

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

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

2:00 PM

FEBRUARY 4, 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; and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector; and Mark Newport, Police Department

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1, Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT:

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the January 7, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Eby moved to approve the minutes from the January 7, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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 commented that they were working to wrap up the site review. The biggest item was the third-party review on the storm water. Ms. Walker commented that Planning Board approval would be subject to the final report back from the third-party review. It should be back before the March Planning Board review.

1. Based on the recent email from the DOT, the driveway location is fine as proposed.
 - a. Mr. Coranti confirmed that DOT approved the driveway location.
2. Design of drainage systems shall be subject to final review by the third-party reviewer and approval by DPW prior to Planning Board review.
 - a. Mr. Coranti confirmed that was fine.
3. The truck turning plan appears as though some parked vehicles could be impacted, please clarify.
 - a. Mr. Coranti responded that they would update the plans. Ms. Walker clarified that they could change it so that the parking is not impacted. Mr. Coranti confirmed they have a revised plan that works and avoids the parking spots. They can provide the radius. Mr. Howe requested that that the tracking was in color to show which line went with what. Mr. Coranti confirmed that would be updated and they could give two drawings one for the entrance and one for the exit.
4. The turnaround should be a minimum of 20' in width and 47'10" in length, does it meet the minimum turning radius?
 - a. Mr. Coranti responded that they could widen it to 20 feet. They can provide the radius.
5. It is not clear what the maintenance schedule is for the stormwater systems on site. Please provide annual maintenance and inspection report with reporting going to Planning and DPW annually.
 - a. Mr. Coranti responded that this would be in the condo docs, but the report can be submitted in the packet for review as well.
6. Efforts should be made to protect the mature trees on the site that are adjacent the limit of work. Snow fencing should be installed along the dripline prior to construction.
 - a. Mr. Coranti agreed that was their intention. Mr. Britz added that fencing during construction would help to keep contractors away from them.
7. If not already completed, demolition of the existing structure may require review by the Demolition Review Committee.
 - a. Ms. Walker clarified that the Planning Board needs to be aware of the demolition, so a separate hearing is not required.
8. The proposed sidewalk connection to Lafayette Road should be extended around the radius to directly align with the opposite sidewalk to Ocean Road.
 - a. Mr. Eby clarified that the comment was about the internal sidewalk. Mr. Coranti confirmed that would be updated.
9. The three parallel spaces should be posted as visitor spaces.
 - a. Mr. Coranti confirmed they would be posted.
10. Is any fencing proposed along the perimeter? If so, a fence detail should be included.
 - a. Mr. Coranti responded that they would be keeping some of the existing fence and adding more along the property line. The barbed wire on the existing fence would be removed and there would be plastic weaved through it to create a privacy screen. Ms. Walker noted that there should be a fence detail included in the plan that shows the type, style and height.

Mr. Howe questioned if DPW was fine with the proposed sprinkler line. Mr. Coranti responded that the fire protection line was going to the sprinkler rooms. Mr. Desfosses commented that it needs its own separate valving. They will also need a blanket water access easement. There is no change to the connection needed. The final water plan should be approved by DPW.

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 with the following stipulations:

To be completed prior to Planning Board submission:

1. Applicant shall update the truck turning plan to confirm there is no conflict with parked vehicles;
2. The turnaround shall be a minimum of 20' in width and 47'10" in length and the turning radius shall be confirmed to comply with Fire Department standards;
3. The proposed sidewalk connection to Lafayette Road should be extended around the radius to directly align with the opposite sidewalk to Ocean Road
4. The three parallel spaces shall be posted as visitor spaces.
5. Applicant shall provide details of the proposed fencing on the perimeter of the property and shall indicate where the fencing will be located on the property.

To be incorporated as a stipulation of approval for Planning Board:

1. Design of drainage systems shall be subject to final review by the third-party reviewer and approval by DPW.
2. The final water services plan shall be reviewed and approved by DPW Water Division.
3. The Engineer of Record shall submit a written report (with photographs and engineer stamp) certifying that the stormwater infrastructure was constructed to the approved plans and specifications and will meet the design performance.
4. A stormwater maintenance and inspection report shall be conducted annually and provided to the City's Planning and Public Works Departments.
5. Efforts should be made to protect the mature trees on the site that are adjacent the limit of work. Snow fencing shall be installed along the dripline prior to construction.
6. All as-built plans and plans provided for recording to the City shall be in the coordinate system required by the Site Plan Review regulations.
7. Owner shall provide an access easement to the City for water valve access and leak detection. The easement shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Legal Departments prior to acceptance by the City Council.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. 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.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Attorney John Bosen and Steve Pernaw spoke to the application. Mr. Bosen commented that they filed an application for an amended site plan to accommodate the needs for a national supermarket chain taking over the Shaw's. The Game Stop is being demolished and there is a new entry way shown on the plans. It will open the site and make a safe access in and out of the plaza. The left turn lane would be removed. The applicant is willing to extend the median to make a safer entrance way. The left-hand turn removal would make it safer. TAC commented that it may be better off with existing conditions. It is not something anybody wants but is within the right of the applicant. The client will keep existing conditions unless they get approval for the proposed amendment. The Plaza is not aware of any safety issues with the current configuration. Applebee's down the street has a similar configuration. Mr. Pernaw can address the TAC comments. This retail client would enhance the area. They are all in support of a safer entrance way. The proposal is for an auxiliary entrance to the plaza. The traffic count in and out of the plaza from that new entrance will be quite low. It's designed to catch the traffic before it comes to the crest of the hill and they see another grocery store option.

Mr. Pernaw prepared the traffic memo. The number of access points to the plaza does not change. It's moving the driveway in front of Game Stop from full access to limited access. The proposal would create a right in and right out driveway with 2 conflict points. The median can be extended. The access street works for people who know the City, but they need to account for people coming in for the first time who may miss it.

TAC Comments:

1. The National Cooperative Highway Research Program, in their Report 457, provides guidance for when a right turn bay should be provided at an intersection. Based on the speed and volume of traffic on Woodbury Avenue, together with the expected volume of right turns into the proposed driveway, a right turn bay should be provided. A right turn bay can significantly improve operations and safety at the intersection, as it effectively separates those vehicles that are slowing or stopped to turn, from those vehicles in the through traffic lanes. This separation minimizes turn-related collisions such as angle, rear-end, and same-direction-sideswipe, and eliminates unnecessary delay to through vehicles.
 - a. Mr. Pernaw responded that the reviewer is correct. Ideally, they would have a right turn lane approaching. It's just a guideline. It is a nice to have but not essential. Applebees has this configuration. There is a possibility that they could make a right turn taper in the frontage.
2. The traffic memo states that a driveway on Woodbury would allow direct access to the site without impacting Durgin Lane. Given that the traffic volumes on Woodbury

Ave are more than 3 times greater than the volume on Durgin Lane, and that Durgin Lane traffic is all local traffic turning in and out of commercial driveways, and that vehicle queues on Durgin Lane, as reported in the referenced Woodbury Ave Engineering Study, do not extend back past the first site driveway, the impact to Durgin Lane traffic would be negligible and not a reason to provide a major driveway on Woodbury Ave.

- a. Mr. Pernaw responded that the reviewer is correct. There is not much room. It could be a potential problem in the future. Southbound vehicles could distribute between the two-accesses. It is better to let drivers decide based on the traffic situation.
3. While having several driveways helps to disperse the site traffic, the site already has 7 access points, which is more than sufficient to adequately disperse the site generated traffic. There is no need for another major access point, as the level of service and capacity at the signalized intersections is not a cause for concern.
 - a. Mr. Pernaw responded that they were just modifying an existing access point by removing functions.
4. The City recently completed a major signal improvement project (over \$1M) along the Woodbury Avenue corridor to improve traffic operations, flow and safety. This proposed driveway would have a negative impact on traffic flow and safety, as it creates a new major driveway between two closely spaced signals, without a right turn lane.
 - a. Mr. Pernaw disagreed. There would be a reduction in conflict points.
5. While state driveway standards allow for driving spacing as stated in the memo, the state driveway standards also require 30 foot wide driveway lanes with a minimum of 20 feet between the entering and exiting lanes of a driveway such as this. There is no separation between the lanes in the proposed driveway design, and the lanes are only 12 feet wide.
 - a. Mr. Pernaw responded that this proposal has flares that may be extended if needed. There is 20 feet between the entrance and exit. This is not a gas station. This is a single drive that shows width and angles. It is a simple right in and right out with a pork chop island.
6. If the median island were extended beyond the right-turn-out portion of the proposed driveway, a right-turn-out only driveway may be considered, but not the right turn entering in the presently proposed configuration.
 - a. Mr. Pernaw responded that they did not have a problem with extending the median. Alternatively, the driveway could be pushed a little further north and the median would not be extended.
7. Fire Department still has concerns regarding access to the rear of the building. Particularly with trucks at the loading docks.
 - a. Mr. Bosen responded that they would need to secure the tenant before addressing the rear of the building. There is some opportunity for it, but there are loading zones in the back as well.
8. A line of shade trees should be considered for the wide landscape areas adjacent the proposed driveway. In order to maintain views into the site the trees could be planted toward the rear of the landscape area.
 - a. Mr. Bosen agreed to the shade trees.

Mr. Bosen commented that he believed they were making an existing condition better.

Ms. Walker noted that the applicant suggested modifying a right turn taper and showed willingness to extend the median island. Mr. Eby responded that the problem was that there was not enough frontage to do the proper treatment. The second time a person comes to the site they won't use that driveway. They will use Durgin Lane. Mr. Eby would be willing to accept the existing driveway, but there is not a need for it. Most of the traffic is on either end of the traffic light site. Ms. Walker commented that what was submitted is not a complete package for planning review. It would be helpful to have an existing conditions plan and a demo plan for the Game Stop.

Ms. Walker commented that one proposal today is the existing conditions. Mr. Bosen responded that the client has studied this. Woodbury Ave. was designed for this type of use and it is a perfect spot for a grocery store. If the client does not get this driveway, then they won't come.

Mr. Eby commented that the Applebee's has a lot less traffic than a shopping market. Mr. Pernaw responded that it was mostly just to show the geometry of the driveway. Mr. Eby noted that the bank on the corner creates a complexity. Ms. Walker questioned if they talked to the bank about shared access. Mr. Bosen responded they had not. Mr. Eby noted that there was a right turn lane and left turn lane to Durgin Lane. There are already 7 access points to the parcel. There is no need for this driveway. It would have adverse traffic impact. Mr. Pernaw responded that it was just the issue with southbound traffic missing the side lane and seeing another grocery store.

Mr. Britz questioned if they looked at sightlines for the intersection through Durgin Lane. People should have enough time to see the store and turn. It would be good to show that data. Mr. Bosen responded that he understood the concern and hoped they were not making a problem where there wasn't one. The property owners were not aware of a problem and the configuration already exists. Hopefully that counts for something. Ms. Walker responded that this was a technical review. Planning Board makes the ultimate decision. They probably will not solve the driveway issue without making some headway with the client. Mr. Bosen responded that they hoped the extension of the median would go a long way. Mr. Eby noted that the right turn in was the biggest concern because of the amount of traffic on Woodbury Ave.

PUBLIC HEARING

Daniel Lynch from First Seacoast Bank commented that he has not had a chance to review the plans. Mr. Lynch was supportive of reusing the market. The bank would benefit from having a nearby supermarket. There have been some positive revisions, however, the median does not extend out far enough. The median should be extended to prevent misuse. Mr. Lynch questioned if there was a potential to make it an entrance only. That would capture the traffic that missed the Durgin Lane. There is a driveway there now, but Game Stop receives far less traffic than a supermarket does. The bank has not been contacted directly but would be open to more conversation if needed.

Ms. Walker commented that an entrance only would not solve the queuing concerns. Mr. Eby confirmed that they would not have a proper deceleration lane turn which is problematic.

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 commented that TAC needs to see the complete package to properly evaluate. Mr. Bosen questioned if they would satisfy concerns if they provided more room for the right turn lane. Mr. Eby responded they would have to address the sidewalk there.

Mr. Britz moved to **postpone** this request until the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

C. **POSTPONED** 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. **POSTPONED**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

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

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **LCSG, LLC, Owner**, for properties located at **160 and 168-170 Union Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a new single family residence and separate building with a 4-bay garage and an apartment above on a site where a duplex currently exists resulting in a total building footprint of 3,106 s.f. and 8,117 new GFA with associated site improvements, grading, utilities, lighting, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 135 Lots 30 and 29 and lie within the General Residence C (GRC) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering and Jeremiah Johnson spoke to the application. Mr. Weinrieb commented that there have been some changes to the site since the application was submitted. The existing single-family residence and barn have been removed. There is a partially paved driveway and broken pavement on the north side. The proposal would need zoning relief for a four-vehicle garage off Union St. with the door pointed south toward Middle

St. There will be a one bed apartment above the garage. Then the single-family residence will be reconstructed on the property to almost the same footprint. There will be 3 external parking spaces, so a total of 7 spaces on the site. They are maintaining more than the required area to the south abutter. To the north would be a large open space with an optional retaining wall. The roof will pitch runoff to a drip edge in the back and there will be gutters on the north side. All the traditional pavement will drain to a catch basin on the property. There will also be permeable pavement with crush stone. The initial design proposed a single water service in the same trench as the former single family.

TAC Comments:

1. Water and sewer lines for the old structure need to be shown being terminated at the respective mains
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb responded that he thought that was done at the demolition, but they would take care of it.
2. Why does 160 have two sewer connections?
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb responded that was a typo.
3. All structures need to have their own water service of which 1" is minimum size.
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb responded they had interpreted it differently. The preference would be to have individual meters to monitor them more easily.
4. There needs to be a maintenance plan for the porous pavement. This pavement will need to be tested annually and replaced as necessary.
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb responded that would be included in the storm water management plan.
5. The grading on the side of the driveway should be altered so water is not directed to the side of the 2 bedroom structure (add curb or other).
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the entire area is permeable pavement with an underdrain system. They don't need a curb there for grade. It works fine without it. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it was fine as proposed.
6. The area between 274 Union and the new structure should be sealed surface.
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it was partially sealed with broken pavement. They will create a swale to ensure water goes out into the street. They can add mulch or another alternative in that area.
7. The water line going to the back structure must go into heated space, a meter will be required here. Space must be reasonably large enough to work on meter (24" wide, 30" high).
 - a. Mr. Desfosses clarified that the main meter should be at 160 and they can sub meter from there on their own.
8. Fire service supply not shown on the utilities plan
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb responded that he did not think a residential use needed a separate water line. Mr. Howe responded that a residential one would need a separate one, but there is storage under one of them. That makes it mixed use.
9. Stormwater Reports should be sent to both Planning and DPW annually
 - a. Mr. Weinrieb agreed.
10. Given the overall design of the house and carriage house is traditional, consider steeper-pitched roofs with brackets. Additionally, a granite step and landing should

also be considered for the single family structure given the prominence of this entry. What is the material proposed for the railing system?

- a. Mr. Johnson responded that he has worked with Mr. Cracknell to make changes.

11. Stud pockets should be used between the three windows on the dormers on the carriage house in order to have the window casing fill-out the face of the dormer without the use of clapboards.

- a. Mr. Johnson responded that he has worked with Mr. Cracknell to make changes.

Mr. Marsilia commented that he was concerned about drainage from the rear garage going to the neighbors. Mr. Weinrieb responded that in the existing conditions it all drains down to that area. In the proposed half of the roof will go to the permeable pavement and the other would go out to the street. There is also a stone drip edge with an underdrain that goes into a containment area. The only runoff going into area would be a little rain. They will probably add a retaining wall to help with that as well. Mr. Marsilia questioned if the garage bay would be divided into two and two. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that was the plan.

Mr. Britz suggested putting in another grading line to create a higher slope to keep runoff from going into the neighbor's yard. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed they would look at that. Ms. Walker questioned where the water collected now. Mr. Weinrieb responded that it does not pond.

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. Britz moved to **recommend approval** of this request to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Howe with the following stipulations:

1. Plans shall be updated to show that water and sewer lines for the previously demolished structure will be terminated at the respective mains;
2. Correct error showing two sewer connections to 160 Union Street;
3. Plans shall be reviewed with DPW Water Division to verify water service requirements;
4. Plans shall be revised to show that the water line going to the building in the rear goes into a heated space and a meter shall be required at that location. Space must be reasonably large enough to work on meter (24" wide, 30" high);
5. Fire service supply shall be added to the utilities plan;
6. A stormwater inspection and maintenance report shall be completed annually and copies shall be submitted to the City's Planning and Public Works Departments;
7. The installation of the drainage connection to the street shall require the oversight of City staff or a third party engineer.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Richard Fusegni, Owner**, for property located at **201 Kearsarge Way** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide a lot with an area of 47,062 s.f. and 205' of continuous street frontage into three (3) lots as follows: proposed Lot 1 with an area of 15,482 s.f. and 100' of continuous street frontage; proposed Lot 2 with an area of 15,856 s.f. and 100.2' of continuous street frontage; and Proposed Lot 3 with an area of 15,723 s.f. and 82.84' of continuous street frontage. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 218 Lot 5 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon with Ambit Engineering and Attorney Bernie Pelech spoke to the application. The proposal is for a subdivision of one lot into 3 lots at the corner of Birch St. and Kearsarge Way. The lots go north west, and the land is large enough to support them. A variance was required for the frontage on one lot. The applicant wishes to preserve an existing tree grove and is proposing a conservation easement on it. They did a workshop meeting and showed conceptual layouts of homes with driveways, grading erosion control, and utilities.

TAC Comments:

1. The driveway for Lot 5-4 needs to extend to the street. The sidewalk will need to be modified. This should be shown on the plans.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that they have revised the plan to address that.
2. The driveway to Unit 2 should be shifted as far from the intersection with Kearsarge Way as possible.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that they relocated it as far away from the intersection as possible.
3. The drainage for the houses should be incorporated into the back yard areas where they can be maintained.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that they were trying to provide a yard between the housing development area and the conservation land. If they introduce drainage, then there would be a less robust backyard. They could introduce a berm to hold the water back.
4. All water services need to be at least 1". What is the size of the existing service that you hope to reuse?
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that the note states one inch is typical for the proposed. They added a note to verify the existing service is one inch.
5. Show 2" water main being abandoned.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon commented that they put the new water pipe in same location. A note has been added to address the continued use of service to neighbors. They will provide temporary water service to any impacted abutters.
6. Birch St is to be reclaimed and reconstructed to City Standards.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that the note has been added.
7. Provide easement to turn around in driveway of 5-2 for plowing/city access.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that a note was added.

8. Show gas lines.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that the plan has been revised.
9. Show electric and cable lines.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that a note has been added.
10. 2' stub out of manhole is sufficient.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that the plan has been revised.
11. Materials to be approved by Portsmouth Water/sewer
 - a. Mr. Chagnon agreed.
12. Installation of utilities to be witnessed.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that a note was added.
13. Remove detail F/C3, it is incorrect and doesn't meet standards
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that it would be removed.
14. Provide City standard detail for drop sewer manholes on plan set.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that the detail was added.
15. What is the existing sewer in Kearsarge? It is shown as PVC, AC and Clay on various plans and details.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that they revised the detail for this.
16. If not already completed, demolition of the existing structure may require review by the Demolition Review Committee.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon agreed. Ms. Walker commented that they can add it to the advertisement to avoid a demolition delay. They will still need a demolition permit.
17. It appears that many mature trees are located within and adjacent to the proposed limit of work. They should be shown on the existing conditions plan.
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that the trees were shown on sheet C1.
18. How is the conservation restriction area proposed to be monumented to prevent future encroachment and clearing by the lot owners?
 - a. Mr. Chagnon responded that the conservation easement edge will be marked. Attorney Pelech added that he would prepare the easements for the City to review. Ms. Walker noted that it would be helpful to have a draft at the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Howe questioned at what point addresses would be assigned. Ms. Walker responded they should be requested to be assigned once Planning approves the plan. Mr. Howe commented that the addresses should match the driveways. One should be Kearsarge Way and the other two should be on Birch St.

Mr. Desfosses commented that they will need to deforest 10 feet wide for construction access back there. They will do just as much damage in the back as they will in the front. Mr. Chagnon responded they will take careful consideration with the construction team and build with smaller equipment. Mr. Desfosses commented that it needs more thought. Ms. Walker questioned if they were comfortable with it being a condition of approval. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was fine.

Mr. Eby questioned if the driveway corners could be tightened up because they were very large. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they could.

Mr. Chagnon commented that the electric would be overhead on Kearsarge Way. Ms. Walker noted that it just needs a waiver. It's overhead on all of Kearsarge Way.

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 with the following stipulations:

1. The driveway to 5-2 shall be shifted as far from the intersection with Kearsarge Way as possible;
2. The drainage for the houses shall be incorporated into the back-yard areas where they can be maintained without impacting the portion of the property designated to be a conservation area;
3. Plans shall show 2" water main being abandoned;
4. Birch Street is to be reclaimed and reconstructed to City Standards;
5. Owner shall provide easement to turn around in driveway of 5-2 for plowing/city access;
6. Add location of gas, electric, and communication lines to plan;
7. Applicant shall provide more detail about how the conservation restriction area is proposed to be monumented to prevent future encroachment and clearing by the lot owners;
8. Street addresses shall match the driveway locations;
9. Driveway radii on Kearsarge Way shall be tightened.

The motion passed unanimously.

C. The application of **4 Amigos, LLC, Owner**, for properties located at **1400 Lafayette Road, Peverly Hill Road and 721 Peverly Hill Road** 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 53-unit Garden and Townhouse Style residential development consisting of 6 structures with a combined total footprint of 37,775 s.f. and 122,000 GFA with associated grading, lighting, utilities, stormwater management, landscape improvements and community space. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 252 Lots 7, 4 & 5 and lie within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Landscape Architect Bob White, Engineer Chris Demoula, Michael Keen and Rebecca Brown spoke to the application. Mr. White commented that the property is a portion of a larger property with Rite Aid, the bank and Five Guys on Lafayette Rd. This project is on Peverly Hill Rd. There are 52 units of housing proposed. There will be two intermediate roads and a connector road. The basic layout is a larger building that faces the first block. It will be 3 stories with ground level parking. There will be a series of town houses with garages and then another smaller building with additional units. Community space is a major criterion. There will be community space on the frontage of Peverly Hill Rd. All side streets will be wide pedestrian sidewalks. They are not counting any sidewalk that isn't 10 feet wide. There is additional community space in the center with a pocket park and a courtyard. They are connected by a pedestrian walkway. There is an additional area of community space at the corner of the bank.

Mr. Britz questioned how accessible the community space will be to the public. Mr. White responded the community space will be connect by sidewalks for the public to access it.

Mr. Demoula commented that the grading and drainage will be consistent with the Rite Aid and Five Guys development. It will be closed drainage with deep sunk catch basins. There are four underground systems on the site. All have been designed based on AOT requirements plus 15%. There will be a decrease in runoff post development. The utility plan shows where they are connecting to mains. There is currently two connection points. The gas connection will be along Peverly Hill Rd. and electric will come off an existing pole. All buildings will be sprinkled and will have both domestic and fire service to buildings. There will be silt sock of fence for erosion control. There is a long-term maintenance plan included.

Mr. Keen commented that building A will be on the south east corner of the new parcel. There will be 3 levels above grade level parking. Parking will be undercover. The main entrance is in the corner with a closed vestibule. There are mechanical spaces, an elevator and mail collection in the building. Parking access is through the back. There is an area for indoor bike storage. There is also trash collection and storage. There will be common space an exercise room etc. The townhouses are pretty straight forward. They will have a stoop entrance up half a level from the street. People will go up to the living level or down to the garage level. They will be two bedrooms with provisions for a third. They will have a deck that fronts to the courtyard. Building C will be on the north end. Parking will be ground level with two living levels above that. They will be a combination of two bedroom and one bedroom. It will be similar to Building A.

Mr. Howe questioned if there was a second exit from the garage. Mr. Keen responded that right now there was only one main door, but they can add another.

Mr. White commented that each unit will have 1-2 parking spaces. The townhouse will have two parking spaces in the garage.

Ms. Brown spoke to traffic. They compared the previously proposed retail building to what is now being proposed. It showed residential will generate 50-70 fewer trips in the peak hour and

600 less on a daily basis. There will be 25 p.m. peak hour trips and 30 Saturday midday peak hour trips. There was supplemental analysis to look at how many trips are being generated by what is there now. It showed less trips than what was previously estimated. There are 30 fewer on Saturday and 100 fewer on weekday peak hours. There weren't any intersections with significant collision history. All of the sight distances exceed 500 feet and DOT requires 400 feet., so there is more than enough.

TAC Comments:

1. There should be one shared water main tapped in Peverly Hill Road, not two.
2. Sagamore Creek is an impaired water body, stormwater reporting must be submitted yearly
3. 3rd party engineering construction oversight will be requested for Parking, Drainage and Utilities.
4. Show overlay with Peverly Hill Rd design to see if curb and sidewalk as shown is consistent.
 - a. Mr. White responded that they followed the curb alignments and layout with the exception of a residential drive to an existing house. They are suggesting that driveway be closed because they won't a driveway there.
5. Water main on Peverly Hill Road in this area may need replacement.
 - a. Mr. Desfosses clarified that the it was the main just to the north that should be replaced. It makes sense to replace it then tie in the water service there. Then they can service to the property when the main from Lafayette Rd. to West Rd. is replaced. They can coordinate with DPW on this.
6. Stormwater inspection reports should be sent to Planning and DPW annually
 - a. Mr. Desfosses clarified that they just need to be reviewed in design and inspected in construction.
7. The applicant needs to provide a copy of the summary report prepared by IAC, dated 6/11/12, which outlines the ground penetrating radar technologies that were used to identify the potential burial ground which was subsequently excavated. The archaeologists concluded that there was no burial ground on site. This is not consistent with the information that the City has been provided as part of our Peverly Hill Road project.
 - a. Mr. White responded that they carried over the results from the Rite Aid portion. Mr. Desfosses commented that they used the same consultant as the applicant and the reports conflict. Mr. Mitchell commented that they did a full excavation of the area. They are staying out of that area anyway. Ms. Walker commented that the company needs to reconcile the reports.
8. The raised crosswalks on the stop controlled approaches to the internal intersections do not seem necessary, and would make turning movements difficult for vehicles driving over them. They are better suited to straight sections of roadway that are not under stop sign control. Patterned or stamped materials flush with the street, or raising the entire intersection would be preferable to raising the crosswalk alone.
 - a. Mr. White responded that they were fine to lower the sidewalks.
9. No Parking signs are required at the head of access aisles for accessible parking spaces.

10. The mid-block raised crosswalks constructed as part of the original development are not effective and should be eliminated. New crosswalks should be provided at the internal 4-way intersection nearest 5 Guys and Rite Aid.
 - a. Mr. Eby commented that they don't need to be raised. Mr. White responded that they would like to have uniform level sidewalks all the way down. Ms. Walker responded as long as it is appropriately designed, then it can be there. Mr. Eby commented that the raised sidewalks make it awkward for cars to turn. It should be a whole raised intersection. Mr. Demoula commented that would create drainage issues and confirmed they would work with Mr. Eby offline.
 - b. Mr. White commented that there are two crosswalks that were originally designed to be speed table but were only built to 3 inches. The intent is to leave them. Mr. Eby commented that they should think about providing crosswalks at the intersections. Mr. Demoula responded that would impact drainage.
11. The perpendicular curbing at the ends of the parallel parking spaces will be very difficult to keep clear of snow.
12. Parking spaces in the garage that have columns at the ends should be wider to allow for easier access to and from the spaces.
 - a. Mr. White responded that they have given extra width to the spaces with the columns. The columns are outside the dimensional layout of the spaces. Mr. Keen added that the drive access aisle is 26 feet wide to the edge of the parking strip. They held the columns back to protect them and allow for more straightforward parking. Widening it would impact the trash/mechanical room or parking.
 - b. Ms. Walker clarified that the plan also shows double yellow lines. They don't need to be removed, but they are not needed. The preference is that they were not there.
13. Is the stamped concrete oval meant to be driven over? If not, perhaps pavement arrows should be provided to direct vehicles around it.
 - a. Mr. White confirmed a vehicle could drive over the oval.
14. Will the townhouse style condos have garages?
15. There will be a strong desire for residents to walk to Market Basket, and it should be encouraged and made safer. However, there are no pedestrian accommodations for crossing Peverly Hill Road. The existing pedestrian crossing at the Lafayette Road signal could be used, but pedestrians typically do not like to deviate from a straight line to their destination. The applicant should look at providing an appropriately designed crossing at West Road and a sidewalk along the south side of Peverly Hill Road leading to the plaza driveway.
 - a. Mr. White responded that it seems like the best place to cross is near West Rd. It is out of the way of the median. Mr. Eby agreed that was the best location. Ms. Walker commented that they were providing a pedestrian traffic generator and creating the reason for that crosswalk. The City will want some participation from the applicant to create it. Ms. Walker understood the point on the widened sidewalk. Mr. Desfosses added that the City built the sidewalk on the other side of Market Basket to move signals around. The City has invested quite a bit as well.

- 16. The existing trip generation of the site should be provided and compared to the original projected trip generation for the site.
- 17. What is the status of the driveway permit application with the NHDOT?
- 18. If not already completed, demolition of the existing structure on the abutting lot may require review by the Demolition Review Committee.
- 19. The sidewalk and crosswalk adjacent the truck parking spaces should be realigned to hold a 90 degree crossing by extending the sidewalk and landscape area between the truck parking and the main entrance driveway.
- 20. The main entrances should be shown for the 12,600 SF 6-Unit Condo Complex “C” and the sidewalk along the southern wall should be extended to connect to the adjacent sidewalk.
- 21. What is proposed for the paved space directly behind Complex “D”? Where is parking located for these units? The outdoor parking spaces should be shown behind the units on Complex “B”.
- 22. Some community spaces appear to not qualify with the community space standards. For example, the porous pavement pavers (5D) within the rear parking courtyard or the reference to a “square” or “outdoor dining café”.

Ms. Walker commented that they would appreciate the 3-D renderings to help visualize. Mr. White responded that they would have that for the Planning Board.

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 changes required were not substantial, but one more round to iron out the details would be beneficial.

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

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Howe moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:44 pm, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee