

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

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

2:00 PM

DECEMBER 3, 2019

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Juliet TH Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Patrick Howe, Fire Department; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1 and Ray Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

Mr. Britz moved to approve the minutes from the November 5, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Howe. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of the **Bethel Assembly of God, Owner**, for property located at **200 Chase Drive** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide a lot with an area of 2.7 acres (116,591 s.f.) and 1,635 +/- ft. of street frontage into two (2) lots as follows: proposed Lot 1 with an area of 90,096 s.f. and 1,120 ft. +/- street frontage and proposed Lot 2 with an area of 26,495 s.f. and 515 ft. +/- of street frontage. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 210, Lot 02 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District. LU #19-211.

Mr. Howe moved to hear Old Business Item A and Old Business Item B together and vote on them separately, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Belden with Altus Engineering, Steve Kelm with 200 Chase LLC, Robbi Woodburn with Woodburn Landscaping and Pastor Chad Lynn with Connect Community Church spoke to the application. Mr. Belden reviewed some of the comments from the previous meeting. There was concern about the drainage. The applicants met with Mr. Desfosses on site to look at the existing

drainage patterns. The drainage plan has been revised and there were negligible changes to the models. They will continue to work with DPW on approval of the concept of drainage.

TAC Comments:

- The 2.6 people per vehicle is not consistent with the actual numbers observed, which are 2.4 people per vehicle. Applying this rate to the peak attendance plus 10% would require 79 parking spaces, greater than the 75 proposed.
- There should be a plan in place to address overflow parking needs.
 - Mr. Belden responded that he observed the parking for two weeks. There are multiple services and 15-20 volunteers all come in their own car, so that drives down the average. On November 24, 2019 the church held one of their biggest events for Thanksgiving. The church marked off 75 parking stalls for that event and the volunteers parked off site. They were shuttled to the site. They accommodated 202 attendees with 73 cars in the lot. It was 2.8 people per vehicle. Mitigation parking techniques included in the parking plan and they were used for the thanksgiving dinner. The last page of the package has a sketch showing overflow parking. An additional 16-17 vehicles can fit on site if they can double stack in the aisles for the larger events. There is also the connecting drive aisle from the residential area to the church. They may also be able to double stack parking there if it does not impede emergency access. The church is monitoring their parking and trying to keep services to 150 persons or smaller. They will provide a draft for a special events parking plan for the City to review.
- The applicant's plan is still not shown replacing the sidewalks along Michael Succi and Chase as required.
 - Mr. Belden responded that they were not aware that this was a requirement for the project. The project does not have the funding for a lot of off-site improvements. The proposal is to replace it just in front of the residential site.
- The applicant is showing improvements that are located on City property, which the Planning Board does not have jurisdiction over. This will need further discussion.
 - Mr. Belden responded that he would talk about the community space at the end of the presentation. Ms. Walker commented that the community space should be feasible on its own without relying on the City's property to complete the community space. There are a lot of improvements proposed to public land that could lead to maintenance issues.
- Solid Waste Storage Area - the proposed location of the storage area is inappropriate to the Maplewood Ave. view corridor and greenway as well as the sight-line to the proposed building.
 - Mr. Belden responded that there would be a solid 6-foot-tall fence with arborvitae around it. Ms. Walker commented that the trees were inconsistent

with site plan and landscape plan. Mr. Cracknell questioned why it was not in the middle of the site. The current location could create a barrier for the handicap spot. Mr. Belden responded that they moved it to get additional parking and create the access connection. There is a striped off area for handicap access and trash access. The door to the enclosure would be on the building side. The handicap spot is on that side because they can access the building and go right to the elevators. Ms. Walker commented that the configuration was still concerning.

- ADA Parking – Does the proposed ADA parking space provide adequate access and egress given the location of the abutting parking spaces?
- Sidewalk Extension between Chase Drive and Maplewood Ave. – To support better and more efficient pedestrian circulation consideration should be given to extending the concrete sidewalk along the front of the proposed building (along the parking lot) to Maplewood Ave.
- Proposed Walkway – If needed tip-downs should be added to the proposed walkway where it crosses the driveway connector between the church and the proposed apartment building.
- Community Path – A construction and maintenance easement may be required for the proposed path extension through city property.

Mr. Belden noted that the remaining comments related to the community space. The requirement is to have 20% community space. This plan is providing 22.1 % community space. There are pathway connections through the site with signage. The one around the church will be a brick paved walkway. There will be a circular area with plantings in the right of way. The improvements can stand alone without work in the right of way. The pathway going north and south connect Chase Dr. to Market St. At the last meeting the Committee discussed making a connection for the new building to Market St. There is a big swale in that area. Making the connection requires a culvert and path going over the swale. The proposed connection is the best access. Connecting the loop to Market St. provided a lot of benefit to the project. They are not counting City land in the community space, but it provides good access to the space. Ms. Woodburn added that beyond the two path connections the only other improvements on City land was plantings. They can change the loop and bring in the plantings or create a maintenance agreement. Mr. Belden commented that this project provides a significant amount of public walkways.

Mr. Howe questioned if there would be no parking on one side of Chase Dr. Mr. Belden responded that it has been requested, and they are on the Parking Traffic and Safety agenda for December. Mr. Howe commented that it's very tight and only one lane with parking on both sides. The reduction of parking on site makes this concerning. Emergency vehicles need to be able to access the neighborhood. As the plan currently stands there are still major concerns unless parking on Chase Dr. is restricted.

Mr. Eby commented that it looked like 75 spots would be enough. The worst-case peak with 10% would be over that amount. However, there is a mitigation plan to help with that.

Mr. Desfosses noted that there should not be drainage infrastructure on city land. The building seems to be a little too big because the drainage can't fit around it. Mr. Belden responded that there are two locations where it is on City property. The first one is a culvert under the path going over an existing large swale. Ms. Walker questioned if a connection was not there would there still be a drain there. Mr. Belden responded that there would not. The second is an outlet structure with an 8-inch pipe to get it closer to a catch basin. Ms. Walker noted that there is too much drainage in the corner with the community space and it is impacting City land. Mr. Desfosses commented that they should pipe the flow to a swale on the side so no infrastructure would be on City property. Mr. Belden responded that the elevations would make that complicated. Ms. Walker commented that this needed to be resolved before it goes to Planning Board, and they need to handle drainage on site.

Mr. Cracknell commented that he did not like the trash enclosure along Market St. The trash could be stored in a little building. It could be an asset. It could be more environmentally sensitive. The building should be well designed and integrated into the site. The handicap spot does not look inviting with everything around it. It's tight.

Ms. Walker reiterated that in general they are making a good effort to connect community space to the public ways. The community space in front of the church needs work specifically the side closest to the two existing residences. It looks like just a lawn in front of the church. The connections should be balanced without over burdening them with infrastructure and landscaping. The oval should be modified. The drainage is something that needs to be resolved. The storm water needs to be handled as much as possible on site.

Mr. Britz commented that he was also concerned about the community space. There's no meaningful community space because it is all accessways out to the public ways. Mr. Kelm commented that the community space that is being added is in excess of the park that the City is constructing. There is a significant amount of paths, which is double the walkways the City is constructing on Market St. The plan is not counting anything on City property. The investment and amount of work is not minor. Mr. Britz agreed that it was not minor, but they are just linear paths. Ms. Woodburn added that the paths are vegetated areas throughout the site to welcome the public across the property. The connections make the property porous and useable to the neighborhood. There is real value in having residents feel welcome crossing the property in a beautiful way. Mr. Cracknell questioned if there would be public access easements. Ms. Walker responded that it was not required but it does have to be community-oriented community space.

Mr. Eby noted that parking space number 6 is right up against the bin storage and hard to get door access.

PUBLIC HEARING

Kyle Crossen-Langelier of 304 Leslie Drive lives across from the parking lot in the cove. Ms. Crossen-Langelier was concerned about lights shining onto her property from cars and lighting

on the building. Especially because the church is considering night services. Ms. Crossen-Langelier requested more information on the exterior lighting and mechanical systems and for the applicants to not remove the pine trees. There should be proper screening.

Jason Karlin of 29 Brigham Lane commented that this was a repeat of the same submission and it is flawed. The plan needs more details for the utilities. The parking configurations for the residential building does not make sense. The parking space against the trash enclosure is problematic. The dumpster enclosure is too close to the property line and seems too small. They need a waiver. The community space does not feel inviting. There is still an application to subdivide. Mr. Karlin questioned if there would be easements to keep the site connected. This project is too big; it's a 22-unit building. They need a development site to build it with a CUP. One requirement for a site development is community space that is controlled by a single entity. The applicants could subdivide and build a 9-unit building that is allowed. That would solve a lot of issues. Mr. Karlin commented that he still wanted to see a plan with the building rotated and waivers.

Roger Gauthier of 36 Brigham Lane commented that they were trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. It just won't fit. There are too many apartments and the parking doesn't work. There have been so many meetings and it is still the same plan.

Ed Richards of 435 Cutts Ave. commented that this project is driven by a financial need of the church. If the City was approached with this application for the empty lot, then they would not approve it. Parking is restricted for part of Chase Dr. because there were issues with parking when the church was busier. The current use numbers for the church should not be the basis for the parking. It should be based on the building capacity. There are no other places to park for overflow. This is not a downtown church. They should require a variance to reduce the parking from 147 to 75. The Frank Jones site has twice the amount of parking than this building. The walkways will not be used as community space. The building should be reoriented. This application will just keep coming back until it is approved. Once the site is subdivided the community space will be left with the church. They will not have 20% community space left with the residential building. As neighbors they are willing to work with a development that makes sense

Maryanne Gauthier of 36 Brigham Lane commented that they moved here a few years ago. This development will result in a parking and traffic increase. A similar request was made by the mosque. Their building has a capacity of 125 and 60 spaces, which is a reduction from the 68 that were required. The church capacity 525 people. They are requesting to go from 134 spaces to 75 spaces. The mosque specifically says in the proposal it would be used once a week. They have other locations in Rochester and Dover. This church would be used many days. The parking is concerning.

Mr. Belden commented that they can put an outlet into the catch basin on Michael Succi Dr. to get drainage off of City property. They will replace the sidewalk and run the pipe to connect to the catch basin. For the other one they could make an excess agreement or put the path in at grade with the walkway. There would be no structures on City property.

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

Ms. Walker clarified that TAC is an advisory committee that provides the Planning Board with a recommendation. The Planning Board will provide an approval on parking. TAC can only make comments on it. An additional CUP is required for a development site. TAC cannot require people to go for a variance if the project complies with zoning. The developer has responded to comments that TAC and the neighborhood have made. The developer should keep in mind that it is always good to work with the neighborhood as much as possible. The subdivision has not been withdrawn. There is still work that needs to be done.

Mr. Marsilia commented that there is potential that they could have an occupant load of over 500 for the church and an effective of 200. People have been expressing the concerns about the church attendance increasing. They could reduce the CO to 250. There are ways to do that to get a new CO. That could alleviate some of the concerns. Ms. Walker noted that a Planning Board stipulation could also indicate that.

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this request until the Tuesday, January 7, 2020 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Howe. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of the **Bethel Assembly of God, Owner**, for property located at **200 Chase Drive** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a new 22-unit residential apartment building with a footprint of 7,440 s.f. and 28,727 s.f. GFA with associated site improvements, grading, utilities, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 210, Lot 02 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District. LU #19-211.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this request until the Tuesday, January 7, 2020 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Howe. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Foundry Place, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **165 Deer Street ("Lot 3")**, requesting a second 1-year extension of the Site Plan Review approval for a 5-story mixed use building including a hotel, restaurant, and parking garage that was originally granted on February 15, 2018, granted a 1-year extension on November 15, 2018, and which will expire on February 15, 2020. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125, Lot 17 and lies within the Character District 5 (CD5) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Gregg Mikolaities from August Consulting and Attorney Tim Phoenix were present to speak to the application. The project was last here in February 2018 and was approved with stipulations. They also got Planning Board approval with stipulations. There was a peer review on the drainage and traffic. They are here for another 1-year extension. The architect summarized the changes since that approval. The building square footage was reduced. They are adding guest rooms and reducing the restaurant and meeting space. There would be a minor reduction in traffic.

Ms. Walker noted that when there was a second extension request it has to go through TAC and the Planning Board. The main issue is to see if there were any significant changes.

TAC Comments:

- 15 bike racks are shown on Lot 2. Are these intended for use by the hotel guests? Why aren't they on the site?

Mr. Mikolaities responded that in the original approval JSA had some mounted bike racks. They were inadvertently removed. They will be added back into the plan. There is also room for an internal bike rack on the first-floor covered parking.

- Community Space – The proposed private easement within the proposed public community space area on Lot 2 (for the benefit of Lot 3) should be clarified and the intended purpose or program for this area should be considered in advance of approval in order to maintain consistency with the community space standards needed to allow for the taller building.

Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that was being resolved with the City.

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 of this request to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of the **Weeks Realty Trust, and Carter Chad, Owners and Tuck Realty Corporation, Applicant** for property located at **3110 Lafayette Road** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of 18 residential townhomes in 5 structures with a footprint of 15,880 s.f. and 47,252 GFA with associated site improvements, grading, utilities, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 292, Lot 151-1 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Joe Coronati spoke to the application. The project is at the corner of Ocean Rd. and Lafayette Rd. excluding Bursaw's Pantry. It's three house lots. One is on 65 Ocean Rd. and the other two are on Lafayette road. They got a lot line adjustment and consolidation approval from the Planning Board in November. One lot will be its own conforming lot. Then this development will be on the rest. There will be a curb cut for access on Ocean Road. There will be three 2-unit buildings and two 6-unit buildings. There will be 2 car garages on the ground level. They are proposing a sidewalk connection to Ocean Road and Lafayette road. Larger vehicles can navigate the site with a hammerhead turnaround. The driveways will be 20 feet wide. The townhouses are 2.5 stories. The 6-unit buildings are dual faced. The garages will not be visible from Lafayette Rd. or Ocean Rd. There will be an underground R-tank for the drainage system. They will be infiltrating almost all storm water with overflow toward Route 1 to the catch basin. There is only a small amount of discharge for a 50-year storm. The buildings are laid out to work with the topography of the site. There will be stone drip edges. They have met with DPW on a preliminary basis for the utilities. The water will probably come from Ocean Rd. with an 8-inch loop system. There are proposed sprinkler rooms for the buildings and individual water shut offs. They will tie into the western most manhole with a gravity fed system for the sewer. They have worked with a landscape designer to add plants and trees to the site. There are three large trees that will be preserved on site. There is an existing fence line down the property line that will be kept intact. The site will be simply lit with lights on the front of units and streetlights on the road. There will be nothing in the rear of the units other than door lights.

TAC Comments:

- The driveway should be shifted to the north on Ocean Road, to provide greater separation from the driveway to Lot 152, to avoid the three lane section of Ocean Road as much as possible, and to better align with the driveway to the Fire Station on the opposite side of Ocean Road.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that it would be challenging to move it because they need to maintain frontage for the lot. The goal was to avoid any additional curb cutting. Ms. Walker added that NHDOT needs to approve it.
- The driveway will require approval from NHDOT, as Ocean Road is a state highway.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that they have applied but have not heard back.
- The dumpster location appears difficult to be accessed by the trash truck, without blocking the access road. Could it be placed closer to Lafayette Road at the end of the access road?
 - Mr. Coronati responded that the dumpster location could slide down and line up with drive access. Ms. Walker noted that the Planning Board required a waiver if they could not meet 20 feet. They will need to have strong justification for the dumpster location. Mr. Coronati noted that they could look at private trash pickup.
- Please indicate where visitor parking is provided.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that each unit would have 4 spaces. Two in the garage and two outside in the driveway. Everyone has 1-2 visitor spaces within their unit. Mr. Cracknell commented that they could add some parallel visitor spaces if the dumpster was not there. Ms. Walker noted that they would need

3 visitor spaces total. Mr. Coronati confirmed they could make the stop sign change.

- Test pit data missing.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that they would include that data.
- STOP sign should be 30"x 30", not 36".
- Concern about loading of all the stormwater in one corner of the site against the property line. This may negatively influence the adjoining property.
 - Mr. Coronati responded that they have separation of 10 feet to the property line and are able to infiltrate the storm water. The other directions the storm water exits the property. Only storm water will go into the tank. The plan meets the requirements. There is no runoff from the property other than a small amount at the 50 year storm. Mr. Desfosses noted that the soil in the neighborhood is historically poor. It will be good to see the test pits. Mr. Desfosses was unfamiliar with an R-tank. Mr. Coronati responded that it was a plastic chambered system. They used them at Islington St. They take up less space and have varying heights.
- Stormwater detention may need to be spread out across the site.
- Water/sewer services should come out of the structure in heated space, not from garage. Will need space on first floor for utility room for water meter, etc.
 - Mr. Desfosses commented that it will be a problem unless they are going to sleeve all of them. Each unit has a meter and a sprinkler room on the end. If the utilities won't be rerouted, then they need to be sleeved. Mr. Coronati agreed. Ms. Walker noted that they could speak to any comments they had questions about or needed clarification on. Otherwise it is assumed that they are understood.
- Capping of existing services not shown.
- 12' easement to NHDOT should be provided.
 - Ms. Walker added that the DOT generally requires that frontage on their side. It's supposed to be for future road widening. They should reach out to see if they want that. The City supports it because it gives the potential for a bike/ped path.
- Proposed transformer may be too close to structure.
- Fire services should be shown as 'to be determined' once MEP plans are complete.
- C900 water main may not be approved, need review by Portsmouth water department.
 - Mr. Desfosses noted that they just need to confirm with them.
- Screening from RT1 should be provided.
- Pavement thickness is minimal for a multi-dwelling site using dumpster pickup.
- The stormwater treatment for this property shows a proposed 1,276 R Tank Chamber. Is there adequate separation from the Estimated Seasonal High Water table for the proposed installation?
- Given the amount of new impervious surface on this lot is there any stormwater treatment beyond the proposed chambers?
- Truck Turning Plan – The plan and the turning radius of WB-50 vehicle appears to show a minor conflict with any outdoor parking associated with townhouse unit #12.

- Architectural Elevations – Rear-facing roof canopies or decks should be considered over the garages on the 6 unit townhouse units. A small roof canopy should also be considered to provide cover and reduce the blank wall over the rear pedestrian doors.
- Solid Waste Removal – The proposed dumpster plan should confirm that trucks will be able to remove the proposed dumpsters without leaving the proposed driveway.
- The location of the dumpster pad should be more internal to the site or at least further from abutting properties.
- Bituminous Sidewalk – Due to durability and maintenance concerns, consideration should be given to using concrete for the sidewalks.
- Landscape Plan – If the existing vegetative buffer is inadequate, fencing should also be considered along the property lines abutting other residential properties.

Ms. Walker clarified that the architectural elevations were just guidance.

Mr. Howe commented that the truck turning movements should be based on the tower truck.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the plan needed a water lines accessible easement to let the Water Department access the meters.

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. Cracknell moved to postpone this request until the Tuesday, January 7, 2020 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

C. The application of **Borthwick Forest, LLC, Owner** for property located on **Islington Street** requesting Amended Subdivision approval to subdivide the previously approved lot with an area of 41.56 acres to two lots; proposed lot 1 with an area of 5.32 acres and the remainder of Tax Map 241, Lot 25 with an area of 38.24 acres. The previously approved road lot consists of 0.727 acres and is proposed to be private. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 241, Lot 25 and lies within the Office Research (OR) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. There are no changes to the site plans it's just subdividing the lot and easement lines. The proposal is to merge lots and subdivide to create two lots. This will be a private road. Easements were added related to public utilities and access for bicyclists and pedestrians. Additionally, the 41.5 acre lot will be subdivided off for the medical building, so it sits on its own parcel. The easement plan added previously shown public access easements for water and sewer. The plan shows easements on the road now that

it's private. The railroad easement and right of way will remain. The attorney assured them it can be done. The new easements will be recorded after Planning Board approval.

Mr. Desfosses clarified that the storm water improvements required for that lot are on that lot. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was correct. The easements for drainage are for the road. The easements on the larger parcel will benefit the smaller parcel.

TAC Comments:

- Pedestrian Right-of-Way – Assurances should be made to maintain the proposed 20 foot pedestrian access easement to the City connecting Islington Street with the newly-constructed roadway.

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 of this request to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

D. The application of **Dagny Taggart, LLC, Owner**, for property located on **Daniel Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval and Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.5A43.43 of the Zoning Ordinance for the construction of a new 4-story commercial building with a footprint of 17,200 +/- s.f. and 59,600 +/- s.f. GFA with associated site improvements, grading, utilities, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 107, Lot 27 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) District

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon with Ambit Engineering, Mark McNabb, Tracy Kozak with JSA Architects, Robbi Woodburn with Woodburn Landscaping, Attorney FX Bruton, and Traffic Consultant Rebecca Brown were present to speak to the application.

TAC Comments:

- Trip Generation Summary Letter
- It was assumed that no employees at the site would take public transportation, so the trip generation numbers are likely conservative, or higher than expected.
 - Ms. Brown responded that they can provide updated numbers. The analysis was conservative in nature, and they didn't take credit for public transportation.

- 30% of the office trips (14 trips) are assumed to use Sheafe Street to access the site. While this is the shortest route to the site for these trips, it is not desirable to add traffic to this very narrow, two-way street.
 - Ms. Brown responded they were amenable to have a policy in the lease to direct employees to not use that street. The trip distribution will be updated to come down Congress St., then back around to Penhallow St.
- The restaurant trips are all assumed to park in the Hanover Garage. This presents a worst case for the intersections in proximity to the garage. If they park elsewhere, the impacts could be different.
 - Ms. Brown responded that they if they were to move elsewhere it will redistribute and be less of an impact around the garage. The plan can make changes to assumptions and distribute.
- There are some numbers missing from Figures 2, 4A, 4B, and 4C.
- On Figures 4A, 4B, and 4C, the total volume of entering and exiting traffic should be shown in the Hanover Garage box and the Site box, so it is clear as to where the traffic is heading.
 - Ms. Brown responded that they will provide additional volumes.
- The peak traffic generation period for the project will be the Saturday midday peak hour, which was not studied in the City's Downtown Traffic Model. While the Model can be used for analysis of the PM peak hour, a separate study will be needed for the Saturday midday peak hour for any intersection that will see an increase of at least 100 vehicles, unless you can show that the weekday pm peak is the overall critical peak hour.
 - Ms. Brown responded that the analysis showed Saturday midday peak hour would be the highest. This was based on conservative assumptions of trips walking to the site. Since the office will be closed and the trips will be for the restaurant. Most people will be downtown and walking to the site. The expectation is that it will be higher than 45%. Ms. Walker commented that if Saturday was peak hour, then they would want a traffic study.
- Driveway apron on Penhallow should be asphalt, not cobblestone, within the City street layout.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- Vehicles will block the sidewalk on Penhallow when entering the building, waiting for the gate/garage door to open. Placing the gate 20 feet from the sidewalk would allow room for the vehicle to pull in without blocking the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that on the plans the garage door was recessed and approved by the Historic District Commission. It is 15 feet from the tip down lane to the sidewalk. If it was longer, then there would be a tendency for cars to line up and wait.
- A flashing warning sign/signal should be installed at the driveway to alert pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting from the garage.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed this would be added.
- It appears that there is a column in the handicap parking access aisle, next to space 19.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would look at this issue.

- It would be better to have the van use space 20, as the wheelchair lifts in a van are typically on the passenger side of the van.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would move space 20 and make it van accessible.
- How will the tandem parking spaces on level 2 be used? Will they be assigned to the same tenant?
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that will be assigned to the same tenant.
- The developer is increasing stormwater runoff slightly, about 4-10% from existing depending on the storm. If there is no opportunity to mitigate this increase onsite, the Developer should consider mitigating this via an off-site municipal drainage improvement such as adding storm drainage to upper Daniel St.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that in the 3 Pleasant project they helped out by removing the combined water from the City system. This plan covers the parking lot. They have no problem with mitigation off site, but would like to ask what that means specifically. Mr. Desfosses responded that it would be an iterative process.
- It is not clear whether the developer is intending for the period lights on Daniel to stay or go. There is a note about returning parking meters after construction, a similar note should refer to lighting.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they will add a note. If it needs to be moved, then it will be restored and reinstalled.
- There are no period lights being shown on Penhallow St despite the wider sidewalk width. Period lights should be added with the final design layout approved by the City. Details need to be added to plan set.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that it can be added if needed.
- Developer should identify a space for refuse containers on the plan. They are needed in this vicinity and get used quite often.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they will provide 3 locations on site in the community space managed by the building staff. They will work with City staff to let appropriate locations.
- They are planning on relocating pole 1/9 on Daniel, this is a larger pole with multiple transformers and it's proposed location will impact the lighting conduit already in place.
 - Mr. Chagnon confirmed it will be relocated.
- They are showing a pole on Penhallow to be removed by Consolidated with no explanation. Does the line the pole is holding go away entirely?
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they have coordinated with Consolidated Communications.
- Sanborn map from 1920 shows up to 11 structures located on this lot. There should be a note that any services to these buildings encountered should be abandoned per the requirements of DPW. Since Penhallow has been reconstructed, this will likely only be an issue on the Daniel St side.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they will add a note.
- They are planning a 3" domestic service tapped off their new fire line both located on the antique main on Daniel St. If at all possible, this should get routed to Penhallow's new main instead. If connection to Penhallow is not possible, main replacement on

Daniel may be required. The domestic service should be a size commonly available and both the fire and domestic lines are to be tapped to the main directly.

- Mr. Chagnon responded that they can move to Penhallow St. with a 2-inch domestic.
- 6” sewer connection is planned on Penhallow, with a rubber saddle. This shall be changed to a pvc wye cut into the main with solid repair couplings.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that would be updated.
- Plans show a new 24” PE drain pipe being installed between new building and old police station building then connecting to 18” pipe in Penhallow. This pipe is likely oversized and would require the manhole in Penhallow to be 5’ in diameter.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they looked at that before the meeting and if it was changed to an 18-inch pipe then it does not back up. That change will be made.
- There was a 6” PE drain connection that was installed for this parcel near the south east corner that will need to be removed.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they will add a note.
- Catch basin liners should be used whenever catch basins are constructed.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they will add a note. Ms. Walker commented that they should raise any concerns or objections. Otherwise it is assumed that they are fine with the comments.
- Pavement cross section shown in detail E is odd use of mix thicknesses
- Detail E, only cast iron ADA tactile panels will be acceptable. All final details shall be approved by the Department prior to installation.
 - Mr. Chagnon requested clarification. Mr. Desfosses commented that they needed to take off “approved equal.” There is no approved equal.
- Detail K shows 5” granite curbing where the standard is 6”
- Drain manholes in the ROW shall have hinged covers type Ergo XL
- Pipe connections in all structures shall be booted and the space between the pipe and manhole shall be parged with mortar
- Sewer manhole detail is shown (incorrectly, wrong cover type) but none are evident on the utility plan.
- Pipe trench detail N should call out fabric between the bedding stone and sand for all pipes greater than 12”
- Excavation for 2-stories beneath ground will require support of City infrastructure
- Basement foundation systems shall be water tight
- Excavation for foundation will require dewatering permits, soil testing should be completed to determine if contamination procedures should be planned for.
- Gas service trench detail shows 42” of cover. This is not typical and will likely cause issues with other utilities. Change depth to standard 3’ depth at least in ROW.
- Bricks in the sidewalk detail shall be called out to be Pinehall Pavers, remove the note about building bricks
- Community Space Easement – The final community space easements need to be approved by the legal department. Importantly, three properties will be used to establish the minimum required community space. Note that the community space

was required under a Condition Use Permit issued by the Planning Board to approve a building footprint of over 15,000 SF.

- Screen Walls and Murals – Note that these items have not yet been reviewed by the Historic District Commission (HDC) and will be reviewed under an Administrative Approval process once the wall and fence details have been submitted to the HDC.
- All proposed off-site improvements to the streetscape that are unrelated to the proposed development should be shown on separate plans, as these are not the purview of the Planning Board’s site plan review approval.
- Building Canopies – It appears that several of the proposed roof canopies overhang the public right-of-way. If so, similar to the projecting bays on 25 Maplewood Ave., an easement deed/license will be required from the city prior to construction.
- Landscape Plan – Are the proposed tree planters along the proposed alleyway off of Daniel Street proposed to be raised? If not, consideration should be given to increase the spacing between the planter and the building wall.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the planter is something that can be moved around. Ms. Walker noted that it should be shown in the detail.
- Transformer Pad – To reduce the unsightliness and obstruction to pedestrian circulation, can the proposed transformer pad on the Daniel Street alleyway be located any closer to either the existing or proposed building walls?
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they will remove the pad.
- Building Elevations – Note that the HDC approved the building design on 11-13-19 with stipulations. The stipulations appear to be shown on the revised elevations.

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

Ms. Walker noted that this was a long list of comments. TAC is not comfortable approving this for the Planning Board. Traffic will take a little time. The design review process can move forward, but it would be better to resolve these items before Planning.

Mr. Britz commented that would he like to see storm water changes. Mr. McNabb commented that they were proposing mitigation. Ms. Walker confirmed it would good to work that out before the Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses commented that he wanted to review the communication line to ensure there would not be any impact to the neighbors.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this request until the Tuesday, January 7, 2020 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cracknell moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:38 p.m., seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee