

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

Remote Meeting Via Zoom Conference Call

to access by web <https://zoom.us/join>

to access by phone, dial (929) 436 2866

Meeting ID 412761414

Password 010773

Per NH RSA 91-A:2 III (b) the Chair has declared the COVID-19 Outbreak an emergency and has waived the requirement that a quorum be physically present at the meeting.

2:00 PM

APRIL 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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADDITIONAL

STAFF PRESENT: Jillian Harris, Planner 1

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the March 3, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Howe moved to approve the minutes from the March 3, 2020 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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, Tom Levy and Rick Green were all present to speak to the application. Mr. Colwell noted that the plans were updated based on the comments and concerns raised at the last TAC Meeting, and those updates were outlined in a detailed memorandum.

TAC Comments:

- Please overlay landscape plans with utility plans and check for conflicts.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that would be provided to show no conflicts exist.
- Please modify water main per the sketch provided separately.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that has been revised.
- Utilities and storm drainage to be overseen by third party during construction.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they agree and added a note to the plans.
- Street name sign to be provided according to MUTCD and DPW standards.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that would be provided.
- Gas is shown on utility plan as deepest utility. This is not typical. Typical depth is 3'.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that purpose of the detail was to show the horizontal separation. It has been updated to show the gas utility as the shallowest.
- Use anchor tees with gate valves, please edit detail accordingly. Same detail, note 1 does not apply to this detail, note 2 is incorrect. Valve to open right.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that has been added to the detail.
- Detail says type K copper services, plan says CTS, please specify properly and update. If CTS, tracer wire will be required.
 - Mr. Colwell questioned if there was a preference. Mr. Desfosses responded that the applicant can choose. Mr. Colwell responded that they will specify one material.
- Hydrant maintenance plan required. Add note to hydrant, 'hydrant to open right'.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they will add the hydrant maintenance plan to the condo docs, and they will switch the opening.
- Specify NH standard frame and grate for CB's.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that a note has been added.
- Water main shall be DI, PVC shown on detail is not approved.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that the PVC will be removed.
- Gravel selects should extend at least 24" past EOP because road is so narrow.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they agree and have revised the detail accordingly.
- Details for retaining walls along the roadway need to be designed and stamped by PE and submitted for review.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they agree and added a note to the plan. Mr. Colwell questioned if the City preferred that those plans be provided with the submission or if they could be submitted prior to construction. Mr. Desfosses responded that was fine with DPW.
- Roadway lighting shall be dark sky friendly.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that it was dark sky friendly and will add a note to the plan.
- ECO Passage Grates to be reviewed every 5 years for compliance with H2O loading by NH PE, report to be submitted to DPW.

- Mr. Colwell responded that will be added to the condo docs and will be submitted for review.
- Stormwater maintenance plan and cleaning report need to be submitted yearly.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that it would be included in the stormwater operations and maintenance manual.
- Extent of guardrail to be used is not shown well. Please call out where guardrail locations are required.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that the walls used to be higher, but they were revised based on the Conservation Commission feedback. The wall height has been reduced and the guardrail has been removed. In this type of setting the guardrail is not required. Mr. Desfosses responded that was fine as long as it met AASHTO. Mr. Colwell confirmed that it did.
- Move the stop sign and stop bar to 10 feet from the edge of Banfield Road.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they agreed and would change it.
- There appears to be a tree in the path of the fire truck turning path at the intersection with the first internal cross street. The landscape plans and the fire truck turning path plans should be overlaid to determine if there are any other locations where conflicts may occur.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they have done this internally. The canopy of the tree interferes with the turning radius not the trunk. That can be clarified on the turning radius.
- The landscape plan is extensive and given the amount of development is a good mix of trees and shrubs and will over time help to better integrate the development into the natural area where it has been located.
 - Mr. Colwell agreed they have spent a lot of time on the plan.
- See separate comments provided by peer reviewer (CMA) for drainage system. Final sign off from peer review is required.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they have been working with CMA in addressing the comments and there were two outstanding comments. The first was to use double grates, and that change has been made. The second was a comment related to the drainage system liner. The HDPE liner has been replaced with a PVC liner that can be put in all in one piece. That response is under review. Mr. Britz commented that not enough has been done to show that a more traditional drainage system would not work. The current design is buried deep under the road and it will be hard to check or fix. Another drainage design could be more effective.
 - Ms. Walker agreed that the drainage report was mostly addressed, but they will need final sign off. Ms. Walker also agreed with Mr. Britz's comment, and was not sure this was the best design. Mr. Levy responded that the deepest depth of the tanks would be 11 feet down. Other developments in the community have used these tanks and they have been successful.
- The drainage design appears to be experimental relying on infiltration through fractured bedrock at depths of up to 29' bgs. The site would be better suited to a more proven stormwater treatment design. As pointed out by CMA the stormwater treatment as designed will be very difficult to construct. Additionally, if the system fails there will be no reasonable way to determine this. Having such a difficult design and expecting a

condo association to perform the required maintenance is not an acceptable solution. More effort should be made by the applicant to propose a treatment system on the surface such as a gravel wetland or bioswale that is not so complicated in its design. State and federal stormwater regulations are becoming more and more strict and the City must insure compliance. If the applicant states that a surface treatment system cannot be built they should provide calculations and information showing what they have attempted to design before moving to a very complicated subsurface system such as the one they have designed. The applicant should describe why they cannot provide a more proven treatment technology that does not rely on chambers that are constructed within the seasonal high water table?

- Mr. Colwell clarified that depth of the tanks range from 8 to 11 feet. It is not an experimental system and the system has been used on other projects TF Moran has worked on. The liner made it look more complicated. That was revised to be PVC and it will be installed in one piece. This is a filter system.
- Ms. Walker noted that TAC agreed to have a third-party review because they had concerns. The applicant has addressed the concerns of the Committee and the peer reviewer, however, there are still some outstanding items. Ms. Walker noted that they cited many examples and questioned how many of those systems are maintained by a condo association or residential entity. Mr. Colwell responded that Riverwoods in Durham, NH and Three Ponds in Brentwood, NH were. There have not been any maintenance concerns at those sites.
- Mr. Britz questioned how many of the systems were under roadways or close to the seasonal high-water table. Mr. Colwell responded that he could submit an example of a system in South Portland, ME with similar conditions for the Committee to review. The design for this project was altered to be a split system, so if maintenance was needed then half of the road could remain open.
- Mr. Britz questioned how the waterproofing would work long term, and how that would be monitored. Mr. Colwell responded that ports have been incorporated in the design for monitoring. There will be annual inspections and those reports will be provided to the City. The system also needs AOT approval. They have reviewed it and do not have concerns.
- Mr. Britz questioned if they would be able to check the liner through the ports. Mr. McTigue responded that they would not, but the system could function without the liner. It was designed that way to satisfy concerns from CMA. The ports will show the chambers. If there is standing water in the chambers, then it will show that the ground water is leaking into the system. If that happens then the Homeowners Association would have to dig it up and replace the liner.
- Mr. Britz commented that he still thought the site plan was overly intense. If one of the house slots was removed, then a gravel wetland could be built there. If everyone agrees that this plan works engineering wise, then that is that. However, a gravel wetland in the upland was never explored, and might have been something worth looking at. Mr. McTigue responded that gravel wetlands were the most effective in the low points of a site. The houses are at the high point. They were asked to provide a viable alternative to get the gravel wetlands out of the buffer, and the result is this design.

- Mr. Green noted that this was not an experimental system. Mr. Britz responded that the system was not experimental, but the location was unique. Mr. Britz had not seen a system within or below the ground water table. Ms. Walker agreed that it was a unique application from their perspective.
 - Mr. Howe questioned if half of the road had to be excavated to maintain the drainage system what would the width of the remaining road that could support a fire truck be. Mr. McTigue responded that it would be the 10-foot lane, but there was an additional 3-foot gravel panel that could be used to increase the travel width if needed.
- You indicate that the proposed common open space will not be designated under a recordable conservation easement. Please explain how you intend to comply with the requirements of Section 10.725.43 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they intend to comply with a deed restriction covenant. The covenant would be enforced by the Homeowners Association, and part of the condo documents.
- The City had previously requested that the septic system design be submitted for review prior to Planning Board review due to the concern about the constraints of this site given the proposed density. These designs will be subject to third party review. Design of sewer infrastructure is a required submission for both Site Plan Review and Subdivision Approval (including all necessary engineering data). See Section 2.5.4 3(f) and Sections 8.3.2 and 8.3.3 of the Site Plan Review regulations. Also Section VI (11) which specifically mentions that state and DPW approval is required prior to final approval of the subdivision. Per the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, this application must meet requirements for BOTH subdivision and site plan review approval.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that they agree the sewer infrastructure design was required, however this was not a sewer. Ms. Walker commented that they were both referenced in the regulations. Mr. Colwell noted that the designs will meet DES regulations. Ms. Walker noted that they had not seen the designs yet, and that it was required that they be designed and approved before final site plan approval. There have not been enough preliminary designs to have the peer reviewer even comment on them.
 - Mr. Desfosses noted that there were no perk tests included in the plans. Mr. Spaulding responded that the perk tests were based on the soil conditions that are on the test pits. DES provided input on the leach field locations on the plan. Mr. Desfosses requested to see the perk tests. The plan does not need to show full designs, but there needs to be a basis to show how they were depicted. The plan should also show which units go to which fields. Ms. Walker added that the Planning Board will need to see more information on this as well. There needs to be more detail provided. Mr. Desfosses clarified that TAC would need to see a perk test, an estimated flow, and a rough size for each field.
- The habitat crossings are also an experimental technology that has not been adequately tested or proven in this area. Given the size of the wetland crossing the a bridge design would be a better approach allowing for open crossing of wildlife below the roadway that will not subject to potential clogging and maintenance issues. While the applicant has stated previously that a bridge design would not work they now have been given different

guidance on the grade of the driveway leaving Banfield Road. Can they please describe what has been done to investigate a bridge crossing instead of the eco-passages?

- Mr. Colwell responded that the change in grade gives them 2 feet of separation from the top of the road to the top of the wetland. There is still not enough room to build a bridge and provide passage under it. The eco-passages would provide 2 feet of cover under the road. They allow sunlight into the crossings. They are new to New Hampshire but have been used in Canada and Massachusetts. The eco-passages now have wing walls to help guide them into the passages.
- Mr. Britz questioned if there was any way to put a bridge there at all without any grade requirements. Mr. Colwell responded that they gave the bridge designer the original grade requirements and the revised grade requirements. It was not possible with either.
- Mr. Britz questioned what efforts would be made to minimize the amount of salt getting into the eco-passages. Mr. Colwell responded that some roads have no salt or low salt and that could be a possibility. Ms. Walker noted that there should be documentation around salt usage in the Homeowners Association documents.
- Mr. Colwell questioned what practices the DPW had in place for salt sensitive areas. Mr. Desfosses responded that they meter their salt. DPW does not treat limited salt areas in the City currently, so there is not practice set in place for that. However, everything is calibrated to abide by the State guidelines. Mr. Desfosses added that they requested the developer add curb inlets to help catch as much salt as possible before it got to the eco-passages. Mr. Britz added that the maintenance crew for the road should take the Snow Pro course that the State offers because they address salt concerns.
- Alignment of Common Driveways – Given the proposed building and septic system locations it would appear to be possible to fully align the two common access driveways at the front end of the development.
 - Mr. Colwell responded that could be updated to be aligned.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Walker noted that because of the COVID-19 emergency the Planning Board is still working through applications that were supposed to be heard in March. If this application moves forward it would be on the May agenda.

Mr. Howe noted that the street signage and house numbering would need to comply with an FPA-1 and the IFC to make sure emergency responders know where to find the buildings.

Mr. Britz commented that he would not support this moving forward because he did not feel that the storm water portion was adequately addressed. A gravel wetland that is easier to maintain and more visible would be easier for the Homeowners Association to handle. The current design

would not accommodate that, but it's a big enough site that it could be accommodated with some changes. Ms. Walker noted that they could include Mr. Britz's comments and concerns to make sure they are adequately reviewed and addressed by CMA. Mr. Britz confirmed that would be acceptable. The applicant should show that they have fully investigated alternative designs. If an alternative is not possible then CMA should confirm that this system will work for the site. Ms. Walker confirmed that final sign off from CMA is a condition of the motion.

Mr. Desfosses moved to refer this request to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cracknell with the following stipulations:

Conditions of approval to be completed prior to submission to Planning Board:

- 1) Applicant shall overlay landscape plans with utility plans, check for conflicts and revise as necessary;
- 2) Applicant shall modify water main per the sketch provided by DPW separately;
- 3) Street name sign to be added to plan that is compliant with MUTCD and DPW standards;
- 4) Gas is shown on utility plan as deepest utility. Typical depth is 3'. Applicant to update plans as required by DPW;
- 5) Sheet C-34, Buried Gate Valve Detail shall be updated to show anchor tees with gate valves. Same detail, note 1 does not apply to this detail, note 2 is incorrect. Valve to open right;
- 6) Water Service Connection Detail says type K copper services, plan says CTS, please specify properly and update. If CTS, tracer wire will be required;
- 7) Add note to hydrant, 'hydrant to open right';
- 8) Specify NH standard frame and grate for catch basins;
- 9) Water main shall be DI, PVC shown on detail is not approved and shall be updated;
- 10) Gravel selects should extend at least 24" past EOP because road is so narrow;
- 11) Details for retaining walls along the roadway need to be designed and stamped by PE and submitted for review;
- 12) Applicant shall add a note to the Lighting Plan that roadway lighting shall be dark sky friendly and lighting details shall be updated accordingly;
- 13) Stormwater maintenance plan and cleaning report need to be submitted yearly to the DPW and Planning Department. Applicant shall include a note on the plan for this requirement;
- 14) Extent of guardrail to be used shall be shown clearly and plans shall call out where guardrail locations are required. Plans shall specify requirements per AASHTO;
- 15) Move the stop sign and stop bar to 10 feet from the edge of Banfield Road;
- 16) There appears to be a tree in the path of the fire truck turning path at the intersection with the first internal cross street. The landscape plans and the fire truck turning path plans should be overlaid to determine if there are any other locations where conflicts may occur;
- 17) See separate comments provided by peer reviewer (CMA) for drainage system. Final sign off from peer review is required for the drainage system design;
- 18) Sewer design plan shall be submitted and shall include percolation test data as required by TAC. Third party review and approval is required for the design prior to submission to Planning Board;
- 19) Applicant shall provide documentation that an analysis of the habitat crossings proposed are the preferred design versus a bridge crossing as previously discussed with TAC;

20) Applicant shall update plans to fully align the two common access driveways at the front end of the development.

Conditions to be included in Planning Board approval:

- 21) Utilities and storm drainage to be overseen by third party during construction;
- 22) Hydrant maintenance plan shall be provided;
- 23) ECO Passage Grates to be reviewed every 5 years for compliance with H2O loading by NH PE, report to be submitted to DPW. Applicant shall submit Condominium documents that outline this requirement subject to final review and approval by DPW, Planning, and Legal Departments.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. **POSTPONED** The application of **Richard Fusegni, Owner**, for property located at **1574 Woodbury Avenue** requesting a Conditional Use Permit for a drive-through facility in accordance with Section 10.440 (19.40) of the Zoning Ordinance and 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. **POSTPONED**

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Cracknell moved to postpone the application to the next regularly scheduled TAC Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Bonza Buildings, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **41 Salem Street** requesting Site Plan Review Approval to demolish the existing single-family residence and construct 3 new dwelling units, with related grading, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 144 Lot 31 and lies within the General Residence C (GRC) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon commented that there was currently a single-family residence on the property with a single driveway. The land slopes away from Salem St. towards the abutting lots. The proposal is to demolish the existing single-family residence and build three new single-family residences with a shared driveway. Each residence will have their own garage and the utilities will come from Salem St. The drainage will be redirected off the property to Salem St. and not onto abutters' properties. The landscape plan was presented to the Trees and Greenery Committee. A new street tree will be planted to replace the Norway Maple that the Committee gave them permission to remove. The landscaping will provide a more enhanced streetscape.

TAC Comments:

- Show existing sewer service on Existing Conditions plan and reuse as directed.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that will be revised and requested clarification that they should reuse the connection. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct.
- 1½” Water services are rare and is likely oversized for this size building, 1” is standard for most homes.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that will be revised.
- Provide individual water and fire services for unit 2.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they proposed a 4-inch line from the main. It can be redesigned, but they felt that this would better serve the site. Mr. Desfosses responded there should be individual services as requested. Mr. Chagnon agreed and commented that the sprinkler service for unit 2 will be revised to be a separate line. Mr. Chagnon requested confirmation that it need to be sprinkled. Mr. Howe confirmed that it did based on the setback from the street.
- Provide water service for unit 3 off of Salem St main.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that will be revised.
- Move proposed CB out of new driveway downhill so that it is in the curbed area, but 45 degree bend on underdrain to do this.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that will be updated.
- Make sure drip edge is at least 12” wider than edge of eave.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- Street to be milled and paved to repair the disturbed areas of Salem St one year after utilities are completed.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that note would be added.
- Existing water service to be capped at the main.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that will be added to existing conditions, and the note will be revised.
- Any damage to existing sidewalks to be repaired to DPW satisfaction.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that a note will be added.
- Replace drain pipe from CB2 to CB3 with new 15” PE pipe at intersection of McDonough and Salem.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that will be updated and replaced with HDPE.
- Why is new drain pipe in Salem St sized at 15”?
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that on other projects DPW has called for that size. The drainage analysis shows 12 inches is good.
- Crushed stone bedding for drain pipes shall have soil separation fabric between stone and sand blanket.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- Use NH standard frame and grate for basins.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- Use Ergo XL hinged cover marked “Drain” for DMH(s).
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- Ductile iron water main details won’t be necessary.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.

- Provide sewer service details showing 6" PVC services with wyes cut into main and patched back in with pvc repair couplings (no rubber 'Fernco' couplings allowed).
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
- On profile view:
 - Raise proposed drain main in Salem St so it is not in conflict with Sewer.
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
 - Existing 6" DI water is likely shallower than depicted
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed.
 - Gas main is likely shallower than depicted
 - Mr. Chagnon agreed and noted that any information DPW had would be helpful. Mr. Desfosses responded that to his recollection the water was 4.5 feet and the gas was 30-36 inches down.
- Make sure any plantings at corner of driveway are less than 3.5 feet tall so that they don't block sight lines of drivers exiting onto Salem Street.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the tree planting that are potentially in conflict are as follows: a lilac with a 5-foot height that will be replaced by an evergreen low growing in plant. The sweet fern will not grow high enough to be a conflict. The final tree is the one that was selected to replace the maple. This species was picked by Trees and Greenery. They can help to ensure the planting can go in with higher branches. Mr. Eby confirmed that was fine.
- Driveways and Parking - The site plan appears to show three buildings with the same footprint and style. Each building appears to have a two-car garage. However, the landscape plan appears to show a driveway servicing a single car garage for Building #2. Thus, buildings #1 and #3 will likely have difficulty egressing the garage spaces given the second car for Building #2 will likely be tandem-parked in front of the single car garage. Please clarify or adjust the landscape plan.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the landscape plan does not show the correct driveway width. The driveway is wider with 2 car garages for every building. They will correct the landscape plan.
- Streetscape – In stark contrast, the proposed street -facing facades for Building #1 and #3 are largely blank with few openings. Additional windows should be considered for the ground-floor study and utility room as well as locating an additional window in the kitchen adjacent the countertop. It would also be worth considering a brick or stone veneer on the exposed foundation; even if limited to the two street-facing facades.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that they uploaded the wrong architectural plan. The more recent plan improved the façade. There is an operable door there now, so the floor plan has changed. TAC can review the updated plans. They can add an additional window on one side, but the other side would be in the middle of the stairway.
- Architectural Style – In order to add interest and reflect a character more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood it would be nice if the third floor dormers could be adjusted to include two, double-hung windows in the gable with no siding on the face of the dormer. It might also be helpful if Building #2 (the once facing the Salem Street) could use a three or five window configuration with an elongated shed dormer to add some variation.
 - Mr. Chagnon responded that the applicant reviewed the comment. The dormer window is an egress window and the proposed comment would not meet egress code. They can adjust the siding. A single window and dormer is very much a New England design and works with the neighborhood.

Mr. Howe commented that building 2 would be sprinkled, which means it does not need that egress window unless there is an extra story. There is some flexibility for the design there.

Mr. Cracknell commented that that the windows could still look like double hung windows but meet egress code. The applicant should look at that.

Mr. Chagnon responded to some of the written public comments. Nancy Hanscom had concerns about the intensity of the development. Mr. Chagnon responded that the developers are working in accordance with the zoning ordinance. An earlier application from different owners required a variance that was denied. This application meets the ordinance. Elizabeth Bratter made comments about adding more plantings to the back edge of the to take up more runoff. Mr. Chagnon responded that the property provides a fair degree of openness to the surrounding properties. The plan balances open space vs. plantings. Leaving it open has provided a good open space view for abutters. Mr. Bratter also commented that the plantings on the front were not appropriate. Mr. Chagnon responded that they disagreed. Ms. Bratter's next comment was that the building has garages that face one another and she believed they should be staggered. Mr. Chagnon responded that aligning the garages provides more maneuverability. The last comment from Ms. Bratter was that there were sidewalks approaching buildings off center. Mr. Chagnon responded that they don't approach in the center because there are 2 steps up to a landing which is at the door and more steps that go up to the stoop. James Beal questioned who would maintain the new street tree. Mr. Chagnon responded that the tree will be maintained by the City. Mr. Beal's second comment was in regards to the removal of the concrete walkway on the demo plan. Mr. Chagnon responded that the walkway was going to be removed but that was a leftover note from earlier discussions. They will revise the note to saw cut the existing walk at the property line.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Walker read the following written comments into the record:

Nancy Hanscom opposed the demolition of 41 Salem St. It would be better to rehab the building that currently stands. Adding two more houses onto the property would be too much. The remaining land should remain open space because there is not a lot of open space on the property. There should only be one house on the property.

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough St. commented that there have been water issues on McDonough St. that they have worked hard to fix. There are not a lot of natural barriers proposed with this plan to help prevent runoff from going to McDonough St. The screening plants proposed on the front of the property are too high. They should be replaced by low growing shrubs. Ms. Bratter questioned if the garage openings should be directly across from each other or if staggering them would give more maneuverability. There seem to be sidewalks that lead to nowhere. There should be a fake door or something added.

James Beal of 286 Cabot St. commented that he was comforted there would be a runoff analysis on the property for 2 years after construction. Runoff is a major concern for abutting properties. Mr. Beal was concerned about the maintenance of the tree that will replace the maple. The demo

plan also shows that concrete on the abutter Charles Cocchiaro's property that will be removed, and he has not been contacted about that. Mr. Cocchiaro uses the side door to his home and if the concrete is removed he would not have access to that door.

Public Comments made during the meeting:

James Beal of 286 Cabot St. also spoke in the meeting and commented that Mr. Chagnon explained the tree and that was good. He noted that Mr. Cocchiaro requested if anything was going to be done to the concrete he should be notified, and it should be replaced in kind. Mr. Beal noted that the grading for the property will be raised at max 5 feet and questioned if that meant the new building will look like a 40-foot building from his property. The developer should put in some architectural interest between the second and third floor of unit 2, so there isn't a 40-foot unbroken wall.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Cracknell agreed with Mr. Beale's comment about adding architectural interest to the back of unit 2. Mr. Desfosses noted that comment should apply to all three of the buildings. Mr. Cracknell agreed.

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

1) Plans shall be updated as follows:

- Show existing sewer service on Existing Conditions plan and reuse as directed by DPW;
- Revise water service line sizes to be 1";
- Provide individual water and fire services for unit 2 – 4" main with services from the main as discussed at TAC;
- Provide water service for unit 3 as discussed at TAC;
- Move proposed catch basin out of new driveway downhill so that it is in the curbed area, but 45 degree bend on underdrain to do this;
- Make sure drip edge is at least 12" wide than edge of eave;
- Add note to plans that street to be milled and paved to repair the disturbed areas of Salem St one year after utilities are completed;
- Add required note for existing water service to be capped at the main;
- Add note to plans that any damage to existing sidewalks to be repaired to DPW satisfaction;
- Replace drain pipe from CB2 to CB3 with new 15" PE pipe at intersection of McDonough and Salem;
- New drain pipe in Salem St should be sized at 12";
- Crushed stone bedding for drain pipes shall have soil separation fabric between stone and sand blanket;
- Use NH standard frame and grate for basins;
- Use Ergo XL hinged cover marked "Drain" for DMH(s);
- Provide sewer service details showing 6" PVC services with wyes cut into main and patched back in with pvc repair couplings (no rubber 'Fernco' couplings allowed);

- On profile view: a) Raise proposed drain main in Salem Street so it is not in conflict with sewer; b) Existing 6" DI water is likely shallower than depicted; c) Gas main is likely shallower than depicted, to be confirmed with DPW.

2) Landscape Plan to be updated as described to TAC to make sure any plantings at corner of driveway are less than 3.5 feet tall so that they do not t block sight lines of drivers exiting onto Salem Street.

3) Landscape Plan to be updated to match site plan for building footprint and style.

4) Proposed building designs to be reviewed with Planning Department for further guidance on architectural design and abutter concerns regarding building height.

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:06 pm, seconded by Mr. Marsilia. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee