

MINUTES

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

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

2:00 PM

APRIL 2, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe (Fire Department) and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the March 5, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Peter Britz moved to approve the minutes from the March 5, 2019 meeting, seconded by Patrick Howe. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Islamic Society of the Seacoast Area, Owner**, for property located at **686 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 2-story building for religious assembly with a footprint of 3,880 s.f. and Gross Floor Area of 5,333 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 220 as Lot 90 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

Chair Walker read the notice into the record.

TAC Hearing Comments:

- The Life Safety code review should include the 2015 IFC with local amendments in its list of applicable codes and standards under **Fire Prevention**.
- The classroom portion of the building indicates the second exit is accessed through a storage area. This should be adjusted.
- What would allow both exits from the second floor to discharge through the interior of the building?

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

The project engineer Douglass LaRosa was present on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed the site plan and said they were granted a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the Planning Board to allow 60 parking spaces where 68 were required. He said they also were granted a use variance from the Board of Adjustment (BOA) in the SRB zone and had met with the Planning Department and Public Works to come up with the present design. He reviewed the parking levels, noting that there were two areas with infiltration basins and structures to reduce the runoff on the driveway. He said the plan was recently revised to remove a catch basin from the parking lot and place it on regular pavement to provide better drainage. He said some lights were removed at the top of the hill and that lighting calculations indicated adequate light levels in the lower parking lot and around the building. He said the landscaping plan was revised so that an area could be adjusted for an infiltration basin. He said they added plantings, noting that a Highway Noise Overlay District study indicated that three trees should be added. He said they were working with NHDOT to obtain a slope easement to reduce or eliminate the wall, and if they were successful, they would add some plantings in that location.

Mr. LaRosa reviewed the Traffic Noise Impact Assessment Plan, noting that an interior place of assembly required a 55 dba rating or less. He said the project would have double pane fenestration in the building and would be well below the 55 dba requirement. He said the addition of three trees would allow the outside area to also meet level requirements of 65 dba for outside noise and that the average noise level would be 64-65 dba. Relating to the drainage analysis, Mr. LaRosa said the project complied with their consultant's suggestions and would deliver the final report to them later that day. He said their rate of runoff was considerably reduced in post-construction from pre-construction.

Chair Walker asked whether the team addressed the Committee's comments that were sent to them prior to the meeting. Mr. LaRosa said the questions addressed the building but that their building consultant was not present. He asked whether the questions could be addressed at the building permit stage. Mr. Howe said he wasn't sure, adding that the outside consultant identified a few more items, including one that pertained to the exits from the second floor. He said one of the exits would have to exit directly to the outside, meaning that another path or door might be needed. He said that would be included in the site plan review. Mr. LaRosa said they had a sketch showing an exit going out directly to the outside area. He said there was a sidewalk there that wasn't shown in the building elevation plan. Mr. Howe said it should be in the building elevation. He said another item that the consultant pointed out was the exit discharge from the basement. Mr. LaRosa said the team would provide a sketch plan showing how they would exit out the basement onto a leveled grass area, opposite the existing back entrance. He said they would install a 5-ft wide gravel or silt walkway. Mr. Howe said it would have to be noted on the site plan. He also asked how the basement door coming up from the stairs would be installed so that it would swing in the right direction without blocking the egresses, noting the second exit in the basement might solve it coming from the classroom area but probably not from the storage area. Chair Walker said the applicant would have to update the site plan if the project was approved and that the Fire Department would sign off on it before it went to the Planning Board.

Mr. Eby mentioned the comment in the Life Safety Review letter that stated that the exterior stairs should be replaced with a ramp to grade level. Mr. LaRosa said the stairs were twelve feet up in the air. He explained that there was a ramp going up to the main floor and that the slope

didn't meet ADA requirements and wasn't intended to have a ramp on it. He said they had a ramp into the basement and an elevator to the second floor. He thought the plans might have been at a different level of completion when the comment was made but stated that the project had ADA-compliant access to each of the floors. Mr. Eby said they may have been talking about the deck or whatever was there before, but they said that the exterior stairs should be replaced with a ramp. He noted that was where the handicap parking would be. Mr. LaRosa said the access into the building was different before and had been revised.

Chair Walker said the application should go through the Planning Department at that point and that Mr. Eby could decide what the final recommendation would be. Mr. Desfosses said that Public Works would be satisfied as long as CMA signed off on it and that a final signature from the peer reviewer would be necessary.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Walker asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application.

George Pantelakos of 138 Maplewood Avenue rose to speak, but it was discovered that he was present for a different petition.

No one else rose to speak, and Chair Walker closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Britz, with the following stipulations:

- That CMA approve the final drainage design, and
- That the egress issues are cleared with the Fire Department.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Cate Street Development, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **428 Route 1 Bypass, Cate Street, 55 Cate Street, 161 Cate Street and 1 Cate Street**, requesting Site Plan approval for the redevelopment of the properties into a mixed use development, including 40,000 s.f. +/- retail/office space, 325 residential apartment units; Proposed Residential Building A: 23,800 s.f. footprint and 177,000 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Residential Building B: 21,000 s.f. footprint and 141,000 Gross Floor Area, and 23 townhomes; Proposed Townhome Buildings A: 8,640 s.f. total footprint and 25,920 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Townhome Buildings B: 11,440 total footprint and 34,320 Gross Floor Area, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 172 as Lot 1, Map 173 as Lot 2, Map 165 as Lot 2, Map 163 as Lot 33 and Map 163 as Lot 34 and lie within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District.

TAC Hearing Comments

- Are there any yard hydrants proposed?
- The traffic study recommended changing the lane usage on the site approach to the Bypass intersection. The site plans show the existing lane usage. The lane usage recommended in the study would be preferred to allow for emergency vehicle access to Borthwick when traffic on the Bypass is queued back from the traffic circle and the right most lane on the driveway won't be able to move. However, this lane configuration will require either modifications to the Borthwick Ave approach to realign the median island, or shifting the site driveway towards Hodgson Brook. Shifting the driveway may be the better of the options.
- The existing Cate Street bridge may remain open to provide access to the senior center and surrounding properties if and when the median on the Bypass is extended through the Coakley/Cottage intersection. In 2018, the City completed an independent evaluation of the required improvements in order to maintain this bridge for vehicular traffic. This comment is provided for the applicant's reference only.
- The roadway design may not provide sufficient width for trucks to negotiate the curves in the road, or for emergency vehicles to navigate the curves at speeds greater than 20 mph. The proposed road design and drainage will need to be reviewed by a third party reviewer at the cost of the applicant.
- All shrubs on parking lot islands should be maintained at a height of no more than 3 feet, to ensure sight lines at intersections.
- Start the replacement of Sewer at the edge of the Route 1 bypass.
- Landscape details to meet City Standards.
- Street trees to be approved by City of Portsmouth.
- ½ scale plans were not to scale.
- Show grades at Route 1 Bypass, road stationing did not go far enough to determine proper elevation of road.
- Add curve radius to proposed City Road.
- Add drains to bike trail using DI/DB basins.
- Two stormwater areas are shared, who maintains?
- Bad grading at elevation 26, Cate street bridge area.
- 5' sewer manholes will be required for large pipe runs.
- Match crown of sewers as they enter municipal system.
- Provide lighting approved by City. ELO system. Provide proper lighting of road in curves and for trails and sidewalks.
- Sewer inverts to be solid brick.
- Use at least 3" of HBP on off road trail.
- Off road trail goes up in grade possible unnecessarily near corner, please review.
- Submission package is missing Renderings, Elevations, Floor Plans.
- Proposed sign locations should be shown on the plans.
- Please provide a plan showing location of open space as well as location and size of proposed community space and types. A detailed zoning analysis (including any waiver requests to the dimensional requirements of the character-based zoning) should confirm full compliance with the community space requirements.
- Please add proposed bicycle parking to plan set.
- Update the zoning ordinance reference on Sheet CN-0001 (date should be current version of the ordinance). Add parking calculations to Note 11.
- Please explain your plan for solid waste storage and collection.

- Please indicate if you intend to store salt on the site during winter months and, if so, indicate location and provide detail of proposed seasonal storage.
- Please indicate your snow storage and/or removal plans.
- In general all curbing (interior and exterior to the site) should be vertical granite curb unless otherwise allowed by DPW or in locations where curb is intended to be mountable.
- Consider using a raised crosswalk or speed table in lieu of / in addition to the proposed bituminous berms in the driveways between the townhouse units and the mixed-use development;
- Crosswalks and tactile landing pads are not needed at site driveways, City prefers these only get used for street intersections.
- Sheet L1.00 references "City of Portland" Planting schedule and should be updated.
- Provide an updated Subdivision and Site Plan Application Checklist that indicates which plan sheet or supplemental item contains the required information.
- City needs to know what the anticipated water and sewer demand is for this project. Also, how the demand for water will be used, i.e.: residential, office, commercial, irrigation, etc., for City's water system planning. TAC will be recommending that the engineer needs to complete the water system design for this project, at which time, we will require the developer to be responsible for our consultant, W&S (third party review) to review the design and perform a water model/study of the proposed system before we can approve the final design.

Chair Walker read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Project Engineer Rick Lundborn of Fuss and O'Neill was present to speak to the petition, along with Attorney John Bosen and Gregg Mikolaities of August Consulting. Mr. Lundborn briefly summarized the project, noting that the properties were occupied by the Frank Jones Center, a small outbuilding, some industrial facilities, paved areas, and a house. He said the proposal was to remove the paved surfaces and all the buildings from the site and construct a commercial building adjacent to the Route One Bypass. He said the project would consist of Apartment Buildings A and B and 23 townhouses, adjacent to the current townhouse project. He said they wanted to reconfigure Cates Street to be a through street to the intersection with Borthwick Avenue. Mr. Lundborn addressed some of the Committee's comments. He said there was a potential to leave the re-connection to the portion across the bridge open but that they would continue to work with the City. He said there was a large parking field that was part of the project and they would ensure that the raised plaza for the pedestrian-driven street access would have a speed table field at the entrance and exit at all the intersections. He would also provide interconnectivity between the added townhouses. Relating to the proposed curve backed out against the pavement to provide vehicular access and the Committee's suggestion that the project consider a raised crosswalk or a speed table, he said they would do that, depending on grading and viability at those locations. He said they were also proposing a 10-foot wide bike trail along the road on the north side through the intersection of Borthwick Avenue and would add the pedestrian pedestal depending on what happened with DOT and the offsite improvements.

Mr. Lundborn said they were breaking up the plan more and that the road plan would be a separate one. He said there would be a dedicated lane near the intersection with Borthwick Avenue that would go out to the south and another lane going toward the north and the traffic

circle. He said the connectivity to the U-Haul site would be maintained and that the first driveway into the site would be to the east of the U-Haul property; the road would continue, with two lanes currently specified at 11 feet each, and a 1-foot shoulder and curb on each side. He noted that there was a landscape planting strip on the north side between the bike trail and the road, and an additional 6-ft wide sidewalk adjacent to the property but tight to the road. He said they would revise a plan to be in line with the City's recommendations for a through road on Cate Street from Islington Street and a stop control on Bartlett Street. He said there would be green space between the two apartment buildings as well as an area for pets. Regarding snow storage, he said there would be a large area for it that would include an underdrain.

Relating to the Committee's concern about truck movements, he said they did several truck movements through the site and were working with the architects on the garbage pickup and facilities for the commercial building. He said they made sure that a truck could get around the compactor and that they would update their truck turning analysis. He said they ran vehicles coming into the site for life safety as a National Highway Research Group's aerial fire truck vehicle and had updated it for a WB50, which they would provide.

Mr. Lundborn stated that the stormwater drainage was being updated and that they received their saturation rate testing for the site and locations that they wanted to use for the infiltration basins or detention basins. He said that would be the decider on what the underground storage facilities were doing. He said some of them would be infiltration and others would likely be straight holding and slow release retention facilities. He said they also had some bioretention areas. He said the bulk of stormwater for the street would be collected with catch basins and drain manholes, and he explained how it would be done, noting that there would be some tie-in overflows from structures like the underground storage facilities for large storm events, but that generally it would sink into the ground and would not need the overflow. He explained how it would connect. He said the bioretention areas were meant to replace two catch basins on the street and allow for a portion of the street runoff to be treated using LID vs. being shared with the site. He said that none of the site's stormwater flowed into them.

Mr. Lundborn noted that, pertaining to utilities, the Committee had a concern about whether the project would disrupt the U-Haul business. He said it was possible to get the sewer from the other side of the Route One Bypass and the main that ran down behind the Frank Jones Center to run back through the site through a small section of pipe and go into the new proposed main. He said that water would come in from the intersection. He said there was a water line behind the Frank Jones building. He explained that, in order to keep and maintain a loop, they would put a valve in and run it back to the new main. He noted that there was also a 12-inch main that ran along Cate Street, which they would extend down. He said they would have a secondary loop for the townhouses. He said the project would be served by natural gas and underground electric, and that they would consult with Unitil again to see if there was a better route. He explained how the switch gears, manholes, and transformers would work and how the sewer would connect. Mr. Lundborn referred to TAC's comment about fire hydrants, stating that they would maintain the two existing hydrants and install new ones between Buildings A and B, at the intersection of the second driveway adjacent to the townhouses, and at the end of Building B. He said there was a fire hydrant near the townhouse project currently being built and an additional one in the same project. He noted that there would be off-site improvements worked out with DOT and the City.

Mr. Lundborn requested that Mr. Howe look at the utility plans and locations of the hydrants and offer his suggestions. He reiterated that they did look at the radius of large vehicles and could get a WB50 around the 200-ft radiuses and keep it in the lanes. He said a WB67 would need more width and wasn't meant for local streets. He also noted that the curbs would be good for a 25mph speed limit but not much faster. He said they would have the curbs marked for the next meeting.

He said another concern was the sewer, referencing the comment about connecting back to the Route One Bypass. He hoped it just meant tying into the main with a manhole at a 45-degree corner from the line and running down to the first proposed manhole to the new street. Mr. Desfosses said the sewer running adjacent to the Frank Jones site area was the one that Public Works wanted to replace. Mr. Lundborn said they did not want to disrupt U-Haul. Mr. Desfosses said that Public Works might allow a sewer to be there but that it would need to be replaced, and that they preferred for it to stay out front as originally laid out. He said there was also a drain line directly adjacent to it that wasn't appropriate, considering the depth of the sewer, and that the water main was a problem as well. He said it might be acceptable if they could shift the line over so that there was a utility easement centered in it and far enough from the building's foundation. He said if the larger manhole had a suitable radius inside of it, Public Works would probably allow a 90-degree corner, but they would limit it to as few as possible. He referred to the comment about matching crowns where the site sewers were intercepting the large sewer, noting that the site sewers should be higher. He said there seemed to be missing information about whether the site sewers were running at the same depth as the large sewer. He said Public Works still expected the project to go to Cottage and Coakley intersection and cross in a different spot than shown on the plans. He said the applicant had three services for water, coming from U-Haul, the site lot, and the Port City Motor Inn, as well as a service coming out of Cottage Street. He said that would be dealt with when the main went in. He said the 4-inch line would have to be intercepted and fed from that new main. He said they needed to know the expected water usage so that they could run a water model.

Chair Walker asked how long it would take to do the modeling. Mr. Desfosses said they would get an estimate from the engineer on the cost, then collect the funds from the applicant and put it in escrow. Chair Walker concluded that it could be a condition of the Planning Board. She also noted the Committee's comments on landscape details and street trees, and she encouraged the applicant to start with the site plan regulations. She said the planting guidelines were being updated and told the applicant to call the Planning Department if they needed more information. Pertaining to the vertical granite curb comment, Chair Walker noted that the applicant said they preferred to do the silt granite curb and a concrete curb with the sidewalks in the site's interior. She said the Planning Department generally encouraged a vertical granite curb.

Mr. Lundborn clarified that they were doing a vertical on the street where there was an adjacent sidewalk that would become a City right-of-way, and that they would transition to the integral curb when it went into the site. He said all the public realm portions would be vertical against the concrete sidewalk and that the only place they proposed slope was at the landscaped islands. Mr. Desfosses referred to the DI/DB comment on the bike trail and said they were intended for winter use when there was a snowbank. He said the trails got iced up and that Public Works was worried about side curbs. He noted that the project's side curbs seemed to go up very high. Mr. Lundborn said they would look into it.

Mr. Marsilia asked if the commercial buildings included underground parking. Mr. Lundborn said there was no underground parking. He referred to the comment about rubbish storage and said there would be an overhead door for rolling dumpsters, compost, and so on. He said that Buildings A and B each had a trash room where the trash would be rolled out and picked up and that the rooms were sized appropriately for the truck to get in and out. He said they also needed to locate some dumpsters for the townhouses, which would probably be the only exterior dumpster paddock. He said he would find out how often the trash pickup would be scheduled for the two apartment buildings.

Mr. Howe asked whether the tower truck was used in the referenced truck template. Mr. Lundborn said they used the aerial from the NRCHP but would use the WB50, which was equivalent to the tower truck. Mr. Howe said he would provide Mr. Lundborn with the specific one. Mr. Desfosses suggested that the applicant consider a hydrant on Cate Street.

Chair Walker noted that there were follow-up items and that they would try to get the peer review done. She asked whether Mr. Lundborn received any follow-up on the NHDOT permit. Mr. Lundborn said they wanted to phase it all out. Mr. Mikolaities said they would have the permit recommendation the next week, noting that DOT asked them to pull out site impacts only and the one that impacted the City connector.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone the application to the April 30, 2019 meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Wayne & Kristin Ricciardi Barrow, Owners** and **James Verra, Applicant**, for property located at **55 Lafayette Road**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval for a two lot subdivision as follows: the subject lot to be divided so that Lot 1 becomes 10,773 s.f. with 100 feet of street frontage on Lafayette Road and Lot 2 becomes 6,251 s.f. with 96+/- feet of street frontage on Lafayette Road. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 151 as Lot 10 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District and Historic District.

Chair Walker read the notice into the record.

TAC Hearing Comments:

- The sidewalk in this area is being constructed this spring, new lot will require driveway permit and modifications to sidewalk for driveway and utility cuts to be paid for by applicant.

- Please show a proposed driveway location for the new lot.
- Provide explanation why lot line cannot be at right angle to road (per Subdivision regulations Section VI. 2A).
- A blasting plan should be provided for removal of the existing ledge on the lot.
- A drainage plan should be provided to address how development of the lot will address stormwater maintenance.
- Any future construction on the lot will require HDC approval.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

The applicant Jim Verra of James Verra Associates and the owner Wayne Barrow were present to speak to the petition. Mr. Verra said the proposal was a two-lot subdivision and noted that the BOA granted a variance for the lot frontage. He said the existing lot was created in 1948. He said they would add the proposed driveway to the plan. He said the existing property line was five degrees from 90, so they were able to add more area to the lot. He said they wanted to list the blasting plan and drainage plan as notes on the subdivision plan stating that it would be a condition of the building permit. He said they would add to Note 2 that it was in the Historic Overlay District. He noted that an HDC approval would be required for any construction. He said they had water, sewer, and gas utilities from Lafayette Road and that they should be able to tie in to the sewer that was located across Lafayette Road. Regarding stormwater, he said an additional note would be that the water management plan would be part of their building permit.

Chair Walker asked whether the utilities were adequate for the lot. Mr. Desfosses said the hookups would be challenging, especially crossing Lafayette Road because they had to cross under a gas line over the 20-inch water main. Chair Walker asked where the utility lines were on the plan. Mr. Desfosses said the sewer and electric were on the other side of the road, and that water and gas were on the property side of the road. He said that would have to come across if underground service was required.

Chair Walker noted that those were the types of things the Committee needed understanding of before the application went before the Planning Board. She asked the applicant if he wanted to request that he not get overhead service underground. Mr. Barrow said he wanted to sell the property as a lot and did not intend to build on it himself. He asked what risk he would take on if he asked for that to be part of the building permit. Chair Walker said there would be no risk but that he should be aware of any challenges. Mr. Barrow said he wanted the project to conform to the neighborhood and asked whether he should give the challenges to the buyer. Chair Walker said the applicant had to answer those questions from the Planning Board.

Chair Walker said TAC would confirm whether overhead wires needed to be underground, as far as subdivision approval. She thought it was part of the site plan approval requirements but said she would check to see if the requirement could be waived and would let the applicant know.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
Mr. Desfosses moved that Applications B and C be heard together, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **RJF-Maplewood, LLC, Owner** and **RW Norfolk Holdings, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval for a two lot subdivision as follows: the subject lot to be divided so that Lot 1 becomes 58,583 s.f. with 840 ft. of street frontage and Lot 2 becomes 42,779 s.f. with 610 ft. of street frontage Said property is shown on Assessor Map 124 as Lot 8 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts.

C. The application of **RJF-Maplewood, LLC, Owner** and **RW Norfolk Holdings, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue** requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 3½-story commercial building with a footprint of 20,000 s.f. and gross floor area of 74,000 s.f. with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 124 as Lot 8 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5), Historic and Downtown Overlay Districts.

TAC Hearing Comments:

- There seems to be a few conservative assumptions, which may be part of the reason that such poor LOS is forecast for the future conditions. I would like to see the existing traffic volume network and the appendix materials. The Route 1 Bypass bridge was open in January when the counts were done, so there shouldn't have been a need to estimate rerouting of traffic due to the bridge. The 60% from Maplewood seems a little high, as does the trip gen for the retail portion. Also, the 19% seasonal adjustment may be a little high. Will parking spaces under the building be reserved? If not, the dead end aisle for the 10 spaces along the Raynes Ave side will create circulation problems.
- Appropriate contribution to improvements to the Russell St intersection will be required
- All remaining existing lighting standard lights on Maplewood (in project area) Raynes Ave and Vaughan St to be removed as part of this approval
- Provide updated plans to City for construction of sewer this spring indicating sewer lateral locations
- Appropriate contribution for City Sewer construction project may be required, coordinate with DPW
- Is there internal bypass for high flows in the stormwater unit?
- Add additional CB drains in Vaughan St/Raynes Ave as determined to be needed by DPW to maintain a crowned road section.
- There are gas and telephone lines going through proposed planters, please revise
- Actual locations of utility lines to site to be approved by City of Portsmouth
- 8" Domestic water is oversized
- Reclamation of Raynes Ave and overlay of all remaining bindered areas in the Raynes/Vaughan Area to be provided, details approved by DPW
- There are 3 different types of lights specified within 200' of each other, consider revising on site lights to match Vaughan area

- Landscape details to meet City Standards and be approved by City including tree root zones if determined to be needed
- Street trees to be approved by City of Portsmouth
- Lighting Cabinet to meet City standards, all lights in this area to be fed from this new cabinet including lights already installed
- Please confirm what surface material is proposed for the pedestrian alley
- It appears that the applicant is proposing to provide more than 20% community space as required by the ordinance. Is it the applicant's intention to bank the community space towards a future development?
- Correct proposed number of stories on plan Sheet C-102
- Are the dumpsters intended to be used for use by both properties?
- Dumpster location needs to be set back at least 10' per zoning and 20' per site plan review regulations. If 20' is not possible, a waiver will need to be requested.
- The proposed community space should be adjusted to avoid public access easement that does not align with the pedestrian circulation patterns on the proposed alleyway connector.
- The proposed building should be listed as a 4 story building given the 4th story does not qualify as a penthouse.
- Pending HDC approval, the building elevations should be included in the plan set.

Chair Walker read the notices into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Tighe and Bond Project Manager Patrick Crimmins, engineer Neil Hansen, and traffic engineer Vinod Kalikiri were present to speak to the petition, as well as Lisa DeStefano of DeStefano Architects, Eric Nelson of the Kane Company, and Rich Houghton of Halvorson Design.

Mr. Crimmins reviewed the site plan and subdivision plan. He stated that the lot would be divided into two lots: a 1.3 acre site where the existing 111 Maplewood building sat, and a one-acre site to the west for the proposed office building. He noted that there was an access easement for the drive because parking for the existing site would remain. He referred to the demolition plan, indicating what would be removed from the site. He said that existing utilities would remain as part of the existing building.

Pertaining to the comment for the removal of the existing light poles, he said he would specify every light pole that would be removed. He said they also proposed improvements to the existing parking lot. He said they removed the curb cut off Maplewood Avenue to make the parking lot more conforming. Referring to comments about the location of the property line and parking, he said they looked into the existing tenant agreement regarding parking and that they situated the lot line in a way that made sense for both properties. He said the lot line ran across the access drive for the proposed lot. He said it was indicated that up to 55 spaces would be available for the lot, so with the subdivision and curb cut closure, they would provide 55 spaces for the existing building and maintain the 288 spaces needed for the lower office spaces and keep some existing parking. He said there was underground parking on the proposed lot.

Referring to the comment about a community space incentive, he said they exceeded that requirement so they wanted to bank it and would need a CUP. Chair Walker agreed and said a PDI Plan Development Agreement was part of the approval. Mr. Crimmins said they would review it with the applicant. He said they designed a community space area that would connect through the site over to the AC and had a pocket park, wide sidewalks, and so on.

Referring to the comment about a four-story building, he said the building was labeled as 3-1/2 stories but was modified to indicate four stories. He reviewed the ground floor plan, including parking, access drive, streets, sidewalks, crosswalks. He said the existing dumpster would be moved to a different location.

Referring to the comment about setback requirements, Mr. Crimmins said they would meet the 10-ft setback by putting in place what was out there for the existing office building. He said they would probably require a waiver for the 20-ft setback and would submit it as part of their package. He said it made the most sense for the trucks to get more access and that there would be a service trash area at the basement level. Related to the comment about the pedestrian easement and whether it referenced the setback line for the Eversource vault, he said they had a 20-ft setback and that a dash line went through it.

Chair Walker asked for clarification on proposed materials. Mr. Houghton said the primary streetscape material was City-standard brick and that they proposed concrete unit pavers for the pedestrian connection throughway, which were more durable than brick but had a similar joint pattern and construction detail. Chair Walker noted that the comment may have been related to the pedestrian connection. She asked why the gray area wasn't included on the community space and whether there was a fence or a wall. Mr. Crimmins said the team would discuss whether the intent was to allow public access or if there would be restrictive access. Chair Walker asked that the applicant update the site plan to show the materials and details. She said that, for the community space to be counted in the access easement, it had to be deeded as public access to the City but could be qualified if maintenance was factored in. She said it could be any type of surface if the client maintained it but should be brick if it was out in the public way. She asked if brick was proposed for the Maplewood Avenue plan. Mr. Houghton said that brick was shown in more areas. Chair Walker said she would verify what they had in the plan but thought there was an intent to have a different material surface rather than brick for that portion of Maplewood Avenue. It was further discussed.

Mr. Crimmins said that the site plan for the existing parking was the same design as previously approved. He said the basement level plan had 31 parking spaces and also included a ground floor commercial space and lobby entry set up at elevation 10. He said the parking garage was at elevation 7 because it needed the height. He showed where the trash bins would be stored. Mr. Desfosses asked whether there was any residential space, and Mr. Crimmins said there was not.

Mr. Crimmins said the grading and stormwater management system had the same design intent that was previously approved by the City, and he described the underground retention system. Regarding the utility plan, he said they showed the same tie-in locations as the previously-approved plan, with water coming off Maplewood Avenue. He said the size would be removed and that the final size would be coordinated with Public Works. He said that gas and telephone

would come off Raynes Avenue and would be shifted a bit to avoid conflicts. He said the sewer would come off Vaughan Street and tie into the new sewer line. As to the comment about working with City staff to review those plans, he said the plans would be updated to show laterals so that they could be installed at the time the sewer was installed. He said they were shoring up the grease trap on the plan in case the restaurant space needed it. He said the electric would tie into the existing manhole vault and that Eversource had looked at it.

Regarding the lighting comment, Mr. Crimmins said they would add the lighting relative to the location of the cabinet. Mr. Desfosses said the cabinet should be in the same spot and that it should be confirmed that it still worked. Mr. Crimmins suggested reviewing it again and said he would coordinate it with Mr. Desfosses before the next meeting.

The Chair asked whether the utility separations for the lots would be part of the site plan. Mr. Crimmins said the existing building had their own individual services and would have their own access. He said the utilities for both lots would be underground.

Mr. Houghton reviewed the site plan for landscaping and stated that there would be raised street planters on Maplewood Avenue as well as some screening for the parking, a planting bed along the south side of the proposed parking, seating elements with integrated planting beds along the pedestrian passage, stairs and a retaining wall, and a crosswalk at the vehicle entry toward Vaughan Street. He said the rhythm of street tree planters would be continued along Maplewood Avenue at the corner near Gateway Park. He said they proposed a public terrace at the grade change and would integrate bench elements at both sites. He said planters would be incorporated along Raynes Avenue and would be closer to the back of the street curb. Chair Walker said the City had recommendations for varieties of trees and would provide the applicant with initial guidance. She noted that the Trees and Greenery Committee would also look at it.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the applicant was proposing an easement to provide access to the public along Raynes Avenue that would place the planters where the right-of-way was. He noted that swinging car doors could hit planters that close to the curb line and suggested adjusting the planter pits so that they worked with the street layout. Mr. Houghton said they had a progress detail for the planters and a resolution for car doors by pushing back the planters a few feet or angling the tree pit curve to slope and meet the top of the curb condition along the street. Mr. Desfosses said he preferred the raised planters and wanted to ensure that they were centered on the parking lot lines so that car doors could be opened. Chair Walker said they could be setting a precedent and that she would give the applicant more guidance. Mr. Houghton said they also included a low fence and planter rail to keep pets and people out of the planters.

Mr. Houghton discussed the lighting features, noting that they had street poles between the planters 60 feet on center. He said the lantern style would be used on Maplewood Avenue and the District ornamental standard along Vaughan Street and Raynes Avenue. He said a third pole type would be along the pedestrian corridor that would give more output and be safer for pedestrians as well as have a more appropriate pedestrian height. He said the standard street light height was 18 feet, which was high for a pedestrian. Mr. Desfosses said he thought it was 16 feet, which was why the applicant was asked to use that light. Mr. Houghton said they would have about three or four new lights along the pedestrian alley in the middle and would make it

consistent. Mr. Desfosses asked why the lighting was switched from being on the curb line in front of the older building to behind the right-of-way at the new building along Maplewood Avenue. He asked if it was because the sidewalk wasn't wide enough to have lighting between the planters. Mr. Houghton said they would look at it and make sure it made sense, but it was likely that they would pull them further back from the parking spots.

Mr. Crimmins stated that the Alteration of Terrain plan was submitted the day before.

Mr. Kalikiri discussed the traffic study. He noted that there was some confusion about the technical appendix and said he would review questions about traffic growth off-line. He said the assumptions were conservative and that TAC would see slightly higher traffic volumes. He said he would revise it and scale them back. He said some of the numbers weren't significant enough to have a big impact on the results. Overall, he said the study showed that the project would not cause a detrimental impact to the area's traffic operations, noting that they modeled it both with their future traffic and other future developmental traffic, along with proposed improvements. He said the future analysis would reflect those changes.

Chair Walker asked when the project would update the sewer on Vaughan Street and was told that it would be in May or June. She asked whether the applicant would contribute to the improvement. Mr. Desfosses said Tighe and Bond did a funding matrix and that the amount would probably shift, but that it was set up and that they just needed to agree on a dollar amount.

Mr. Marsilia asked if the generator would go on the roof. Mr. Crimmins said it wasn't confirmed but noted that the building was a non-combustible material. Mr. Marsilia recommended that if the generator was placed on the grade, it should be shown on the plan because there would be significant intake and exhaust that would show up in the elevations and would go before the HDC. He said the applicant might also need an elevator.

Mr. Howe asked what the commercial space on the basement level would be. Mr. Crimmins said he didn't know. Chair Walker recommended that it be factored in because it would need an egress if it was used as a public assembly space. In response to further questions from Mr. Howe, Mr. Houghton said there would be an ornamental tree roof deck for the office space and that he would confirm with the architect whether there would be a first-floor vestibule.

Mr. Marsilia asked what the cut was on the deepest point of the lot line and was told that it was probably 10 feet on Maplewood Avenue. He said the applicant should provide the design for Public Works to review, and it was further discussed.

Mr. Eby noted that there was a 'loading zone, no parking' sign that would have to go through Parking and Traffic Safety. Chair Walker agreed and said the approval was needed before the project went before the Planning Board. She asked if the sign was to ensure that loading zone requirements were met and whether they were needed on site. Mr. Crimmins said he would look into it. Mr. Eby recommended that the underground parking spaces be reserved due to the dead-end island that might not allow vehicles a way to get out. Chair Walker agreed and noted that the loading requirements were not part of the City Ordinance.

Mr. Britz recommended that the fertilizer in the plant bed materials be low-phosphorous, slow-release nitrogen fertilizer because the water from the plant bed would flow into the North Mill Pond. He asked that it be reduced from the denoted 10-10-10 fertilizer.

PUBLIC HEARING

George Pantelakos of 138 Maplewood Avenue said he was present on behalf of Jim Somes of 154 Maplewood Avenue, who had sewage backflow problems and was concerned that the project would add more sewage, so he wanted to know if the sewer and storm systems would be up to grade. Mr. Desfosses said they were going through engineering and utility design reviews and were aware of the issue. He said the project’s sewer system went into a different spot.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Chair Walker clarified that there were no loading requirements in the CD5 District and that the applicant had to evaluate whether they needed that loading zone on the public way because there was no guarantee that they would get it.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone the application to the April 30, 2019 meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:07 pm, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee