

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

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

2:00 PM

JANUARY 7, 2020

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; Mark Newport, Police Department

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the December 3, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Howe moved to approve the minutes from the December 3, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. 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. +/- street frontage. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 210, Lot 02 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District.

Mr. Britz moved to take New Business Item D out of order, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Desfosses moved to hear Old Business Item A and Item B together, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

Eric Weinrieb and Corey Belden from Altus Engineering and Robbi Woodburn from Woodburn Landscaping were present to speak to the application. Mr. Weinrieb noted that they have been to several meetings to get to this point. The Committee is familiar with the project, so they can focus on the staff memo and comments.

TAC Comments:

1. For the Thanksgiving service, does the 73 vehicles include the 8 in the parsonage lot and 10 volunteer off-site vehicles?
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that the 8 cars in the parsonage lot were included, but the 10 cars parked offsite were not included.
2. Parking is not prohibited along Michael Succi Drive. If overflow parking becomes a problem on Succi Drive, additional on-street parking restrictions may be needed.
 - Mr. Weinrieb agreed and had no objections.
3. While overflow parking in the parsonage lot would be acceptable, stacked parking in the main lot is not desirable, as it would impede emergency access and egress for vehicles that are blocked in.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that this would be for large events only. It is fairly typical for everyone to leave at the same time. It should not be a big issue. 20 cars can stack on one side and leave a corridor for access.
4. Plans to stack parking are concerning with regards to flow and access.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that this was addressed above.
5. Given the proposed parking reduction, we would recommend that the Planning Board stipulate a lower occupancy load maximum for the church.
 - Mr. Weinrieb agreed. The church is amenable to reducing the occupancy to something around 350, which would require a special event parking plan.
6. Your plans include reference to Unit 1 and Unit 2, which I believe are references to a condominium plan, which is not part of this plan set. Please remove those references.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they will be removed.
7. The Landscape Plan should be updated to extend the Arborvitae in front of the trash enclosure area along the parking stalls facing Market St. to Greenway #2.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they could put in arborvitaes. Ms. Woodburn added that there are arborvitaes at the end of the parking lot behind the trash enclosure. In the front there is a double row of sea green junipers. They are there because they can handle snow. They will have year-round coverage. Ms. Walker confirmed that was fine.
8. The electrical conduits that are shown crossing the City's water main should be concrete encased for 10' on either side of the main.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they were not familiar with that requirement. Mr. Desfosses responded that it was a safety concern. The primary and the water cannot mix. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that would be updated.
9. The applicant is showing a check valve underground on the fire service, this is unique, they should verify that this is required with the City Engineer.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that there is an additional check valve that will be removed. There will just be one off the main.
10. The culvert under the walkway is not sized on the plan.

- Mr. Weinrieb responded that it would be a 15-inch pipe.
11. A large area of the new parking lot will drain through the main front door area of the new building. This water should leave the area differently as it may lead to a common icing issue in winter.
- Mr. Weinrieb responded that it was a porous area with a low point. They will change the grading to pitch it toward a catch basin.

Ms. Walker requested that the applicants discuss the changes made to the community space. Ms. Woodburn responded that there was a connection up around the church to Chase Dr. That connection is no longer there. There will be park space with an elliptical pathway and a high point with benches that look down Market St. On the other side the paved walkway will go to the side door. At the corner of the driveway and Chase Dr. there will be a pocket park with benches and trees. There will be two parks on either side of the building. There is also now a walkway that connects to the sidewalk. Mr. Belden added that there was a rain garden in that area previously, but it was changed to a sub-surface storm tech. That whole area will be open grass now. Ms. Walker clarified that all community spaces connected to Market St. The connections have improved public access. It would be helpful to show how the area with the church sign will be integrated into the elliptical area. It is not required to have those areas deeded, but they need to be open to public. Ms. Woodburn confirmed there would be wayfinding signs at the beginning of each path.

Mr. Desfosses commented that there might need to be some selective cutting in one park area to open it up more. It could be a discussion with Trees and Greenery.

Ms. Walker commented that the parking management plan and reduced occupancy recommendations would be carried forward to the Planning Board. Ms. Walker noted that they received correspondence from the public and one of the comments related to the type of ownership of the units. TAC and the Planning Board don't have per view on the ownership and prices unless the application is using workforce housing for incentives. There were community space questions and ongoing concern about the parking in the correspondence as well. If there are still concerns, then they should be raised at the Planning Board. They have been addressed from TAC's perspective.

Mr. Marsilia added that they will need to physically change the space to reduce the occupancy. It can't be artificially reduced. They will need to add storage space.

PUBLIC HEARING

Jason Karlin of 29 Brigham Lane questioned how the property could be subdivided and still considered a site development. The subdivision plan states an area for lot 2 that is different than what is on the agenda. That should be clarified. The community space is still an issue. Greenway 3 has the church sign in it and would be unwelcoming to the public. The new pocket parks are nice and may need some pathway lighting. Rain garden 1 still impacts the community space. Mr. Karlin questioned how deep the culvert would be. The proposed buried electrical will disturb the root systems of all the trees in that area. There should be easements for all utility access not just water. The waste handling topic has been discussed before and still has a parking

space issue. The lot 1 dumpster is too close to the property line. There should be a permanent easement for the connecting driveway. They are providing a sidewalk only for lot 2. It should go all the way up.

Ed Richards of 435 Cutts Ave. commented that he had two major concerns aside from the building orientation and size. The parking should not be determined by the present use of the church. It should be determined by the potential future use of the building. There is no on street parking available. There is no overflow parking. The building required 173 spaces when it was built. If the occupancy is reduced to 350 people, there is still more people than parking spots. Mr. Richards was concerned that people will come up deeper into the neighborhood to find overflow parking. Mr. Richards handed out a list of conditions that should be considered by TAC and the Planning Board. There should be more visitor parking and handicap parking spaces. There should be 40 or more parking spaces for the residential building. The bus stop is not practical. The size of the lot is not big enough for the development. If the spaces are reduced to 75 then the building occupancy should be reduced to 200. The parking for the residential building should stand on its own. Cutts Ave. and Chase Dr. should have resident only parking. The building height should not be more than 40'. The community space at the church entrance is not inviting. The neighborhood is willing to work with the church to come up with something more reasonable. Mr. Richards submitted a letter from his wife for the City to review.

Maryanne Gauthier of 36 Brigham Lane raised concern about the common space because one is at the entrance of the church. It is not inviting to the public. Ms. Gauthier was also concerned about the parking. The church has to put cars in the parsonage lot to make it work. The church has asked for over 15 variances, so they will keep asking for variances. They will come back to ask for another variance to change the concessions they are making now. They can't control attendance at each service. Also, 33 spaces is not enough for 22 apartments. Market St. is the busiest street on the City. There is no light to cross the street to get to the bus stop. It's inaccessible to most people. This project doesn't work.

Ms. Walker commented that all comments were valid. TAC is a technical review for compliance to zoning and adherence to regulatory requirements for utilities and storm water etc. TAC makes a recommendation to the Planning Board based on technical aspects. Some points raised today are related to policy which is handled at the Planning Board. Ms. Walker noted that they could not address the parking today, but the applicants can try to address it at the Planning Board. Ms. Walker understood that there was confusion about the subdivision and site development and the Planning Board can explain better how it complies with the zoning. Ms. Walker noted that the applicant is required to get will serve letters from the utility companies. Cross easements should be brought forward to the Planning Board. The dumpster complies with zoning.

PUBLIC HEARING

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. Marsilia commented that one of the main concerns is the potential for the church occupancy to increase without any way to prevent it. The occupancy should be physically changed. Ms. Walker agreed.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if there should be a crosswalk put in. Ms. Walker responded that there is a pedestrian activated signal not too far from the bus stop and the stop is used today.

Mr. Marsilia commented that they did not discuss the occupancy reduction number. Ms. Walker responded that applicant requested 350 and the public requested 175. Ms. Walker would work with Mr. Eby to make a recommendation based on parking. The public can comment on it at Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board for the February 20, 2020 meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following stipulations:

1. The applicant shall propose a reduction in the occupant load of the church to match shared parking capacity of the parking lots. The amount of the reduction will be determined in consultation with the City's Planning Director and Transportation and Parking Engineer.
2. References to Unit 1 and Unit 2 on the plan sheets shall be removed.
3. The electrical conduits that are shown crossing the City's water main shall be concrete encased for 10' on either side of the main.
4. The check valve underground on the fire service shall be removed from the plans.
5. The culvert under the walkway shall be sized on the plan.
6. Plans shall be updated to show a change to the grading so the new parking lot area does not drain through the main front door area of the new building.
7. Plans shall be updated to show a 20-foot separation between any proposed utility trenches and existing and proposed trees.
8. Communication lines shall be included on the plans for review and approval by DPW.
9. The plans shall include cross-easements for access, circulation, and maintenance of any shared infrastructure between the two proposed lots.
10. The plan shall include a note that the bus shelter currently on site will be reinstalled at an existing bus stop to be approved by the City.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of the **Bethel Assembly of God, Owner**, for property located at **200 Chase Drive** requesting Conditional Use Permit approval for a Development Site according to the requirements of Section 10.5B40 of the Zoning Ordinance and 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 grading, lighting, utilities, stormwater management, landscape improvements, and community space. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 210, Lot 02 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board for the February 20, 2020 meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following stipulations:

1. The applicant shall propose a reduction in the occupant load of the church to match shared parking capacity of the parking lots. The amount of the reduction will be determined in consultation with the City's Planning Director and Transportation and Parking Engineer.
2. References to Unit 1 and Unit 2 on the plan sheets shall be removed.
3. The electrical conduits that are shown crossing the City's water main shall be concrete encased for 10' on either side of the main.
4. The check valve underground on the fire service shall be removed from the plans.
5. The culvert under the walkway shall be sized on the plan.
6. Plans shall be updated to show a change to the grading so the new parking lot area does not drain through the main front door area of the new building.
7. Plans shall be updated to show a 20-foot separation between any proposed utility trenches and existing and proposed trees.
8. Communication lines shall be included on the plans for review and approval by DPW.
9. The plans shall include cross-easements for access, circulation, and maintenance of any shared infrastructure between the two proposed lots.
10. The plan shall include a note that the bus shelter currently on site will be reinstalled at an existing bus stop to be approved by the City.

The motion passed unanimously.

C. 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 Coranti spoke to the application.

TAC Comments:

1. NHDOT has indicated they will not approve the proposed driveway in that location. How is the applicant proposing to access the site?
 - o Mr. Coranti responded that both roads are state highways. There is a proposed curb cut at Ocean Rd. DOT sent a letter that too many driveways were built off the parcel. The site has two curb cuts. One on Lafayette Rd. and one on Ocean Rd. In 1975 two lots on Ocean Rd. were subdivided and

- given driveways. The proposal is to have one entrance on the existing driveway. They are working with DOT to resolve it.
2. Truck turning plan should be based on Portsmouth Fire Department's Tower 5.
 - Mr. Coranti responded that the turning plan will be updated. It should not be an issue.
 3. Support brackets should be considered for the doorway canopies.
 - Mr. Coranti agreed that was not a problem.
 4. The lot line adjustment and consolidation plan has already been approved by Planning Board, no need to include in this plan set.
 - Mr. Coranti responded that was correct.
 5. It would be preferable to the City that the sewerage leaving the site get routed to Ocean Road. If sewer is routed to Lafayette Rd as shown, it needs to flow by gravity all the way to Rye only to get pumped back to the manhole at Ocean and Lafayette.
 - Mr. Coranti responded that they met early on with DPW to talk about this and they preferred to go out to Lafayette Rd. because it could be done by gravity. Mr. Desfosses commented that they could do either side by gravity. Mr. Coranti confirmed that they would look into it and work with DPW.
 6. We are still not convinced that the stormwater management area will not increase the groundwater elevation on the adjacent property causing them permanent impact. While the adjacent monument 'store' has no basement, the home 50' away from the system does. A groundwater mounding analysis must be performed and reviewed by third party. TAC is requesting a third party review the stormwater design for the parcel.
 - Mr. Coranti responded that they raised the storm water system to be 1.5 feet above the seasonal high-water table and changed the outlet pipe. They can provide a mounding analysis. Ms. Walker confirmed that they would work to get a third party engaged.
 7. Sewer laterals entering the common private sewer need to be spread out a bit so that they are constructible.
 - Mr. Coranti confirmed that was fine.

Ms. Walker commented that the driveway letter was troubling. It should be approved before the application goes to Planning Board. Mr. Coranti responded that their preference would be to have all state approvals be a condition of approval.

Ms. Walker noted that they will do a third-party review for storm water.

Mr. Howe requested that the wheel tracks be a different color in the turning movements and the overhangs should be considered in the landscaping plans.

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 commented that the third-party storm water review should be completed before this goes to Planning Board. TAC has approved projects with a pending driveway permit in the past, but it was pretty assured that DOT was supportive. If this is denied, then it would have to come back to TAC and the Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses questioned if they could move the driveway north to be across from the fire station. Mr. Coranti responded that the lot has minimal frontage. Ms. Walker noted that they could look into a shared driveway and not impact the frontage. Mr. Coranti agreed that they could. Ms. Walker confirmed that the preference would be to line up the driveway with the fire station.

Mr. Desfosses moved to **postpone** this item until the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

D. The application of **Dagny Taggart, LLC, Owner**, for property located on **Daniel Street** requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.5A43.43 of the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Review approval 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, landscape improvements, and community space. 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 from Ambit Engineering, Mark McNabb, Robbi Woodburn, and Attorney FX Bruton spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon commented that they tried to address comments from last meeting and would walk through the most recent comments.

TAC Comments:

1. The parking kiosk on Penhallow will need to be relocated, as it will be in the way of the new walkway.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the kiosk would not be available during construction, so it may need to be relocated for that time. Mr. Eby pointed out where it should be relocated to.
2. The proposed bumpout on Daniel Street will require the removal of one parking space on Daniel Street, which will require the approval of the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee and City Council.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they met with utility company and DPW to talk about Eversource coordination. The alternate plan for the transformer location is to move it to private property. Ms. Walker commented that the transformer as proposed looks like it would be in the middle of the community space off Daniel St. Mr. McNabb responded that it's 3 feet off the building and there is 6 feet clearance for walking. They will be working with Eversource to put in a smaller size transformer. Ms. Walker commented that

showing a rendering of the transformer fitting into community space access point would be helpful. Mr. Chagnon agreed.

3. Will there need to be a fire pump?
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that it is not needed.
4. The traffic modeling will need to be completed and reviewed by City staff to confirm if any additional conditions of approval are recommended.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they agree. Ms. Walker clarified that would have to happen before Planning Board approval.
5. Please identify all the locations where the building overhangs the public right-of-way, this should be included on a proposed easement/license plan
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the plan was included in the plan set. Ms. Walker responded that they should be easements because they are permanent. Mr. Bruton confirmed that would be updated.
6. Please be prepared to explain the different easements shown on the easement plan and their purposes
 - Mr. Chagnon walked through the easements for the Committee including several that were extinguished due to common ownership.
7. Any proposed off-site improvements that are not related to the Planning Board's site plan approval should be separate from the sheets that require PB approval. Sheet C6 and most of P1 and P2 are not related to PB site plan approval for this project. If you intend to request PB support for the proposed off-site improvements that are not directly connected to this project, then that request should be made separately from the Site Plan Review approval.
 - Ms. Walker commented that it was fine to get input from the Planning Board, but it shouldn't be married to the approval. Mr. Chagnon responded that would be updated. Mr. Desfosses commented that P1 and P2 are part of the project.
8. Please add a note to the renderings that these include proposed off-site improvements that are not related to the Planning Board's approval and that would require separate City Council approval.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that was added.
9. The offsite electrical plan does not match the site plan. The transformer is shown in the wrong location. Also, landscaping or other should be provided to alleviate visual impacts.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that was updated.
10. The drainage plan should indicate test pits are required to validate the design. Also, it is likely that there will be impacts to the telephone duct system currently in the road. Plan should indicate this as well as indicate 'work with Consolidated Comm. to relocate ducts as needed.'
 - Mr. Chagnon questioned if the test pits should be onsite in Daniel St. Mr. Desfosses responded that they should be in the street. That should be on the plan. Mr. Chagnon responded that they would put in notes on the plan.
11. Copies of the draft easements for community space and any other easements for which the City will be a party need to be submitted for Planning Board review.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded those would be included.

12. Portions of the proposed community space designated as a “pocket park” along the abutting 30 Penhallow Street property appear to include a private driveway for vehicular use. Additionally, it appears that parking area located directly behind 21 Pleasant Street is also included in the proposed community space. Staff does not agree that areas used for vehicles (regardless of whether they are share with pedestrians) can be eligible as community space. As such, the applicant should consider: 1) elevating and raising some portion of the pedestrian sidewalk between the abutting parking areas or the garage access driveway at that location so that those portions can be included in the pocket park calculation; 2) consider reverting the outdoor café/ dining area along 3 Pleasant Street back into the overall community space plan. Either of these options would enable the community space requirement to be met.

- Mr. Chagnon responded that would require coordination. The community space master plan shows the area of a pocket park that goes up to access to the garage. The park will be revised to extend in the same area. Ms. Walker noted that it appears that there was a shared pedestrian and vehicle drive included in community space calculation. Mr. McNabb responded that they counted it in the old plan. There will be an easement there, but it won't be counted. That is how it is in the plan. The parking will be eliminated to make a pocket park. There will be no curbing to make it a friendly pedestrian area. Ms. Walker responded that the concern was it should be delineated that it is not just a vehicle access. It would be helpful to show a demo of what that will look like.

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:

To be Completed Prior to Planning Board submission:

1. The plans shall be updated to match the plans presented at the TAC meeting as “Transformer Location Alternative”.
2. The drainage plan shall indicate test pits are required to validate the design.
3. Plan shall not potential impacts to the telephone duct system currently in the road as well as any required work with Consolidated Communications to relocate ducts as needed.
4. Copies of the draft easements for community space and any other easements for which the City will be a party need to be submitted for Planning Board review.
5. The Community Space Plan shall be updated to reflect the proposed limits of the pocket park along 30 Penhallow Street as discussed at the TAC meeting.

6. A rendering of the proposed entrance to the community space plaza from the Daniel Street side shall be provided including the proposed location of the transformers.

To be included as Conditions of Planning Board approval (to be satisfied prior to building permit issuance):

7. The applicant shall complete the traffic modeling for the project according to the City's requirements. Any required mitigation by the applicant in the form of improvements to traffic infrastructure shall be determined by the City's Planning Department and Public Works Department. If staff determines that additional Planning Board review is required as a result of the modeling, then the applicant will be required to return to the Planning Board for amended site plan review approval.
8. Drainage test pits shall be completed to validate the design of the stormwater system, subject to final review and approval by DPW.
9. The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) for review and approval by the City's Legal and Planning Departments.
10. All off-site improvements shall be subject to final review and approval by DPW as part of the excavation permitting process.

The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Five Hundred Five Lafayette Rd., LLC, Owner**, for property located at **605 Lafayette Road** requesting Amended Site Plan Review approval for installation of a dumpster including a concrete pad and enclosure. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 229, Lot 09 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney John Bosen spoke to the application. The project went through a full site review and there was never a plan for a dumpster. They have exceeded trash storage within the building and are using a temporary dumpster. A permanent dumpster needs a waiver. There are three parking spaces that would be impacted. The proposal is that they will be employee parking spaces. They will be marked with a sign. The private trash collection will accommodate times. The applicant is fine with the alternative screening comment and they have requested that the City provide samples.

TAC Comments:

1. In addition to the pavement markings indicating Employee Parking in front of the dumpsters, signs should also be posted at the edges of the three spaces, indicating employee parking only. Pavement markings wear off quickly, so the signs will provide more lasting notification.

2. An alternative dumpster screen should be considered that is more commensurate with the quality and character of the recently constructed principal building and the abutting city-owned pump station. Examples can be provided if requested.

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

1. Plans shall be updated to include employee parking only signs for the three spaces in addition to the pavement markings.
2. Plans should include an alternative dumpster screen commensurate with the quality and character of the recently constructed principal building.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **101 International Drive** requesting Site Plan Review approval under Chapter 400 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Site Review Regulations, for parking expansion at three different locations within the site resulting in a total of sixty new parking spaces with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 Lot 06 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Patrick Crimmins and Neil Hansen with Tighe and Bond spoke to the application. Mr. Crimmins commented that the project was for a parking expansion at 3 different locations. Mr. Hansen commented that the northern parking area will be adjacent to the garage, the western lot will be near the entrance, and the eastern lot will be along the most recently added portion of the building. The most northern expansion is an overflow for the garage. There will be 22 spaces and one way in and out. It is the same driveway as the garage. The northern area pavement will be treated by a rain garden. There is an existing fire hydrant that will be relocated. The western expansion will add 20 spaces. Some light poles will be relocated. It will be treated by underground storm tech chambers. The eastern expansion will add another 18 spaces. The treatment for this is 2 catch basins that will be discharged to a jellyfish treatment system.

TAC Comments:

1. How will pedestrians access the building from the northern parking lot? Pedestrian facilities should be provided.
 - Mr. Hansen responded that the cars that park in the garage have to come in through the front entrance. This expansion would be the same idea. There is a striped pedestrian access.
2. ADA standards require that the number of accessible spaces provided on the site be calculated according to the number of spaces required for each parking facility. Parking lots and parking structures are both considered parking facilities. The number of parking spaces required to be accessible is to be calculated separately for each parking facility; the required number is not to be based on the total number of parking spaces provided in all of the parking facilities provided on the site. The calculations of the accessible parking spaces should be provided.
 - Mr. Hansen responded that they consider the entire site as one facility because everyone goes into the main entrance. There are 4 ADA spaces in the garage and 9 in the front of the building.
3. Is there any impact to the stream day-lighting that was proposed as part of the wetland permit for this application?
 - Mr. Hansen responded that all of the storm water for this project ends up in the pond or swale. It is a separate storm water system.
4. Is there a plan to replace the trees along the road where the new parking area is proposed?
 - Mr. Hansen responded that they can add additional trees back. They can use the same species that was used on the other side.

Mr. Howe questioned how many levels the parking garage was. Mr. Hansen responded that it was 3.5 or 4 floors. Mr. Howe questioned if there was a standpipe in the garage. Mr. Hansen responded that there is one in the bottom level of the garage. Mr. Howe commented that they need to verify that cars would not block that. Mr. Howe questioned what the distance from the hydrant to the parking space in the eastern parking lot was. Mr. Hansen responded that it was 5 to 6 feet from edge of pavement.

Ms. Walker questioned if Mr. Eby was satisfied with the ADA spaces comment. Mr. Eby questioned how many ADA spaces would be required if the lots were counted separately. Mr. Hansen responded that the garage would require 9 and the surface lots would require 6. Currently there are 13. Mr. Eby requested that they put 15 ADA spaces in one place. Mr. Hansen confirmed that would 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. Cracknell moved to **recommend approval** to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Desfosses with the following stipulations:

1. Plans shall be updated to include 2 more additional ADA spaces, closest to the building entrance, as required by standards.
2. Plans shall be updated to show replacement trees along the road where new parking is proposed, consistent with those that are planned for the opposite side of the road.
3. The applicant shall verify if there is a standpipe in the garage and coordinate with the Fire Department on requirements for access.

The motion passed unanimously.

C. The application of **Hope for Tomorrow Foundation, Owner**, for property located at **355 (315) Banfield Road** requesting Amended Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a 17,000 s.f. freestanding gymnasium and associated parking area to serve the existing private school on the property with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, and drainage improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 266 Lot 05 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb with Altus Engineering and Scott Hughes spoke to the application. Mr. Weinrieb commented that in 2017 site permits were secured to subdivide the parcel. In April 2018 the Academy obtained a certificate of occupancy and moved into the property. The school is nearly at full occupancy and they are using the Seacoast Health Gym now. The proposal is to build a gym on the grounds closer to the school. Jim Vera did a detailed existing conditions plan and did the design phase for a 17,000 sf gym. The application includes a parking demand analysis. The proposal is to provide 77 spaces. There will be new angled parking coming into the site. The area will mostly likely be used by staff to prevent people from coming and going in those spots during drop off and pick up times. There will be a crosswalk from the main entrance to the gym. The concrete sidewalk can be 6 feet wide. The walkways around the back will be gravel or pervious. Most of the building pitches to the rear with a wide stone drip edge in the back. It discharges to a closed drainage system out to a rain garden. The roof goes to a stone drip edge. Everything is double treated in two rain gardens. There will be new gas service and electrical service for the site. There will be a 6-inch fire suppression line and a 2.5 water service line. That was sized by the mechanical engineer. Mr. Desfosses commented that they should verify the pipe size with the City Engineer. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that they would. Mr. Desfosses commented that a 2.5 water line was not commercially available. Mr. Hughes confirmed that they would talk to the engineer and go to the next size up. Mr. Weinrieb commented that the landscape plan screens the new building from the street. Steve Pernaw updated the traffic impact assessment. The findings included that the existing driveway can accommodate the traffic changes. Mr. Hughes commented that the project would include a gym with a basketball court and bleachers, 4 egresses, and 3 multipurpose areas for the lower grades. There will be storage areas, bathrooms, and locker rooms.

TAC Comments:

1. A NO PARKING sign should be installed in front of the access aisle for the HP space at the gym entrance, as this will be a desirable parking spot.

- Mr. Weinrieb responded that it may be overkill. It is already striped and identified as a handicap spot. Ms. Walker commented that they should add it.
- 2. The school has previously requested a flashing school zone sign be installed by the City. As there are typically no school pedestrians walking along or across Banfield Road, City staff did not feel it was justified. With the use of the Girl Scout parking lot for overflow parking, the school should consider the installation of a pedestrian push button activated flashing warning sign. This is a situation created by the school, and it should be their responsibility to ensure the safety of their users.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that the school was concerned about traffic. Now there is not a need for flashing lights.
- 3. How are the physical education rooms to be used and what are their calculated occupant load?
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded this was covered in the presentation.
- 4. The sidewalk along the proposed angled parking should be widened to 6 feet to provide adequate space for cars to overhang the sidewalk and maintain ADA requirements.
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded it would be updated.
- 5. The sidewalk adjacent the front doors should be widened to allow for direct passage to the front entry doors of the proposed gymnasium as well as the abutting crosswalk.
 - Mr. Cracknell clarified that they should taper off the landscaping because people will cut through it. Mr. Weinrieb responded that would be updated.
- 6. Please provide an existing conditions site plan that shows parking spaces (previously approved site plan would be sufficient).
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they will provide it.
- 7. Your parking demand analysis references that soccer and basketball games can generate up to 25 to 30 spectator vehicles per game. What is your source of this information? Do you have documentation of this?
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that parents will often be attending events coming straight from work, so they will be in separate cars.
- 8. During the original design, staff voiced concerns about downstream properties (285 Banfield) being impacted by concentrated flow. We once again voice these concerns. The neighbor at 285 Banfield is being impacted. Therefore we recommend dredging occur from the stormwater outfall to (and into as necessary) the wetland to the north of the dwelling where it can be attenuated properly. This dredging should also include the replacement of the existing culvert under the driveway of #285 with a properly sized culvert with flared end sections. What else is this project doing to reduce the stormwater in this area so the current impacts seen by residents is not made worse?
 - Mr. Weinrieb responded that they don't believe that they created a drainage problem. The project reduced runoff and they are further reducing it. The drainage problem was there before. The swale in front of their property is undersized and needs to be maintained. They should not drudge on other people's property. Mr. Desfosses responded that the comment stands. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it is a city issue that existed prior to the project. The culvert is undersized.

9. We wonder why the engineer is using an 8” sewer service and if there is enough consistent flow to validate this size pipe.
10. The water service for the building seems too large and should be re-evaluated to confirm size.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the porous pavement parking lot needs a maintenance plan. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that the existing lot was maintained, and the new area will be part of the program.

Mr. Howe commented that the applicant should look at that occupancy load of a classroom vs. an exercise room. It could impact the egresses.

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 **recommend approval** to the Planning Board for the February 20, 2020 meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses with the following stipulations:

To be completed prior to Planning Board submission:

1. A NO PARKING sign should be installed in front of the access aisle for the handicap parking space at the gym entrance.
2. The sidewalk along the proposed angled parking should be widened to 6 feet to provide adequate space for cars to overhang the sidewalk and maintain ADA requirements.
3. The sidewalk adjacent the front doors should be widened to allow for direct passage to the front entry doors of the proposed gymnasium as well as the abutting crosswalk.
4. Applicant shall submit an existing conditions site plan that shows parking spaces (previously approved site plan would be sufficient).
5. The applicant shall verify required sewer pipe size with the City Engineer and update plans as necessary.
6. The size of the water service shall be confirmed and plans updated as necessary to show an appropriate commercially available size.
7. The applicant shall confirm the occupant load and egress requirements for the proposed building with the Fire Department.

To be included as Conditions of Planning Board approval (to be satisfied prior to building permit issuance):

8. The applicant shall work with abutting property owner at 285 Banfield Road as necessary to dredge from the stormwater outfall to (and into as necessary) the wetland to the north

of the dwelling and to dredge and replace the existing culvert under the property's driveway with a properly sized culvert.

9. A maintenance and inspection report for the porous pavement parking lot shall be submitted to the City's Planning Department on an annual basis.

The motion passed unanimously.

D. The application of **DPF 1600 Woodbury Avenue, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **1600 Woodbury Avenue** requesting Amended Site Plan Review approval to upgrade the existing shopping center with new and additional signage, a new driveway entrance off of Woodbury Avenue, and repurposing of the former supermarket space to separate retail space and new grocery space with accessory café/food court. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 238 Lot 16 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to postpone this agenda item to the next TAC Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

E. The application of the **Maud Hett Revocable Trust, Owner**, for property located on **Banfield Road** requesting Conditional Use Permit approval for an Open Space Planned Unit Development according to the requirements of Section 10.725 of the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Review approval for the construction of 22 single-family homes and a new road with related parking, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 256 Lot 02 and lies within the Single Residence A (SRA) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Colwell and Jack McTigue from TF Moran, Jim Gove from Gove Environmental Services, Rick, Michael, and Jenna Green and Gary Spaulding were present to speak to the application. Mr. Colwell commented that the proposal was for an open space residential development of 22 single family homes serviced by a private street off Banfield Road. The wetland crossing is 90 feet in length. 57% of the site is upland. 19 acres are wetland. 7.3 acres would be developed. All homes, yards, and septic systems are outside the buffer. The project was presented to the Conservation Commission on two different occasions and the impact was reduced based on their comments. They have addressed the changes TAC recommended. Turn around areas in the driveways have been provided where they can be accommodated. The others can use adjacent driveways for turn arounds. Houses were moved to reduce the units view of the back of another. That has been adjusted as much as possible. Landscaping was added for screening. A lot of trees and shrubs will be added around all units to help increase privacy. The truck turning movements have been included in the plans. TAC recommended that the applicants look at town homes instead of single-family homes. This is not an allowed use in the SRA zone. Ms. Walker commented that it's allowed as an open space unit development. Mr. Colwell noted that unit 6 and 8 are the closest units to any tree line. They are 15 feet from the edge of the woods. Individual trees may be removed beyond the clearing units if needed. The

applicants intend to leave as many trees as possible. An additional hydrant has been added to the cul-de-sac area.

Mr. McTigue commented that the original design had a 28-foot roadway. It has been reduced to 20 feet wide to reduce impervious area. The cul-de-sac size has been reduced as well. Originally sub surface treatment in the wetlands were proposed. The Conservation Commission expressed concerns about putting treatment in the buffer. The new proposal has storm tech systems under the road. They looked at the using a bridge or box culvert. The road has to come in at 2% grade for 20 feet. The goal was to minimize the vertical curve, which stretched out the length of the decrease. In order to hold the 2% the road is only 2 feet off the surface of the wetland. The low point is 50 feet from the roadway. There is very little clearance from the top of the road and the ground. A bridge would rest in the dirt. The box culvert would be underground. Mr. Colwell commented that the plans include 3 wildlife eco-passages. Mr. McTigue added that the passages would be 5 feet wide with an 18-inch clearance.

TAC Comments:

1. Plans are generally incomplete for this level of review. They are also shown at a scale that is too large to show all the detailing.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that there were 37 plans submitted with the application and they are shown in 80 and 30 scale. They went through the checklist.
2. The utility plans are not showing water lines for fire suppression.
 - Mr. Colwell confirmed that they would show a separate line. Mr. Howe noted that the water department does not allow the use of domestic for fire suppression. Mr. Colwell confirmed that the plan would be updated.
3. Is the proposed common open space designated under a recordable conservation restriction? Additionally, what are the limits of the common open space and how are areas abutting the LCAs behind and beside the proposed houses protected from encroachment over time. How is the common open space proposed to be monumental and/or fenced to prevent unauthorized encroachment into the buffer zone areas?
 - Ms. Walker noted that the LCA boundaries were oddly shaped and the concern is how they would be distinguished from common space. Mr. Colwell responded that they were shaped like that to accommodate the houses, septic and yards. Ms. Walker commented that they should be squarer for the property owners.
4. The narrow roadways and driveways, together with a lack of visitor parking, will likely result in vehicles parking along the main roadway and causing difficulty for 2-way traffic within the site. Applicant should indicate areas for visitor parking, perhaps around the cul-de-sac.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that at the June work session they showed visitor parking and TAC recommended removing it. Ms. Walker clarified that the issue was mostly where they were located. There are other areas where they could work within the design. Mr. Colwell responded that there are lengthy driveways and 2 car garages for each house. There is ample room for parking.
5. Confirm that you did not include the proposed LCAs in the calculation of common open space

- Mr. Colwell responded that is correct.
- 6. In your summary of zoning requirements, please add a column for “proposed” next to “required”
 - Mr. Colwell responded that would be updated.
- 7. The applicant will need to be prepared to make the case to the Planning Board how the OSPUD goals are satisfied by this proposed development, specifically “preserve natural features” and “create usable open space” and that “the anticipated impacts of the proposed PUD on traffic, market values, stormwater runoff or environmental factors will not be more detrimental to the surrounding area than the impacts of conventional residential development of the site.”
 - Ms. Walker clarified that this would be something they should prepare to address at Planning Board.
- 8. Sections 10.725.44 and 45 encourage community open space that connects to other public or private open spaces and allows for public access. Has the applicant explored this as staff previously suggested?
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they have. That common open space was put there because it abuts conservation land. It would connect to the Hepp land. There is a 1,000-foot-wide easement for people to walk to the land. Ms. Walker noted that they should clearly show that on the plan.
- 9. Did the applicant consider whether two-family or townhomes might be feasible in order to minimize impervious surface and overall site impacts?
 - Ms. Walker confirmed that it is allowed.
- 10. The report provided by Mr. Gove and the peer review comments provided to the Conservation Commission note there will be significant impacts to habitat and existing natural features. The peer review comments also noted that some of the analysis provided by Mr. Gove was incomplete. How is the applicant proposing to address the outstanding concerns in this regard?
 - Mr. Gove responded that was an older comment. Mr. West did get everything he needed. This is a wetland crossing which is why the plan includes eco-passages. It is an appropriate way to provide connectivity. There is another location where there is a box culvert.
- 11. If septic systems are proposed than the City will require full designs being submitted for review. This will likely include third party review as well. There is a marginal amount of soil on site and septic systems will need to be designed carefully with contingencies. The applicant should consider installing a force main to Peverly Hill Rd.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that this was understood. They have done extensive test pits out there and Mr. Spaulding was hired to do the design.
- 12. The runoff from the site will go to an existing wetland area. There have been concerns by current residents in this area about impacts from runoff along the roadway and flooding of properties in heavy rain events. What is this project doing to reduce the stormwater in this area so the current impacts seen by residents is not made worse?
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they were trying to balance not drying up the wetland and not making it worse. The post development flows would be the same as the predevelopment. The drainage analysis shows that.
- 13. The design of the stormwater features is also not complete and is conceptually flawed. The systems should not be placed under the roadways as when they need to be

worked on or replaced, there will be no access to homes. These stormwater areas should be placed adjacent to the roadways for access and inspections. TAC requests a third party peer review of the stormwater analysis.

- Mr. McTigue responded that it would be reviewed by AOT. It would be inspected through ports in the roadway. Ms. Walker added that they would do a peer review. Mr. Desfosses added that they are very deep and that is concerning.
14. An 8" water main will be required for fire flow to hydrants.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that was fine.
 15. A deceleration lane (or shoulder) may be required for an entrance drive that is so narrow. Typical speeds/traffic load on Banfield Rd require more thought on this driveway. Maybe the driveway should be wider near the road?
 - Mr. Eby responded that Mr. Pernaw addressed this in the memorandum. It is fine as designed.
 16. The applicant's plan of three individual crossings seems flawed and overly complex. A small bridge meeting current codes or other another design that is more appropriate and located a little farther from Banfield Road should be considered.
 - Mr. Britz commented that the eco-passages are not to the recommended height. There is concern about functionality. Mr. Gove responded that the concept of an eco-passage is for small species who are 6 inches high to use them. Large mammals will go over the road. The 2-foot height is a recommendation. Mr. West agreed that it would still work as a passage.
 17. Curb stops for water shut offs should not be located in paved areas.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed.
 18. A blanket easement will be required for the entire developed portion so that water department personnel can access valves, hydrants and meters for leak detection and metering. Hydrants will need a maintenance program set up. Main maintenance will be private.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed.
 19. Please add stationing to roadway.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that this would be added to the site layout plans.
 20. There appears to be a very deep ledge cut on the far side of the wetland crossing. It seems like the crossing spot was chosen to minimize wetland disturbance in lieu of constructability and long term maintenance.
 - Mr. Desfosses commented that this was reviewed above.
 21. There will need to be a tapping saddle and valve on the 20" main in Banfield to supply water. Therefor the valve shown in the entrance drive is not required.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed.

Mr. Colwell commented that the feedback they have received is conflicting. Ms. Walker noted that it may not all be resolved.

Ms. Walker was not sure if the visitor parking was a big deal. Mr. Eby noted that there was no room in the cul-de-sac with the truck turning movement. If people park on both sides, then trucks can't get through the middle.

Mr. Britz did not agree that Mr. West's comments were addressed adequately. Ms. Walker confirmed that they could look at the comments again.

Ms. Walker questioned if there was a possibility 2% grade could be revisited. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it could.

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. Howe moved to **postpone** this item until the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:16 pm, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee