

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**2:00 PM**

**JUNE 30, 2009**

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Steve Parkinson, Public Works Director (for Deborah Finnigan); Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Deputy Chief, Fire Department and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief

**ALSO PRESENT:** Rick Taintor, Planning Consultant

-----

Chairman Holden called the meeting to order and introduced Rick Taintor, who will be replacing him as Planning Director, effective tomorrow, 7/1/09. Mr. Taintor joined the Committee at the dais and although he will participate in discussion, he will not vote.

**I. OLD BUSINESS**

A. The application of **51 Islington Street, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct one 4-story, 7,836 ± s.f. residential building and one 5-story 12,342 ± s.f. mixed use building, after demolition of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within the Historic District A and Central Business B Districts. (This application was postponed from the June 2, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Britz seconded the motion. The motion to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Attorney Paul McEachern, shared that he was a student of Professor John Holden who was David Holden's father and it was a privilege to be present to give Mr. Holden his send off.

Attorney McEachern stated that this was the fifth time they had been before TAC and the review has been painstaking and thorough. Conditions have been worked out and only a few are left which he felt could be left as conditions of approval. They would like to move forward to the Planning Board. They also still have to appear before the City Council to have Parker Street become two-way. When the HDC finished their review they were very happy with the plan.

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, handed out revised plans as a result of Pre-TAC that morning. They first addressed a potential sidewalk easement and noted that the plans show a new pole being proposed for the three phase utility along Islington Street which will require a sidewalk guy. Sonny LeMere of PSNH has indicated he has every confidence that the existing easements cover that

situation. The next concern was the possibility of a future grease trap so he added a potential location for a 1,000 gallon grease trap on the Tanner Street side. It would also require the relocation of the gas service from the north side to the south side of the meter bank. They will not have to relocate the tree and if the grease trap needed to go in, the area could be excavated and the bushes put back so landscaping would always be there.

There were questions about the lighting and the mounting heights. The LED spec was not included before. The first two pages of Mr. Chagnon's handout were the building lights at the doors, the next page was the ramp light which will be tied to the motion sensor, will be mounted 72" above finished grade and will only come on when a vehicles enter the ramp. The next page was the LED light that will be mounted 18" above grade and is a very minimal, low intrusion to highlight the feature type light.

The next issue addressed trees. The Pyramidal European Hornbeam (Fastigiata) tree is small and slender and they feel is appropriate but would consider other suggestions. The second tree is beech, is more of an oval shape and there would be trimming at sidewalk level. Again, they feel it is appropriate but were open to suggestions.

Mr. Chagnon next addressed the Parking Layout. They felt if they are going to have a vehicle to pick up trash, it makes sense to have a dedicated turn around. They eliminated 2 parking spaces, so there are now 29 spaces in the garage. He revised the parking calculations to reflect that the impact fee basis is 29 spaces counted 3 times, and the requirement is 99 spaces so there would be a 12 space parking impact fee required.

He addressed open space and referred to the Landscape Plan exhibit which was color coded. It showed 6.7% landscaped area which is above the 5% open space requirement. They are also showing walkways which total 9%. The additional "open space" (above 15% of site area) is space over the parking level which they excluded from this calculation. Depending on how the City treats the different areas, they have met their requirement for open space.

Another comment was the 1 1/2" overlay on Tanner Street, which they can handle with a stipulation. Also, the venting of the garage will be handled with a note on the Plans. It will be on the ramp side of the garage.

That covered all comments from Pre-TAC that morning.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for purposes of this meeting.

#### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Holden asked how they will delineate "no parking" in the spaces they eliminated in the underground parking garage. Mr. Chagnon responded that they will put signage saying "Loading Area" in that area. Mr. Holden added that the use of it as parking would be a violation of this Site Plan and that should be added to the plan.

Mr. Parkinson asked where the new pole for three phase would be. Mr. Chagnon stated it would be on Islington Street, approximately across from the Tanner Street intersection. It would be a replacement pole, behind the one that is there now and there will be a guy as detailed on Sheet C-4 in the upper left hand corner. There are two panels of concrete that go from the driveway for the Farragate House to about 3' past the existing pole. The new pole will be placed immediately adjacent to the existing pole and the three phase tap will be made. They will relocate the pole on Tanner across the street. That guy is to hold that line and would be a standard sidewalk guy, landing on the grass. Mr. Parkinson stated

he was not a big fan of sidewalk guys but he stipulated that any pole relocation or additional poles or guys must be approved by DPW in conjunction with PSNH.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold requested the standard automatic notification via private alarm system for sprinklered buildings and Knox boxes for both the commercial and residential buildings.

Mr. Britz asked if they did turning templates for the bottom of the ramp in the garage. Mr. Chagnon referred to Sheet C-5. Mr. Britz was still unclear whether they checked the site distance for when cars leave the garage pull up the steep ramp? He was concerned about people coming out of the garage too fast. Mr. Chagnon pointed out the stop bar and stop sign. The slope is not the same all the way down the ramp.

Mr. Desfosses asked how many gas meters were on the outside of the building. Mr. Chagnon confirmed there will be one per unit, so 24 in the back building. Mr. Desfosses felt that would be a significant amount of wall space and asked whether it would be screened. Mr. Chagnon added that they can stack them and they aren't the prettiest thing but they are what they are. Mr. Holden asked if the HDC was aware of them? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they were and that there was landscaping. Mr. Desfosses hoped it was substantial landscaping.

Mr. Desfosses referred to the Grading Plan and indicated he did not think they have given enough pitch to the sidewalk in front of the building. They are showing 1/10 grade between the building and the curb line and he understands they are trying to provide a 6" curb reveal but it would be more appropriate to have a 4" curb reveal and get another 2" of pitch. It is his experience that brick sidewalks do not hold up well with grading that flat. He believed it was across the whole frontage but indicated Mr. Chagnon would have to take a look at it.

Mr. Allen asked how the two parallel spaces in garage will work. Mr. Chagnon explained that they will have to turn around at the dedicated turn-around on the new plan.

Mr. Taintor mentioned that one of the lamps on the ramp was mis-specified. He had a concern about the handicapped space at bottom of the ramp and whether it was the most appropriate place for it. He understands they are half way between two elevators but it appears to be a difficult space to make a turn. Mr. Chagnon indicated there are two ways to access the space. They can either back into the space or you can turn around and pull into the space but there is not enough room for a 180 degree turn.

Mr. Taintor asked if the 25 ½ feet between the two columns for the parallel spaces was a comfortable space. It seemed tight to him. Mr. Chagnon noted that they are giving an extra 5' for each space so that should take care of it.

Mr. Taintor raised the question at Pre-Tac about pulling into the site and whether a car would be sticking out into the street if they hit the entry gate. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they show a gate on the plans. Because the Committee was previously concerned that people who come down Parker Street who are unfamiliar with the area and who turn down and then have to back up to exit, they did a number of things to address that. They added a sign and they put up a gate in a location that was visible from Parker Street as another visual clue not to pull in. It doesn't allow a car enough room to pull into the gate and have another car pass behind them. They did compare this to 6-16 Congress Street and as Parker Street is two-way, it does not have the same maneuvering space that Congress does but it is a one way street and there is 50% more room to get into this than Congress Street. So, they feel this is an appropriate design.

Mr. Taintor noted that the interim parking plan shows the parking lot and the ramp but it is hard to interpret what is going to happen at the bottom of the ramp. Mr. Chagnon stated they will not be going down that ramp at that time and it will be cordoned off. The intent is to construct the Tanner Court

building so that the construction of the rest of the site can be staged. Mr. Taintor asked if the trash pickup and the Tanner Court building will be unchanged from the first phase to the completion of the project. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Allen asked about the interim parking plan. Mr. Chagnon stated that the project is not phased but the developer wants to build the Tanner Court building first and get Certificates of Occupancy for that building. They were asked to come up with a temporary plan to show how that could be accomplished. They would finish the first building and then if nothing was done subsequent to that, they would put a parking lot in the front to service that building. Mr. Desfosses was uncomfortable approving a gravel parking lot in downtown Portsmouth for an unknown amount of time. He also didn't know if they want people parking immediately adjacent to Islington Street. He is not sure they should even show this as a parking lot. Mr. Taintor agreed. One thing they have all been concerned about is that the Islington Street building will not be built. It is their preference to improve the streetscape of Islington Street. A parking lot on the front would be detrimental to Islington Street and it is very important to make sure that doesn't happen. It would be preferable to build the front building first and have temporary parking in the rear. Mr. Chagnon responded that that the developer has had conversations with the City on that and it works better for the developer this way and it helps the residential neighborhood. Mr. Holden felt the issue was the timing of the second building and by them showing a temporary parking area with no caveats, they could become like Bed, Bath & Beyond where they are two years out and the third building still isn't built. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they would not build the parking garage until the 2<sup>nd</sup> building was built. Mr. Holden asked why should they get CO's if the site isn't completed? Mr. Chagnon indicated that they need to have revenue generated as they go forward to make the project viable. Mr. Holden also felt they will be providing parking for someone and then immediately taking it away. Mr. Desfosses felt it would be more appropriate to have it as a grassed lawn in the interim, which is more sightly. He is hesitant to approve a gravel parking lot and/or a construction fence that is going to stay up for four or five years. Mr. Allen asked if there was a precedent on this. Mr. Holden thought that the only one they have run into is Bed, Bath & Beyond where they went out and built the first two and they have yet to start the third. Mr. Parkinson added that Home Depot also has an additional pad area for a future building as well.

Mr. Parkinson felt that the applicants answered their question from the last meeting about what they were proposing as far as dealing with the parking after they built the back section but he felt it needs to go beyond this. He is not keen on a gravel lot on a main business thoroughfare and there needs to be some kind of time frame, with stipulations on temporary parking if it is going to exceed a specified amount of time then it needs to be paved, it needs to be bonded and there needs to be temporary landscaping on the front portion. If it is going to be over 6 months or a year, additional stipulations must kick in to address the City's concerns.

Along that line, Mr. Allen asked if they do the first two buildings with interim measures out front, what is the project line for the utilities, road work, etc on Tanner and Parker? Mr. Chagnon stated that the project line should be delineated on the exhibit. Mr. Allen was concerned because it doesn't have any of the utility work or the sewer extension up Tanner and the ramp drainage. Mr. Chagnon stated that all of the utility work is done, the off site drainage and sewer improvements are done, they need the drainage brought up to service the ramp, Tanner Street up to the point of the manhole to service the 2<sup>nd</sup> building, and sidewalks are all done except the ones from the building forward on Islington. Parker will be left as it is. The ramp is not used so two way isn't an issue yet and they are providing a temporary sidewalk out to Islington.

Mr. Holden asked if the public's interest is seeing the completed sidewalks, can they provide a timeline? Mr. Chagnon stated they would be completed in accordance with the front building construction. Mr. Holden thought that was a non answer and raises some concern. Mr. Chagnon thought it was an issue with other projects in town as well.

Attorney McEachern thought that they dealt with the same issue at the Parade Mall and they would be willing to pay after a certain amount of time, and landscape it as well. After an appropriate period, they would put in the sidewalk. Development does not have a matrix and there are a lot of unknowns and they have approached this project as logically as can be done. Mr. Holden pointed out that the big difference with the Parade Mall is that it was subdivided into three separate lots. Attorney McEachern thought that every situation is different and they can put in conditions. By putting up the rear building, the residents will have a nice area to look at with landscaping. They can propose a schedule and have that be a condition. Mr. Holden was uncomfortable with that and would almost say they had to start on the front building within 30 days of completing the rear building. It might be appropriate for them to work on that.

Mr. Parkinson understood that they are doing the sewer and drainage over and everything associated with the back buildings, but his major concern is putting traffic into the neighborhood and putting everyone onto Hanover Street and their temporary parking does just that. He strongly encouraged the improvements to Parker Street be completed for two way traffic and keep traffic off from Parker rather than Tanner. Attorney McEachern felt that made sense and that could be a stipulation. They want to keep this project moving forward.

Mr. Allen indicated that he would feel a lot more comfortable if the front building were built first and the parking lot were on the back side. Attorney McEachern stated that the project would never take place that way. Mr. Holden felt if they both go down this road they will be negotiating this in Court. Attorney McEachern responded that they don't want to do that. In a perfect world the whole project would go up all at once. Mr. Holden was under the understanding that this is one project but they are finding a hole in that and it doesn't help that the plans say "future building".

As much as Mr. Parkinson would like to keep the landscaping developing down Islington Street and putting a building out there, addressing the needs and concerns of the neighborhood first, rather than the business community on Islington Street, is more paramount in his mind. If the back building never got built, the residential area would not be happy. Attorney McEachern indicated that the problems in Portsmouth are wonderful problems and Berlin, NH would love to have them. The City's expertise is valuable and that's the process that is happening now. Mr. Holden felt a positive statement is that they felt they could work on a schedule so that they could review it for the construction of whatever the second building will be. Attorney McEachern thought that could be in the CMMP, where it should be. Mr. Holden felt that once they have an approval, the City loses some control.

Mr. Taintor felt one big issue is the parking impact in the neighborhood. That is widely shared as a concern at City Hall and elsewhere and it was brought up from the neighborhood point of view last time. He is very uncomfortable with this. There was a very slim narrative provided in the traffic report and it said there was not a parking problem. Regardless of what the parking ratios are, they are removing parking that is currently being used by neighborhood residents, they are not providing any parking for the businesses and employees and they are providing only a fraction of what the residential units will require and he has real serious concerns with the statement that the Bridge Street lot is under capacity. He would not be comfortable without an independent parking review. Attorney McEachern responded that this meets all requirements of the CB zone. He is uncomfortable that the City has had a Parking Impact fee and has looked at additional parking in this area and has done nothing on it. This is not just a developer's problem. This project meets all of the zoning requirements and they may be uncomfortable with this project but they should follow the law. In the end, it is the future of Portsmouth which requires additional downtown parking. This project is subject to the laws of today and they are looking for good faith and fairness. Mr. Taintor did not believe the Bridge Street lot is under capacity as stated in the report and he would like confirmation of that.

Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they did the counts for that and the person who did that report is not present but they worked with Deb Finnigan on that. This Board had the same concerns and sent them to the Traffic & Safety Committee and the Parking Committee and both groups approved of the

project. This is a private lot and won't be providing parking to the neighborhood. Mr. Taintor asked if they felt that the parking and traffic plans do not cause parking congestion issues in the neighborhood. Mr. Chagnon felt that this project will have an impact over what is there now. Going back in time, this site used to be three homes. The furniture store that is there now could be used by somebody tomorrow. There are a variety of uses that could have far more impact to the neighborhood.

Mr. Parkinson has seen this project a number of times and the issues are slowly being addressed. They have looked at water, sewer, traffic, parking, and landscaping. He felt it was time to move this project on to the Planning Board as they have addressed the technical aspects of the project. There are now concerns about if this is phased, so there needs to be more work on how that will be done and he felt that should be done at the Planning Board level.

Mr. Parkinson made a motion to approve with stipulations. Mr. Holden seconded the motion, for discussion.

Mr. Holden felt if they were uncomfortable moving this on, they should address the motion and narrow down the issue. He encouraged that the Committee make the necessary stipulations and if someone still feels uncomfortable, a motion to postpone can be made.

Mr. Britz had a concern with parking. It looks to him that 70 new parking spaces are needed in addition to the 29 spaces being provided and he doesn't see how 70 people are going to find a parking space in that neighborhood without creating congestion and problems. Whether it is a request of this board to do an independent parking study or the Planning Board, he feels that someone should request that study to look at the impact on the neighborhood. That is the one thing that he feels is outstanding with this project. They have said all along that this project is too intensive for this site. They all understand that it meets the zoning requirements but it still looks like there is a lot going into this little lot. The one area that will clearly be difficult to meet the needs of the site is parking. The parking garage is a nice effort towards reducing that but it still leaves a big gap in parking.

Mr. Holden asked if his stipulation was that an independent parking study is needed and should be provided to either this Committee or the Planning Board, depending on which is more appropriate. Mr. Britz agreed and added that he would support an independent parking study.

Mr. Parkinson stated that he has been involved in projects throughout the Central Business District for many years and he never agreed with the parking rules and regulations that the City provides. He cannot see holding a developer hostage for a project when they are allowed to do this. Until the City changes their rules and regulations they will look at this same thing time and time again.

Mr. Holden suggested holding that thought and moving on to other stipulations.

Mr. Desfosses asked whether they need both fire services? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they do not. The HDC approved this as three buildings. Mr. Desfosses stated that where the fire services come into the parking garage, they should have bollards around the set ups so that cars will not hit it. That should be a stipulation.

Mr. Desfosses noted on Sheet D-5, it says there is a brick walkway going down into the garage and he wondered if that is correct? Mr. Chagnon stated that is above the garage level.

Mr. Desfosses commented on the paving of streets in connection with the issue of phasing as the utilities going into Tanner and Parker are pretty intensive so he they are going to want the streets paved at least as part of phase one. Maybe they can use a different asphalt product in case the top coat doesn't go on for many years. That should be a stipulation. Mr. Holden felt that should be worked out when they work out a phasing/sequencing plan.

Mr. Allen commented that a sequencing plan should show utilities, the grading for the front parking lot, spot grades, and appropriate driveway aprons.

Mr. Holden suggested that they will expect Attorney McEachern to propose a project timeline, to be reviewed by DPW to insure all paving and utilities are covered for the short and long term and that it is subject to approval by the Planning Board. Mr. Allen required a more detailed plan of the front portion of site during the undeveloped period. Mr. Holden added that the intent of the plan is to make it as precise and short as possible while respecting the applicant's needs. Mr. Allen also indicated it should deal with drainage in the ramped area going down to avoid a pond at the bottom. Mr. Holden will be looking for Attorney McEachern to be saying that if this doesn't happen within "X" then "Y" shall happen, subject to the Planning Board.

Mr. Desfosses asked about showing the parking lot on the Site Plan. Mr. Taintor asked whether it should be grass or parking and there is a concern about this becoming a permanent parking lot. Mr. Holden felt that if it was the Planning Board reviewing this, they will have the opinions of staff and DPW and they will probably spend more than one session on it. Mr. Taintor felt the ideal would be if the parking lot area never got built as that would mean that the project was moving along. If the parking lot was built, it would mean there is some problem with building the second phase. He would like to see building the parking lot as a last resort. The idea of the sequencing plan, which is an expanded interim parking plan, is essential. They need to have that showing what utilities will be done at what point. Mr. Allen felt if they are going to want a CO on this site, it must be a safe and complete site.

Mr. Parkinson stipulated that any new poles or relocated poles or facilities associated with poles, must be approved by DPW in conjunction with PSNH.

Mr. Taintor stipulated that the future location of the grease trap should be shown on the plan. Also, minor corrections should be made regarding the light on the ramp, the brick walk, and the sidewalk grading on the front.

Mr. Holden indicated that Parker Street shall be subject to Planning Board and City Council concurrence on the traffic pattern. He asked Mr. Chagnon about changing some issues regarding easements and licenses and talk about giving the land to the City. Mr. Chagnon thought it may be appropriate for the Planning Board to take that up. They show an access easement plan as they are giving over a lot of the site to street and sidewalk improvements but it may be appropriate to consider that being a fee simple to clear up any issues of liability. Mr. Parkinson would defer to the City Staff for the more acceptable means. Mr. Holden stipulated that the applicant shall propose an easement or fee transfers subject to the approval of the Planning Board, Planning Department and Legal Department.

Mr. Holden requested that they sign the areas in the parking garage that are not to be used for parking and note that it would be a violation of the Site plan if that is so done. Also, that the revised Site Plans are subject to the HDC.

Mr. Holden went back to the first stipulation, he proposed that Mr. Britz had a very worthy issue but asked that he remove it as a condition and perhaps make it as a motion to postpone because this Committee or the Planning Board needs to see an independent parking study before they go forward. Otherwise, if the stipulation remains, there will be an independent study but it will be going to the Planning Board.

Mr. Chagnon stated that they have submitted a report. Mr. Holden felt it may not be sufficient. If the motion to approve passes, they would have to do an independent study. Mr. Chagnon did not understand what that means.

Mr. Britz clarified that Mr. Parkinson made the motion and then Mr. Britz discussed whether they want this Board to recommend an independent study or whether they want to recommend something to the Planning Board but the maker of the motion doesn't support it. Mr. Britz wanted to have a discussion about it and that was his point. He understands that Mr. Parkinson has more experience with parking in the downtown but he just felt that 70 spaces in this area, even though it is allowed, is unprecedented. Mr. Parkinson stated that the City's own zoning allows it. Mr. Taintor felt there were two separate issues. There is the Zoning Ordinance regarding the parking spaces requirement and there are the Site Review Regulations. This Committee has to find that the project does not provide traffic congestion and safety issues in the area. It requires the right number of parking spaces but the ultimate requirement is whether it creates any undue congestion and he feels they need that information. Mr. Britz was more concerned with parking issues rather than traffic. Mr. Desfosses echoed both concerns. This developer is putting a large burden on the parking situation in the City and they are responsible to help the City fix this. Mr. Allen stated this was unique because there is zoning and then there is location. In the heart of the downtown there is more parking availability but this is on the fringe of a residential neighborhood. He thinks there is a difference that makes the site review regulations worthy of looking at the parking impact.

Attorney McEachern understood their concerns and noted it has almost gone into a philosophical discussion. Their job is to enforce the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Holden reminded him that they are here under the Site Review Regulations. Attorney McEachern felt they have met that.

Mr. Holden confirmed they have a motion to approve and they are debating this element. He recommended that there be a motion to postpone so that this Committee can review an independent parking assessment. If the motion is voted down, then they would vote on the main motion which is to approve. Or, they could remove the stipulation for the independent study.

Mr. Britz indicated that he will remove stipulation as he felt it was more of a discussion point and it was important that it was in the record so that the Planning Board can decide. He felt there was merit in discussing it.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) Bollards shall be added around the fire service set-ups where they come into the garage, so that cars will not hit them.
- 2) Any new utility poles, relocated poles or facilities associated with poles, shall be subject to approval by DPW in conjunction with PSNH.
- 3) The Site Plan shall show a location for a future grease trap.
- 4) The Site Plan shall show a continuous curb radius from Parker Street to the ramp entrance.
- 5) The Site Plan shall indicate the correct types and mounting heights of wall-mounted exterior lights on the ramp (Sheet C4 and C5).
- 6) The Site Plan shall show signs prohibiting parking in the hatched area shown on the Parking Layout Plan (Sheet D5, revision date 6/30/09), and shall include a note stating that the use of such area for parking would be a violation of the Site Plan approval.
- 7) The words "Brick Walk" shall be deleted from the Parking Layout Plan (Sheet D5).
- 8) The Site Plan shall show the correct sidewalk grading at the front of the site.
- 9) The traffic pattern on Parker Street shall be subject to Planning Board and City Council concurrence.
- 10) The applicant shall propose a project timeline, addressing the short-term and long-term provision of all paving, utilities, grading, drainage, and interim and permanent parking; and such timeline shall be subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works and the Planning Board.
- 11) The applicant shall propose easements or fee transfers, which shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Board, Planning Department and Legal Department.
- 12) The revised Site Plans are subject to HDC review.

.....

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

B. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 and Chapter 400 of the Pease Development Authority Site Review Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of **Pease Development Authority, Applicant**, for property located at **200 Grafton Drive**, wherein site review approval is requested to replace an existing clubhouse with a new 7,200 s.f. (footprint) clubhouse, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 345 as Lot 1 and lies within the Natural Resource Protection District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Jim Spaulding, Civil Engineer with The H.L. Turner Group, appeared on behalf of the Pease Development Authority who wants to demolish the existing clubhouse and the golf course storage area and build a new clubhouse which will have golf cart storage and a basement underneath. The walkway provides access to the lower level. The first floor will contain the pro shop, function room, offices, and a small kitchen. They are also proposing a 1,250 s.f. outdoor seating area behind the clubhouse. Right now there is a platform with a tent and they are proposing to move that to the rear. The existing parking across the street will remain as is. It is currently partially paved and partially broken asphalt and gravel. They are not proposing an increase in use or membership. The parking area can handle up to 250 cars. The impervious area is essentially unchanged and they did a calculation that showed it dropping a little. The decrease was largely the result of removing the golf cart area. The drainage overall shows no significant change however there is a small increase of drainage that runs into the ditch on the side of the site. That is mainly because they are piping some of the drainage from the roof going into pipe as it is below grade. They had a soil scientist do a report and there are Hinkley Series soils which is a sand and gravel soil. They anticipate they will have infiltration of a substantial amount of the roof runoff in the drainage pipe network which will be perforated and will infiltrate some of the stormwater.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for purposes of this meeting.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses asked if it was on septic? Mr. Spaulding stated it was not. On the Utility Sheet, C-3, there is a sewer coming off of the corner of the building. There is an old septic system on site but it has been abandoned for many years and the existing building is not on septic either.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve with stipulations. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Parkinson asked if they thought it was a good location for the dumpster to be right next to the event tent? Mr. Spaulding confirmed that the PDA has since asked them to relocate it. Mr. Parkinson stipulated that should be noted on the revised Site Plan before the Planning Board.

Mr. Parkinson noted there was some reference to a sewer pump station and asked if that was currently in use. Mr. Spaulding believed it was but will not be needed once the new clubhouse is built. Mr. Parkinson stipulated that they have the system closed in accordance with DES standards and noted on the Site Plans.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold didn't see the underground sprinkler line for the water line. Mr. Spaulding confirmed there was a domestic water line coming in but he does not show a separate sprinkler line. He thinks the agreement for the sprinkler system came in recently. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold indicated that it should be shown on the final set of Site Plans. Mr. Spaulding explained that the sprinkler system will be a design build so they don't know what size line will be coming in. Mr. Parkinson requested a note on the Site Plan that it will be design built. His concern would be that if the requirement for the fire system requires an upsizing of the water service to the property, they need to know that.

Mr. Desfosses asked to reserve the right to review the Site Plans when the utilities are finalized, and before the Planning Board. He will need them by next Monday, July 6<sup>th</sup>.

The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations.

- 1) The new dumpster location shall be reflected on the revised Site Plans, prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 2) The sewer pump station shall be closed in accordance with DES standards and noted on the Site Plans;
- 3) A note shall be added to the Site Plans that the sprinkler system will be design built;
- 4) Representatives of DPW shall review the revised Site Plans when the utilities are finalized, and before the Planning Board meeting;

.....

C. The application of **Clear Channel Broadcasting, Inc., Owner, and Flo TV Inc., f/k/a, Mediaflo USA, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **815 Lafayette Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a broadcast antenna on an existing guyed tower and to install a 10' x 11' s.f. equipment shelter within the existing compound, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 245 as Lot 3 and lies within the General Business District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Joshua Delman, representing Flo TV, Inc., indicated that they provide wireless telecommunication services to the Portsmouth area and in particular they will provide a service that streams live TV to mobile phone handsets. They need a local facility in the area to provide the coverage. They have found an existing broadcast facility and they propose to mount a 12' omni directional antenna at an elevation of 301'. The tower today is a 492' so nothing will extend beyond the existing height of the tower. Cables will run down to an unmanned equipment facility. The shelter will measure 10' x 11'. There will be power and telephone and it will be a fenced compound to match the existing compound. No sewer, septic or water is required. They went to the BOA for a use variance and it was approved on May 19, 2009.

Mr. Holden pointed out that they need the owner's signature on the application prior to the Planning Board meeting.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for purposes of this meeting.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Britz asked for clarification of location of the new tower as the Site Plan was confusing to him. Mr. Delman approached Mr. Britz and described the site. The site will be new gravel and at Mr. Britz's request, he pointed out the wetlands. They will be paving a new slab, surrounded by new gravel and they will extend out with a fence by 40' x 20'.

Mr. Holden suggested that they stipulate that this be subject to review by the Environmental Planner to determine whether a Conditional Use Permit is required.

Mr. Parkinson asked if this is a cleared area. Mr. Delman confirmed it is a field type grass.

Mr. Britz made a motion to approve with the stipulation that the Environmental Planner shall review this prior to the Planning Board meeting to determine whether a conditional use permit is required.

Mr. Taintor noted that the plans say "Preliminary" and are not stamped so both of those items need to be taken care of.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) The application shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planner to determine whether a Conditional Use Permit is required;
- 2) The Site Plans shall be stamped by a Professional Engineer.

.....

**III. ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 3:50 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse  
Administrative Assistant