Ms. Tracy Kozack responded that kitchen one will be on the first floor in between the lobby and the café. Kitchen two is on floor 5 for the bar and restaurant.

Mr. Penny added that there will be a few temporary signs and lights put in on lot 4 to assist with people navigating around the lot. When lot 4 is re-developed then the signs and lighting will be moved. The last big subject is the easements. There is an easement table that summarized all the easements for lot 3. A couple changes were made to the plans to correctly show that there will be an easement on lot 2 for the community space and easement to the city along sidewalk. There is a lot 2 construction and maintenance easement plan that will be combined into one easement. There is a lot 4 access and egress easement. There is a lot 4 construction and maintenance easement given to lot 3 that will be one easement. The one thing missing from the table would be an easement for the utilities on the corner of lot 3 and extend to lot 2. There is a construction mitigation and management plan. This will be completed after site plan approval.

Mr. Pezzullo questioned if there would be utility easements on lot 4 to benefit lot 3? Mr. Penny confirmed there should be an easement for Eversource and telecommunications.

Mr. Bob White provided a streetscape presentation. There are some challenges to this site because of the elevation changes. The handicap ramp is elevation 9 and the floor of the building is elevation 12. The sidewalk on the main entrance will be on grade for ADA access and the sidewalks around will be as well. Some sidewalks will have planter edges and some will have tree wells. The sidewalks will be brick. There will be an elevated deck in the back where food services are and there will be a stone face on the front. The intent was to have the sidewalk go through the entire project at the same height, but they weren't able to do that. The planting areas along the street are designed with bio-retention soil. There is a draft of the maintenance plan between Deer Street and the City that is being worked on. They are proceeding under the assumption that the actual maintenance of the sidewalks for snow removal etc. would continue to be done by the city.

TAC Comments –

- Please complete a site plan review checklist for this application -- <http://files.cityofportsmouth.com/Files/planning/SitePlanApplicationChecklist.pdf>.
- Driveway should be asphalt not brick. Brick is ok in the drop off area. Dashed line should be solid in driveway.
 - Mr. White responded that the intent is to create a drop off area at the hotel out of brick. They have talked with a brick manufacturer and asked if there was a vehicular grade brick. The manufacturer does make one. That has been incorporated into the vehicular area on the plans. Ms. Walker responded that the brick should not be on the driveway, but it would be fine for the drop off. Mr. White responded that the intent was to create material continuity. The pedestrians should know there is a pedestrian path in front of them. They would like to keep that as brick. Ms. Walker responded that TAC would need to look at past projects and discuss how it has been handled.
- Why are there stairs leading into Foundry Place roadway? This is not desirable, should keep pedestrians out of roadway except at crosswalk.
 - Mr. White responded that an easy solution would be to carry the plantings all the way through there. The goal was to no create a full barrier of plantings between sidewalks and the street. This can be revisited to create more room. The earlier was advisement

was to keep 7.5 feet clear for snow removal and pedestrian traffic. This can be revised if needed. Ms. Walker responded that the stairs don't appear to have a purpose over the landscaping. Mr. Cracknell pointed out that the stairs would provide pedestrians access over the plantings. Ms. Walker added that the stairs are not even at the crosswalk. Mr. Desfosses commented that the City is not in the business of shoveling stairs. One comment made earlier was that there is an assumption that winter maintenance would be done by DPW. That won't happen for stairs. The asphalt is suggested for the driveway because it's an area that will be used a lot and if repairs are needed for asphalt will be easier to fix over brick.

- Sidewalk is narrow along corner closest to garage. This area will have a lot of pedestrians from the garage.
- Dashed line leading to drive-thru can begin where arrows are located.
- There are a number of improvements on this plan that involve lot 4. This should be a joint application for both lots.
- Impacts to Lot 4 including all easements, utilities, etc. to support adjacent developments (Lot 3, Lot 5) need to be clearly identified. Also, identify impacts to development/construction of Lot 4 building, utilities, etc. as a result.
- Note #11 on the Site Notes (C1.1) should reference any public roadway, curbing, and sidewalks (not just Foundry Place).
- Please confirm that your open space areas identified on sheet 3.6 conform with the zoning section 10.515.20 of the zoning ordinance.
- Anywhere you reference a detail (TYP.) please refer to the specific detail sheet # and reference # in the plan set.
- You are proposing using a removable screen around the transformer pad. We're not sure this complies with the site plan review requirements for screening in Section 6.9, we will need to discuss.
 - Mr. Penny responded to this in the presentation above.
- Project Vision (Attachment A). City staff do not agree with your statement that this project and the parking garage "are being developed in collaboration and are symbiotic in nature." This contradicts what you previously submitted to the NHDES to support your argument that an AOT permit is not required because these are separate and distinct projects. The parking garage is an entirely separate project and any collaboration that is occurring is related to area-wide utility and infrastructure improvements that will be shared by all impacted properties.
 - Mr. Penny responded to this in the presentation above.
- This needs to go out for third party review in respect to drainage/stormwater management and should be considered in the context of other future DSA development projects in the vicinity.
 - Mr. Penny responded to this in the presentation above.
- A Construction Mitigation and Management Plan shall be required for this project once it receives Site Plan approval
- Final utility plan needs to be signed off (in writing, reference plan version) by Unitil, Eversource, Fairpoint, First Light, Comcast
 - Mr. Penny responded to this in the presentation above.
- No loading will be allowed on Foundry Place, therefore the walkways on that side shall be designed not to encourage that use
- Please provide drafts of proposed landscaping maintenance agreements for review by the City
- Explain sewer/water use calculations in Attachment F. Values appear inconsistent.

- Calculations for grease trap sizing will need to be provided. Interior grease traps might be required in addition to exterior units per plumbing code requirements. Engineer to verify.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if there are still poles shown on the tie and bond plans that are not shown on these plans. Mr. White confirmed that was correct. Mr. Desfosses responded that would be a conflict that the applicants still have. The City's position is that it's the City's job to light the right of way as it sees fit. It can't be reliant on private buildings lighting that the City can't control.

Ms. Walker reiterated the lighting issue. Mr. Desfosses noted that the tie and bond plans show three lanterns. These plans are showing landscaping there instead. The applicants feel lighting isn't needed because the building lighting would be sufficient. Ms. Walker commented that a stipulation should be added that there should be lighting coordination with the City. The City would not want to rely on the private property lighting.

Mr. Desfosses commented that one of the reasons they are sliding their position on the landscaped sidewalk because there is concern that people will want to live park to unload and use Foundry Place as that area. If there is not landscaping in that area, then that would encourage the live parking. It shouldn't be encouraged with sidewalks and stairs that go all the way to the road.

Ms. Walker commented that this application was not going to get approved today and there was a need to move the meeting along. Nothing had been presented today that would make TAC change their stance. All comments could be addressed and more coordination or waivers (transformer fence) are needed with the City.

Mr. Cracknell commented that they should update compliance with the zoning requirements. The dimensional requirements aren't listed. The footprint of the building should be double-checked. The variance approvals (parking) should be listed on the site plan. Mr. Cracknell questioned the table in front of the restaurant showing four tables being listed as part of the community space. The applicants need to clarify what that is. It would be great to landscape the area on lot 4 with the triangular wedge. What will be done with residual community space on lot 2? Presumably this will be deeded to the City. Make sure not to leave a gap. The colors are a little off on some of the diagrams and should be adjusted. There needs to be some kind of mechanism for the brick carrying over to the garage. Mr. Desfosses brought up the lighting, are the benches, receptacles and lighting consistent with the city? Out of curiosity what would solar panels look like if they were put on the roof?

Mr. Howe commented that early on it was talked about the lack of fire access on the rear-pressurized stairwells. Reference the high-rise section of the fire code. This plan should include non-combustible mulch.

Mr. Desfosses commented on the valet operation that is going to go to have them drop off then loop around. This seems like they asking more than what is reasonable. Ms. Walker added that a peer review of the traffic circulation could be requested.

Mr. Pezzullo added that the City would need a number value for the anticipated water use for the project. Mr. Penny noted that was a comment they forgot to address. The calculations will be updated.

Mr. Eby added that Eversource should review the electric and communications plan. Mr. Desfosses commented that was in the comments. Do the applicants have something from the gas company to ensure they can supply the level that is being requested?

Mr. White questioned if they could facilitate a meeting to go over the lighting. Ms. Walker told Mr. White follow up with her.

Ms. Walker noted that they would follow up with the peer review

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. Desfosses moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Happy Dreams, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **1 International Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 7,130 \pm s.f., 3-story building expansion to the Residence Inn which will include 36 additional rooms and a 29 space reserve parking area to be constructed in the future, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 303 as Lots 4, 5, & 87 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

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. Desfosses moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Ethel V. Ross Trust, Owner, and Joseph Caldarola, Applicant**, for property located at **142 Mill Pond Way**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 2-story, three unit townhouse with a footprint of $5,560 \pm$ s.f. and a gross floor area of $18,514 \pm$ s.f. , with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 140 as Lot 20 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Lorden and Joe Caldarola spoke to the application. The proposal is for a three unit attached townhouse on Millpond Way. Each unit has three parking spaces one of which in would be a garage space. The drainage wraps around to the back into a rain garden. There will be all new utilities. Some landscaping will be added at the entryways.

TAC Comments -

- The plan showing test pits list the seasonal high water table at 4'. If this is higher than the finished floor of the basement we do not believe these units should have a basement. Starting with a condition where groundwater will need to be pumped for much of the year is an unnecessary impact to the stormwater system.
 - Mr. Calderola responded that they have thought about this, and wonder what would happen to the floor plans if a 7.3 slant elevation were used. The test pits did not show any seasonal high water at that elevation. The digging stopped at 8 feet though, so it's not safe to say that water is definitely not there. The proposal would be to start the basement at the 7.3 elevation and reduce the height a little. Then add a step to keep the basement and not change the site plan at all.
- Excavating the uphill portion of the site for a rain garden as shown may eventually lead to the creation of a wetland here. There is no drain shown for this area, so in the winter once the ground freezes, it will flood to about 10" deep and then freeze into a mini pond. At a minimum, this area should be provided with a drain, a better approach may be to expand the existing wet area on the low side of the property and use that for storage.
 - Mr. Lorden responded that excavating uphill for a rain garden causes concern about water freezing and rain garden impact. The current location got excellent infiltration rates and no ponding is expected. A pipe could be added, but the elevation may not make sense for an outlet. Mr. Desfosses responded that's surface level. Mr. Lorden responded that they excavated down to test this. If the concern is with freezing then a surface drain could be added somewhere. It could sit up a little higher and that would get the infiltration treatments to eliminate ponding.
- Identify separation distance between SHWT elevation and bottom of Rain Garden #1 and #2.
 - Mr. Lorden responded that rain garden #1 has a foot of separation and rain garden #2 has two feet separation. The intent was to try keep as much green space as possible. All impervious areas are draining to a rain garden.
- Please indicate where Low Impact Development Design practices have been incorporated.
- Please indicate where measures to minimize impervious surfaces have been implemented.

- Mr. Lorden responded that they were very careful to verify cars could still maneuver while reducing pavement surfaces.

PUBLIC HEARING

Albert Lincoln and Joe Famarval spoke to the application. Mr. Famarval is the president of the condo association and Mr. Lincoln is a unit owner on the ground floor. There is a need to increase the housing supply and they understand it can cause some discomfort to the people already there. It is understood that the rain gardens should absorb the runoff water, however it is hard to trust that is the case. Today water flows into wetland and then it will pond and overflow into our garages and freeze. The new development being approved should not make situation worse, but it should assume responsibility to make it better for abutters. This should be looked at again. The diagram on the second page of Appendix D shows the routes of water all ending up in the wetland. That doesn't absorb water well. Secondly, there is a lot of interest in a landscape screening between the two properties. It should be a thick hedge that will create a barrier between the two properties. Today there is privacy once the new development is there the windows will face each other. Thirdly, the propane tank on the utility plans is right next to the wetlands and across from their garages. If that's where it has to be, then it should be screened by an enclosure. They are not opposing the development, but would hope that these concerns are heard.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to recommend approval to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby.

Mr. Desfosses commented that 1000-gallon propane tank is pretty big and will be into the daily ground water because it's so close to the wetland. It is a poor spot for it. It should be relocated. Putting rain garden number 1 uphill from a building with a basement is a bad idea. Today there is no basement to block ground water, so that may increase the numbers from today. Rain gardens do freeze and there should be more drainage.

Ms. Walker commented that based on these comments this application is not ready to go to planning board.

Mr. Britz withdrew his motion. Mr. Eby removed his second.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Walker summarized the concerns that were discussed. There should be landscaping screening on the property line. The propane tank should be moved and screened. The rain garden location is concerning as well.

Ms. Walker questioned if the City should do a peer review? Mr. Desfosses responded that it's probably not needed on a project this small. The final decision on this will be based on a revised design.

.....

C. The application of **Wentworth-Douglass Hospital, Applicant**, for property located at **56, 73 and 121 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction a 2-story, 25,000 ± s.f. medical office building and a 3-story, 60,000 ± s.f., medical office building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 303 as Lots 4, 5, & 87 and lie within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Dave Fenstermacher, Leah Olsen project engineer, and the architect were there to represent the project. Mr. Fenstermacher spoke to the application. The project is located along Corporate Drive. The existing building is under operation. It was recently renovated and occupied by Wentworth Douglass. The project includes the production of the ring road that goes around the existing building. There will be building A with parking, the existing building with parking, then the last building. The utilities will incorporate the TAC suggested changes including the 8-inch pipe. The western side will service building B and the existing building. Building A will be serviced on the eastern side. The storm water buffers and systems have been defined. There are five systems out there with a surface sand filter because it is not the greatest soil out there. The bike racks and drop off area for the building were adjusted. The drop off area will divert incoming traffic to either go straight to park or turn to drop off then spin back around to go park. There is enough room for emergency vehicles. Ms. Walker questioned if there is signage for this drop off flow? Mr. Fenstermacher responded that the team is working on the layout. Once that is finalized the signage will be added.

TAC Comments –

- The crosswalk and stop sign locations raise a few concerns. Near the north end of Building B, why not bring the sidewalk out to the ring road and have just one driveway crossing, rather than the two driveway crossings? The stop sign before the crosswalk could be eliminated if this is done, and a stop sign could be placed on the mini-ring road. There should be a stop sign at the south end of the mini-ring road in front of Building B. At the driveway entrance to building A, the crosswalk should connect the sidewalks on the ring road, rather than being in the driveway throat. And a crosswalk could be placed across the driveway entrance to Building A. This would allow the stop sign in the driveway throat to be moved out to the ring road. There should be signs directing drivers to the drop off entrance for Building B. if they turn into the first driveway, they will not be able to access the drop off area on the passenger side of the car. A pedestrian crossing warning sign should be installed at the crosswalk to the Building B entrance from the handicap spaces.
 - Mr. Fenstermacher responded that the comments related to the sidewalks and crosswalks all seemed reasonable and will be incorporated.
- This needs to go out for third party peer review in respect to stormwater/drainage and sewer design.

- Ms. Walker added that this would be a condition before approval.
- Sanitary sewer design to comply with NHDES requirements.
- Sewer pipe size should be 8" diameter after first manhole from building. Sewer pipe that serves multiple services should be 8" diameter.
 - Mr. Fenstermacher addressed this in the presentation above.
- An access easement is required to access water main.
- Water main must be installed with polyethylene wrap and three brass wedges at all non-conductive joints.
- Add flush concrete sidewalk between handicapped parking in front of existing building (middle building).

Mr. Britz commented that the maintenance details of the sand filter units should be added. Mr. Fenstermacher confirmed that would be added. Mr. Britz added that the way this will be maintained in the future should be on the site plan. Mr. Fenstermacher responded that the owner would be required by AOT to keep a maintenance log.

Mr. Pezzullo added that the option should be kept open for 3rd party review of utility, water, sewer, and storm water construction.

Mr. Britz noted that the landscape plan indicates removing some existing trees and replanting close to where the removed trees are currently. Mr. Fenstermacher responded that once the layout is set, then a site walk would be done to verify locations.

Mr. Howe commented that there should be an example of the signage that will be at the road to review it. The landscaping should use non-combustible mulch.

Mr. Howe questioned what the widths of the roads were. Mr. Fenstermacher responded that one is 24 feet and the other is 28 feet wide.

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. Eby moved to postpone Site Plan Review of the application to the January 2, 2018 (2:00 p.m.) Technical Advisory Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:06 pm, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee