

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

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

**2:00 PM**

**MARCH 3, 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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**ADDITIONAL**

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jillian Harris, Planner 1

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A.** Approval of minutes from the February 4, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Eby moved to approve the minutes from the February 4, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

**II. OLD BUSINESS**

**A.** 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 Glowacki spoke to the application. Mr. Bosen worked with the Planning Staff to redesign the entrance. The right out has been eliminated and the median was extended. It is safer than what is there today and what was proposed at the last meeting. Mr. Bosen noted that they were in agreement with the comments.

TAC Comments:

- The water service for 1618 Woodbury Avenue needs to be terminated at the main in the road. This is not currently shown on the plans.

- Mr. Glowacki noted that they agree with all three comments that related to the demolition plan.
- The gas service for 1618 Woodbury Avenue will need to be terminated. This is not shown on the plans. The gas main is located under the existing sidewalk.
- The sewer service to 1618 Woodbury Avenue is shown capped at sewer manhole, please add onto note, ‘water tight’.
- The existing ramp at the corner of Durgin Lane and Woodbury is already fully handicapped compliant. It does not need to be replaced.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that can be removed from the scope.
- The privately owned CB in the north east corner of 1618 Woodbury Avenue is 20” below grade. This basin should be raised up to grade.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that was easy to include.
- Provide a stay right sign for the island extension on a breakaway post, remove old sign foundation/post.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that would be included.
- Call out ‘bull nose’ style curb pieces for the end of the new island.
  - Mr. Glowacki confirmed that would be updated.
- Typical parking lot striping lot detail has an error.  $19+24+19=62'$ 
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that would be corrected.
- Do not use welded wire fabric in any sidewalks that are in the ROW.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that they will omit the welded wire fabric from that detail in the ROW.
- Use thermoplastic markings for crosswalks, lane symbols and stop bars in the ROW.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that the note would be added.
- Provide easement for signal equipment and tip down at Ruby Tuesday driveway.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that the applicant does not own that portion of the property. Mr. Desfosses clarified that it was for the other portion of the driveway. Mr. Glowacki confirmed that could be updated on the south side.
- Woodbury Avenue has new pavement. Any pavement impacted by utilities or island construction will be milled and repaved after 12 months to the satisfaction of the Public Works department.
  - Mr. Glowacki agreed.
- Based on the new traffic analysis and the proposed modifications to the GameStop driveway, City staff are satisfied that the revised driveway will operate safely. However, the curblin and sidewalk should stay as true to the existing layout as possible, as pedestrians are not likely to follow the new sidewalk, the sidewalk would require an easement to the City, and the sidewalk snowplow would not be able to follow the new configuration.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that they provided a taper to bring the pedestrians further into the site. Mr. Eby noted that they should bring it further back to the road.
- The extension of the median island and elimination of the right turn out portion of the driveway are key elements to the safety improvements at this location and will go a long way to improving the operations of this driveway.

- Mr. Desfosses clarified that they prefer it stays in the right of way. Mr. Glowacki confirmed that they could fix that. Mr. Desfosses commented that it should be a straight shot and be handicap accessible.
- Truncated dome panels are not necessary at driveway crossings.
  - Mr. Glowacki agreed.
- The R1-3P sign on the revised driveway is missing.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that would be updated.
- Recommend the snow removal contractor be “Green Snow-Pro Certified”
  - Mr. Glowacki confirmed that they will coordinate that happens and add a note to the plan.
- Annual stormwater maintenance documentation shall be submitted annually to Portsmouth DPW and Planning Departments.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that they will add a note.
- Shade trees should be considered within the open lawn area to reduce the heat island effect of the larger site.
  - Mr. Glowacki responded that they considered it and will consider it further. The landscape plan that was included has pockets of landscaping to make it more robust. They will include shade trees.

Mr. Howe commented that any mulch on the site should be fire resistant or non-combustible.

Ms. Walker noted that the changes should be made before the Planning Board Meeting.

## **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 addressed prior to submission of plans for Planning Board:

- The water service for 1618 Woodbury Avenue needs to be terminated at the main in the road;
- The gas service for 1618 Woodbury Avenue will need to be terminated. The gas main is located under the existing sidewalk;
- The sewer service to 1618 Woodbury Avenue is shown capped at sewer manhole, please add onto note, ‘water tight’;
- The existing ramp at the corner of Durgin Lane and Woodbury is already fully ADA compliant. It does not need to be replaced;
- The privately owned catch basin in the north east corner of 1618 Woodbury Avenue is 20” below grade. This basin should be raised up to grade;
- Provide a stay right sign for the island extension on a breakaway post, remove old sign foundation/post;

- Call out ‘bull nose’ style curb pieces for the end of the new island;
- Correct typical parking lot striping lot detail math error;
- Do not use welded wire fabric in any sidewalks that are in the ROW;
- Use thermoplastic markings for crosswalks, lane symbols and stop bars in the ROW;
- Provide easement for signal equipment and tip down at 1574 Woodbury Avenue driveway.
- Woodbury Avenue has new pavement. Any pavement impacted by utilities or island construction will be milled and repaved after 12 months to the satisfaction of the Public Works department. This shall be noted on the plans.
- The revised driveway curbline and sidewalk should stay as true to the existing layout as possible as discussed at the TAC meeting;
- Truncated dome panels are not necessary at driveway crossings;
- Add the missing R1-3P sign on the revised driveway;
- Add recommended snow removal contractor be “Green Snow-Pro Certified” in the stormwater maintenance plan;
- Note on plans that the annual stormwater maintenance documentation shall be submitted annually to Portsmouth DPW and Planning Departments;
- Shade trees should be considered within the open lawn area to reduce the heat island effect of the larger site.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. **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. Britz moved to postpone until the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Cracknell. 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, Chris Demoula from GPI and Rebecca Brown spoke to the application.

Mr. Demoula commented that they revised the plan and went back to standard crosswalks with accessible ramps. That eliminated the awkward turning movements for cars. An additional egress was added to Building C. The curbing was revised to be slope granite curbing except with the parallel parking. There is a crosswalk connection by the hotel that is aligned to come straight across.

### TAC Comments:

- A blanket easement to allow the Portsmouth Water Dept. to access valves, meters and for leak detection will be required for the site.
  - Mr. Demoula confirmed that would be added.
- Instead of tying OCS1 into the existing CB, install a new DMH just downstream from the existing CB and tie OCS#1 into that new DMH.
  - Mr. Demoula responded that they were hesitant to put in an additional structure because they don't think it's needed. It's a straight shot to the catch basin. Mr. Desfosses commented that the additional structure should be there. Mr. Demoula confirmed that it would be added.
- The water service for the front 23 unit building is very long. This may lead to poor water quality. Instead, consider running services under floor slab inside of sleeves from the courtyard side.
  - Mr. Demoula responded that they did not think it was a long connection, but can discuss this further with the Water Department. Mr. Desfosses agreed that they should discuss it with the Water Department.
- All water lines to be installed to Portsmouth Standards.
- All sewer lines installed to be to State and City standards
  - Mr. Demoula agreed.
- All utilities being installed will be witnessed by a third party inspection company to be determined by the City.
  - Mr. Demoula agreed.
- Confirm from Eversource that both poles proposed to have service drops are able to provide them (i.e. there is nothing else on the poles that they will not allow a service drop)
  - Mr. Demoula responded that they have calls in on the utility connections and will update the plans as needed.
- Wherever possible, the end stalls in a row of parking should be a bit wider.
  - Mr. Demoula requested clarification on the comment. Mr. Desfosses responded that they are tight spots, so if there is room to make them half a foot wider then that would be good.
- Truncated dome panels are not to be used except for street crossings or signalized driveways in the ROW.
  - Mr. Demoula responded that they have no problem with that.

- Number the buildings so they can be referred to.
  - Ms. Walker commented that they are labeled it was just missed in the review. Mr. Howe added that it seems like this should be a Peverly Hill Road address. The buildings should have letters instead of numbers. Mr. White questioned how the townhouses should be addressed. Mr. Howe responded that the building would have a letter and then each unit would be numbered. Ms. Walker added that it would be helpful to include internal signage in the plans before the Planning Board and run it by Mr. Howe for input. It would be good to reach out the DPW to get a sense of what the address would be. Mr. Demoula confirmed they would.
- Easements need to be provided for the sidewalks along Peverly Hill Road.
  - Mr. Demoula confirmed that would be added.
- Follow City of Portsmouth standard planting details available on the City's web page -- [https://www.cityofportsmouth.com/sites/default/files/2020-01/Tree%20Planting%20Detail\\_0.pdf](https://www.cityofportsmouth.com/sites/default/files/2020-01/Tree%20Planting%20Detail_0.pdf).
  - Mr. White confirmed that they would use the relevant ones.
- The 'Halka' Honey locusts planned for the frontage to Peverly might be too big of a species to fit under the wires. Please revisit this.
  - Mr. White responded that they would look at that for clearance.
- The location of Maple and Elm trees at intersections could block the view of both drivers and pedestrians. Low plantings may be more suitable at these internal intersections.
  - Mr. White responded that they will check the sight distances on them.
  - Mr. Desfosses added that they received a comment from the City Arborist that the Princeton American Elms should be replaced by other trees. The tree planting detail needs to be revised. Mr. White confirmed that they would consult with the arborist.
- The speed table and raised intersection detail can be removed from the plan set if they are not proposed anymore.
  - Mr. Demoula responded that this was resolved already.
- The applicant should provide a pedestrian crossing of Peverly Hill Road at the West Road intersection, along with an RRFB, and design (engineered) plans for a sidewalk along Peverly Hill Road between West Road and the Market Basket driveway.
  - Ms. Brown responded that it was their belief that there was already an accessible path that goes down the easterly side of Peverly Hill Rd. and they can cross at the signalized location to walk back up to the Mark Basket. Ms. Brown looked at the potential crossing area and sight distances. Ms. Brown also looked at the appropriate type of crossing based on the volume and speeds. The work sheet is from the NCHRP article. Many agencies use it determine whether or not to install a signal. Based on the traffic volumes and the travel speeds on this road, they would need to have 15 crossings to warrant a crosswalk and 45 crossings for an RRFB. It doesn't make sense to install a new crossing especially because there is already a signalized crossing close by. The pedestrians using the new crossing will be relatively low. Mr. Eby commented that he thought it was still merited. Ms. Walker agreed this would be a future condition that would prevent a potential issue. The applicant can argue their case at a Planning Board. Ms. Brown noted that there is a very wide shoulder there, so people can walk along the shoulder.

Ms. Walker noted that people will try to walk across and along the shoulder and people won't have the protection.

- Copies of the Stormwater Inspection and Maintenance Log shall be forwarded to DPW and Planning at least annually.
  - Mr. Demoula agreed.
- The so-called "Square" should be relabeled as a pocket park.
  - Mr. Demoula responded that this would be updated.
- The sidewalk adjacent Complex C still needs a connection to the sidewalk along the southern edge of the building. This connection provides access to the sidewalk leading to Peverly Hill Road.
  - Mr. Demoula responded that would be added.
- In building C, is there an exit on the parking level from the vestibule directly to the outside?
  - Mr. Demoula responded that there was an internal door from the garage out. It's on the architecture plan, but not the site plan. That will be updated. Mr. Howe noted that they could not egress through a trash room. Architect Michael Keen pointed out the main entrance door out of the vestibule and the added egress door. Mr. Howe questioned if that served the second floor as well coming down the south stairs. Mr. Keen confirmed that it serves all three floors. Mr. Howe noted that people are supposed to be able to see the exit when they leave the stair room.
- Waterline extension comment that was left off in error.
  - Mr. Demoula requested a dialogue on the comment. Mr. Desfosses commented that the main should be replaced from the end of the extension that was done in 2001 through West Rd. The only other option would be to connect to Lafayette Rd., but it may not be possible. Mr. Demoula responded that was consistent with what they talked about. Mr. Demoula questioned if the City was willing to do a cost sharing because of the amount of improvements this project includes for the City. The client is willing to do a cost share agreement with the City. Mr. Desfosses responded that they could not speak to that today and could not guarantee that they would be on the same timeline as this project. This will get approved today with the condition that the main will get replaced and the applicant can work with the City. Ms. Walker added that there would be concern if the reliance was on a waterline that needs to be replaced and there was an unknown timeline for the City project. A cost sharing wouldn't be feasible because the City is not ready to do the project. They can consider a proposal before Planning Board to talk about it. Mr. White commented that painting a traditional crosswalk and signage would be fairly straight forward. The concern is about elevating it to the signal. That is a significant order of magnitude and the crossing may not generate that level of pedestrian traffic. Ms. Walker responded that they can suggest something like that. If there is a lot of pedestrian activity and no option to add RRFB, then that may be a problem. Their proposal can include just providing the electrical connection to add a signal later.

Ms. Walker requested clarification on how this sidewalk would link into the proposed Peverly Hill Rd. sidewalk. Mr. Demoula responded that they would do a curb line, 5-10 feet of landscaping, and then a 10-foot sidewalk. Ms. Walker noted that they don't require deeded easements, but this will be a public sidewalk. There should be an easement for the whole sidewalk for the City to maintain it.

Mr. Howe commented that the addresses and signage can be determined outside of TAC. There should be signage at the beginning of the site for the rear buildings.

## **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. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

1) Prior to submission to Planning Board, the plans shall be updated to address the following:

- a. Instead of tying OCS1 into the existing CB, install a new DMH just downstream from the existing CB and tie OCS#1 into that new DMH.
- b. The water service for the front 23-unit building is very long. This may lead to poor water quality. Instead, consider running services under floor slab inside of sleeves from the courtyard side. Coordinate review of the design with Portsmouth Water Department;
- c. All water lines to be installed to Portsmouth Standards;
- d. All sewer lines installed to be to State and City standards;
- e. All utilities being installed will be witnessed by a third party inspection company to be determined by the City;
- f. Confirm from Eversource that both poles proposed to have service drops are able to provide them (i.e. there is nothing else on the poles that they will not allow a service drop);
- g. Wherever possible, the end stalls in a row of parking should be a bit wider;
- h. Truncated dome panels are not to be used except for street crossings or signalized driveways in the ROW;
- i. Coordinate addressing and numbering of the buildings with Portsmouth DPW and Fire Department. Proposed sign locations shall be added to the plan set;
- j. Follow City of Portsmouth standard planting details available on the City's web page -- [https://www.cityofportsmouth.com/sites/default/files/2020-01/Tree%20Planting%20Detail\\_0.pdf](https://www.cityofportsmouth.com/sites/default/files/2020-01/Tree%20Planting%20Detail_0.pdf);
- k. The 'Halka' Honey locusts planned for the frontage to Peverly might be too big of a species to fit under the wires. Please consider alternatives;
- l. The location of Maple and Elm trees at intersections could block the view of both drivers and pedestrians. Low plantings may be more suitable at these internal intersections;
- m. Princeton American Elms are susceptible to Dutch Elm Disease (it's a common



misconception they are not). They should be replaced with native species such as Black Gum, Swamp White Oak, Bald Cypress, or Zelkova (nonnative), or any combination thereof. Avoiding monoculture is generally a good idea;

n. The speed table and raised intersection detail can be removed from the plan set if they are not proposed anymore;

p. Copies of the Stormwater Inspection and Maintenance Log shall be forwarded to DPW and Planning at least annually;

q. The so-called "Square" should be relabeled as a pocket park;

r. The sidewalk adjacent to Complex C still needs a connection to the sidewalk along the southern edge of the building. This connection provides access to the sidewalk leading to Peverly Hill Road;

s. Update Architectural Plans to address egress concerns from the Fire Dept.;

2) A blanket easement to allow the Portsmouth Water Dept. to access valves, meters and for leak detection will be required for the site.

3) Easements shall be provided for the sidewalks along Peverly Hill Road. Plans shall be updated to reflect easement area.

4) The applicant should provide a pedestrian crossing of Peverly Hill Road at the West Road intersection, along with an RRFB, and design (engineered) plans for a sidewalk along Peverly Hill Road between West Road and the Market Basket driveway. Plan shall be reviewed and approved by DPW.

5) The applicant shall replace the water main in Peverly Hill Road as required per Portsmouth DPW requirements.

The motion passed unanimously.

### III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Nickerson Home Improvement Co. Inc.** and the **Linette and James Revocable Trust of 2000, Owners and Perley Lane, LLC, Applicant**, for properties located at **95 Brewster and 49 Sudbury Streets** requesting Site Plan Review approval to demolish the existing structures and construct 3 dwelling units in two structures, with related grading, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor's Map 138 Lots 57 and 58 and lie within the General Residence C (GRC) District.

### SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering and principal owner Joe Calderola spoke to the application. Two corner lots were merged into one lot and right now there is a commercial building and a single-family home. Those structures will be removed. The project will construct a single family and a duplex in their place with driveways off Brewster St. and Sudbury St.

TAC Comments:

- There is not enough clearance on the pole at the corner of Sudbury and Brewster to run conduit up the pole. These homes should have overhead services like the buildings they are replacing, this will require a waiver from the Site Plan review regulations.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that this plan reflects the onsite meeting with Eversource. They are planning to put the conduit on the east side of the pole that will remain. Then put it underground. Mr. Desfosses commented that there was not enough room on the sidewalk. It will need to be widened. The conduit is on the pole that will be removed. The pole that is staying is the other one. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they would double check it.
- Show with grading that Unit #3's driveway goes up in grade at 2% in the sidewalk area to conform to the ADA and to keep the storm water from Sudbury St out of the backyard.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they will change it to 2%.
- Show a swale along the common borders of Rock St park to bring the stormwater out around units 1 and 2 and out to Brewster St. Grading on the City land may be allowed for the common good if necessary as long as plants are reestablished.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the plan would be updated to reflect the swale.
- Show the existing sewer heading to #31 Sudbury to be removed on the demolition plan.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be added.
- There are two water services shown going into the existing warehouse building. The one shown nearest the sewer doesn't exist. Please remove from plan for clarity.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the extra one will need to be removed.
- The elevation 12 contour behind units 1 and 2 should tie into the 12 contour behind unit 3 and through the infiltration area. A retaining wall should not be needed here. Drain the infiltration overflow into the swale along the property lines out to Brewster.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the wall would be taken out.
- Will there be a fence between the park and units 1 and 2?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the landscape plan shows the fence. It runs from the corner along Brewster St. to the other corner.
- What is to become of the existing drainage connection to the Nickerson Remick building?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that it may be reused for an emergency sump pump. There is also a connection for Sudbury St. that will be reused. Mr. Desfosses commented that they should be shown on the plan.
- The City will require street milling and paving in areas damaged by utilities or construction.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the note would be added.
- Add note that all invasive species to be removed in accordance with best practices.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that a note would be added.
- There is a section of curb with very low reveal near the intersection of Brewster and Sudbury. This section should be reset to match the reveal of the rest of the sidewalk, so that it is not used as a driveway to the parcel.
  - Mr. Desfosses clarified that just to the right of the pole was staying. The curb should be raised. Mr. Chagnon questioned if the rest of the curb was fine as it

was. Mr. Desfosses responded that it needs to be that way for handicap access. A handicap ramp should be added to the corner. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.

- Install NO PARKING signs along Brewster Street frontage.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would rather not add them because it clutters the space. Mr. Eby noted that it was no parking now. The City will add the signs if they don't.
- The test pit logs completed by S.W. Cole stated that they estimate seasonal high water to be one foot above the noted saturation level. The test pit logs note water is observed at between 3.5 and 4.5 feet so the seasonal high water would be 2.5-3.5 feet. Given the finished floor of the basement is listed at 7.5. How will the basement be protected from impacts of groundwater?
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the test pit ground elevation is at elevation 9 that is the 2.5 feet to the floor. Mr. Calderola added that they purposely dug in that part of the driveway because it was the low point. That is where they came up with those elevations. Mr. Chagnon commented that test pit 1 had 4 feet. Mr. Desfosses noted that it was fine. Mr. Calderola added that they looked for tidal impacts, but didn't see any.
- A sidewalk should be constructed along the east side of Brewster Street to the gravel walk shown on the plans. Similarly, the sidewalk should be constructed to the east of the driveway on Sudbury Street and include the area in front of the abutting shed.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that it doesn't show on the plan. The sidewalk on the other side of Brewster St. would be enhanced and the tree area would be enlarged on the other side. The existing conditions plan can be updated to show the sidewalk on the other side of the street. Mr. Eby was fine with the enhanced plantings.
  - Mr. Desfosses noted that the new swamp white oak on the corner of Brewster St. and Sudbury St. needed to be protected per the City Tree Protection Zone standards. The same applies to trees around Rock St. Park. Ms. Walker questioned who would maintain the landscaping in the public right of way. Mr. Desfosses responded that the owners would maintain it. It is no different than having grass all the way out. Ms. Walker noted that it would be good to move it closer to the road. Mr. Calderola commented that they could plant another swamp white oak. Ms. Walker responded that they would need to run it by the Trees and Greenery Committee. Adding a street tree to the front would be good.
- The width of the driveway should be narrowed on the Sudbury Street house.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they don't think the driveway is overly wide. It is 25 feet at the street. It can be reduced to 24 feet for the driveway rules. Mr. Cracknell commented that there was 43-45 feet of curb cut between the neighbor and this driveway. Mr. Cracknell suggested creating a short sidewalk. Mr. Desfosses agreed it would be good to add the sidewalk and questioned why one house would have 4 parking spaces but the other house only has 2 spaces. Mr. Calderola responded that the road is stressed for parking. The goal was to give as much parking as possible. That house is a little premium because it is not attached and has guest parking.

- The third floor rear balconies seem unnecessary given there is no door access to the balcony.
  - Mr. Calderola responded that was a resting platform. If the house has finished space in the attic, then it is required. Mr. Marsilia confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Marsilia commented that they will need to advertise the demolition of the buildings. Ms. Walker responded that it was included in this notice because it's in the site plan.

Mr. Howe noted that it was his preferences that the multi-unit keep the Sudbury address. The other should be Brewster St.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Peter Happny of 66 Rock St. commented that the area has changed a lot and the park renovation was wonderful. The small house on Sudbury St. is a 1780 house and has historical significance. Mr. Happny questioned why it could not be restored to its original condition. The barn like structure has an interesting shape. It would be difficult to renovate it into a condo. Mr. Happny was concerned about tearing down a house with historical integrity. The land could be parceled out to put up two new structures and still save the historical house.

Ms. Walker responded that it was important to bring up concerns like this during this process because this process works as the demo review as well. Mr. Marsilia added that if they get a written complaint, then it will start the demo delay process. It is not a stop to the project, but it gives the opportunity to review the reasons for the demolition.

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 noted that this can't go to the Planning Board if there is a demo delay. Ms. Walker responded that it was not official yet.

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

- 1) Prior to submission to Planning Board, plans shall be updated to address the following:
  - a) There is not enough clearance on the pole at the corner of Sudbury and Brewster to run conduit up the pole. Sidewalk will need to be widened to accommodate this design;
  - b) An ADA accessible ramp shall be added to the sidewalk at the Brewster Street / Sudbury Street intersection;
  - c) Show with grading that Unit #3's driveway goes up in grade at 2% in the sidewalk area to conform to the ADA and to keep the storm water from Sudbury Street out of the yard;
  - d) Show a swale along the common borders of Rock Street park to bring the stormwater out

around units 1 and 2 and out to Brewster Street. Grading on the City land may be allowed for the common good if necessary as long as plants are reestablished;

- e) Show the existing sewer heading to #31 Sudbury to be removed on the demolition plan;
- f) There are two water services shown going into the existing warehouse building. The one shown nearest the sewer does not exist. Please remove from plan;
- g) The elevation 12 contour behind units 1 and 2 should tie into the 12 contour behind unit 3 and through the infiltration area. A retaining wall should not be needed here. Drain the infiltration overflow into the swale along the property lines out to Brewster Street;
- h) Existing drainage connection to the Nickerson Remick building should be shown on the plans if it is to remain;
- i) Add note that the City will require street milling and paving in areas damaged by utilities or construction;
- j) Add note that all invasive species to be removed in accordance with best management practices;
- k) There is a section of curb with very low reveal near the intersection of Brewster Street and Sudbury Street. This section should be reset to match the reveal of the rest of the sidewalk, so that it is not used as a driveway to the parcel;
- l) Install NO PARKING signs along Brewster Street frontage;
- m) The sidewalk should be constructed to the east of the driveway on Sudbury Street and include the area in front of the abutting shed;
- n) The width of the driveway should be narrowed on the Sudbury Street house to 24 ft;
- o) The language found in the Landscaping notes should be consistent with the tree planting detail notes (e.g. planting note 4 calls for all burlap and cages to be pulled open in planting hole--not removed--, while tree planting detail calls for all cage and burlap to be removed);
- p) City trees along the property boundaries in in the ROW should be protected during demolition, excavation, and construction via the City's tree protection zone (TPZ) standards. Add a note to the Landscaping plan that replacement of trees is required, at cost to the developer, if they are damaged or destroyed during construction;
- q) Add street trees along Brewster Street frontage subject to approval by the Trees and Greenery Committee.

2) Coordinate addressing of proposed units with the Fire Department and DPW.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Richard Fusegni, Owner**, for property located at **1574 Woodbury Avenue** requesting Site Plan Review Approval for the construction of a new retail bank with parking, utilities, landscaping, lighting, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 238 Lot 17 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Corridor (G1) District.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Alan Rosco spoke to the application. The proposal is to tear down the Ruby Tuesday to build a full-service Chase Bank. Mr. Rosco met with Planning Staff to discuss the building details and

remote ATMs. There will be two remote ATMs. One will be built with the project and another will be added if needed. The project will meet all local codes a CUP is needed for the drive through and ATM. The plan is to reuse existing utilities on the site. There will be a reduction in wastewater and water demand. A good portion of the site will be landscaped to reduce the heat island effect.

TAC Comments:

- Existing utilities (water, fire suppression, storm drain, sewer, gas, power, communications) should all be reused. These will need to be shown in a more complete way on a plan of its own for clarity.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that would be updated on the plan.
- If the fire service is not being used, it will need to be abandoned out in Woodbury Ave and the City will require milling and repaving of the area as the pavement in the road is new.
  - Mr. Desfosses clarified that if there was not going to be fire suppression for the bank, then they would have to abandon the line out to the main road. The City just paved that, so it may cost more to do that than adding fire suppression. Mr. Rosco responded that they would consider that.
- The existing grease trap will need to be cleaned and then filled with sand.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that it would be abandoned in place.
- The parking stall at the end of a row of parking spaces should be made wider if possible to facilitate exiting the vehicle.
  - Mr. Rosco agreed.
- How is stormwater being treated to remove pollutants?
  - Mr. Rosco responded that the two catch basins will remain right near the driveways or in the corner of the parking lot. Mr. Desfosses noted that catch basins take water away, but they don't treat the water.
- Please reduce hatching, it makes plan very difficult to read.
  - Mr. Rosco confirmed that would be cleaned up.
- Is there a lighting plan?
  - Mr. Rosco responded that they were developing a lighting and landscaping plan.
- Storm drainage and sewer pipes not being reused should be either removed or flow-filled.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that they would cut and cap the pipes.
- The drive up ATM should have a full bypass lane for any vehicle that needs to get out of the queue. If a driver mistakenly enters the drive-thru they need to be able to bypass any queued vehicles.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that the second lane would be the bypass. There is one ATM drive through location, then a small raised median, and then the location of the second ATM if it is needed. That is the bypass. Mr. Desfosses commented that would not work if the ATM lane and bypass are one in the same. Mr. Rosco responded that it could be widened. Mr. Desfosses noted that they should not do the island because it will have to be redone if the ATM goes in. Rosco will look at it.

- Parking lot aisles with more than 7 spaces should not be dead-ended. Drivers are not able to see if a space is empty or whether it is occupied by a smaller vehicle. Perhaps an outlet can be provided into the ATM bypass lane.
  - Mr. Eby responded pointed out a spot in the parking lot were cars would get trapped if the lot was full. Mr. Rosco responded that they would look at it.
- A NO PARKING sign should be provided at the head of the HP access aisle, if there is room between the walkway and the ATM drive lane.
  - Mr. Rosco agreed.
- A trip generation memo should be provided, comparing the proposed new bank use to the previous restaurant use.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that this could be provided.
- No stormwater maintenance plan has been provided
  - Mr. Rosco responded that this was being developed.
- A landscape plan shall be provided and shade trees should be included to minimize the heat-island effect of the larger site.
  - Mr. Rosco agreed.
- A statement that lists green building components and systems is required per Section 2.5.3.1A of the Site Plan Regs.
  - Mr. Rosco responded that the building will have the appearance of 2 front faces and an added sidewalk from the entry out to the street sidewalk.
- The required notes shall be added to the Site Plan per Sections 2.5.4.2E, 2.13.3 and 2.13.4 (included on the Site Plan checklist).

Ms. Walker commented that they want to see a complete package at TAC before an application moves to the Planning Board. Mr. Rosco noted that Chase has a 6-month construction time and they don't open new branches in December. The demo is included with the site plan, but Mr. Rosco questioned if they could do it early. Mr. Marsilia responded that it was not likely to generate a complaint within 30 days of the public hearing. Mr. Cracknell added that this was different from the last application. This building would just engage Mr. Marsilia. Mr. Marsilia added that he could issue a demo permit before it goes to the Planning Board. However, if they demo it and don't get approval, then they are doing it at their own risk. Ms. Walker did not think that was a problem. Mr. Marsilia noted that the utility sign offs would be tricky. Mr. Desfosses responded that they would allow a disconnect at the sidewalk temporarily. Mr. Howe noted that the Fire Department would want that in service as long as possible.

Mr. Howe questioned if the rear exit was part of the customer area. Mr. Rosco confirmed that was correct.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

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

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Eby moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:31 pm, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee