



**CITY OF DOVER**

## TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – P22-62

Application Type: Site Plan Review  
Applicant(s): TSB Properties, LLC  
Owner(s): TSB Properties, LLC  
Location: Production Drive (Assessor's Map D, Lot 12-1)  
Date: September 8, 2022

**INTENT:** To construct a series of five buildings totaling 24,420 sf for warehousing use and associated infrastructure on a vacant parcel on Production Drive. The development will require CUPs for wetland & wetland buffer impact.

**UNITS PROPOSED:** N/A

**AGENDA ITEM #:** 1

**ACREAGE:** 7.75± acres

**ZONING DISTRICT:** IT, Wetlands Protection District

**EXISTING LAND USE:** Vacant

**PROPOSED LAND USE:** Warehousing

**SURROUNDING LAND USE:** Vacant Land, Industrial/Manufacturing, Residential

**ZBA ACTION:** None

**CUP & PERMITS REQUIRED:**

- Wetlands Protection District
- Self-Storage Use (if externally accessed)
- EPA NOI & CGP
- NHDES Wetlands

**WAIVERS REQUESTED:** None requested but landscape plan and streetscape rendering are required.

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Members:**

Donna Benton, Planning  
Natasha Kypfer, Zoning  
Amy Reid, Business Development  
Jim Maxfield, Fire/Inspection Services  
Ken Mavrogeorge, Engineering

**Others:**

Michael Asciola, Planning  
Doug LaRosa, Civilworks  
Michael Menary, Civilworks

**Approval of the August 25, 2022 Minutes:**

J. Maxfield moved to approve the August 25, 2022 minutes. Seconded by R. Amy. Vote: U/A

**PLAN REVIEW:**

**Planning:**

- Water and sewer investment fees
- Impact fees
- Add lot D-12 to CUP application as there is wetland impact on this property as well as D-12-1
- Access through lot D-12 will require an easement and will create a second curb cut which may require relief.
- Use appears to be self-storage, please clarify how the proposed development is not, CUP required for self-storage use;
  - Use CUP required for self-storage in IT District see IT table for restrictions/regulations;
  - Front setback double per CUP criteria of IT along frontage,
  - Traffic memo states "self-storage buildings"
- Floor Plan submitted does not match buildings on Site Plan
- Revise construction hours to no Saturday and Sunday.
- PE Stamp on traffic study.
- Add the following to plan set:
  - Streetscape rendering and Landscape Plan
  - LLS, CWS & LLA signatures and stamps
  - Owners signature
  - Wetlands Protection District to zoning note
  - Update Sheet 4 Note 18 to change Assistant City Manager to Planning Director.
  - Consecutively number all plan set sheets
  - Sewer to Site Note 15 on Sheet 4
  - Common notes 7, 19, 24, & 38-40
  - Show snow storage area calculation
  - Floor plans for all buildings
  - Note to plan that no auto, RV, boat service/cleaning/wrapping/etc. will occur onsite
  - Note to plan that all vehicle/boat storage will be inside buildings
  - Parking areas to plan
  - Note no open lot storage allowed.
  - Zoning District lines
- Architectural comments forthcoming after streetscape and elevations (accurate) provided
- Submit accurate floorplans

**Engineering:**

- I&M Plan: Show and provide detail for energy dissipation structures and flared end sections.



**CITY OF DOVER**

## TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – P22-62

Application Type: Site Plan Review  
Applicant(s): TSB Properties, LLC  
Owner(s): TSB Properties, LLC  
Location: Production Drive (Assessor's Map D, Lot 12-1)  
Date: September 8, 2022

- I&M Plan: Storm Chamber section mentions Isolator Row. Identify the location of the isolator row on the plans and details.
- I&M Plan: There is mention of porous pavement. Indicate where this is proposed on site.
- General Note: Provide copies of easements for utilities and access across abutting properties.
- Landscape BMP O&M Plan: Please provide project specific document. The submitted document mentions large basin with linear swales.
- Drainage Analysis: Document cover says lot 12-1 but the text appears to be for lot 12-2. Check footers and remove references for stormwater management devices that are not proposed on this development (extended detention wet pond on page 5).
- Drainage Analysis: The Infiltration Basin has less than 1 inch of freeboard in the 50-year event. Recommend providing at least 1 foot of freeboard for the system or secondary outflow for larger events.
- Drainage Analysis: Infiltration rate is stated as 8.5 inches per hour. Provide backup for how this was determined or if this is a specified rate for fill. If this is a specified rate, provide notes on plans to specify the fill and testing parameters.
- General Note: Add note to reflect that an easement is provided to the City to maintain the potable drinking water quality through the hydrant flushing program.
- General Note: Provide note that indicates utilities within the property are to be the responsibility of the property owner including the routine maintenance, replacement, repair, and inspection as needed.
- Sheet 4: Add note that All ductile iron water mains, including tees, gate valves, and other connections, shall be wrapped in 8 mil thick polyethylene. Polyethylene wrap shall be either sheet or tube, installed tightly around pipe and fittings as per manufacturer's specifications.
- Sheet 5: Consolidate sawcuts in Production drive.
- Sheet 6: Snow storage seems inadequate.
- Sheet 6: Portions of the retaining wall exceed 4 ft. A building permit may be required.
- Sheet 6: Is there a chain link fence proposed on top of the wall?
- Sheet 6: Add dimension to indicate driveway width.
- Sheet 6: Driveway radii are extremely small. Provide truck turning exhibit to show trucks with trailers and passenger cars can enter without crossing into the opposing lane.
- General Note: Identify the consolidated communications building on the plans.
- Sheet 7: Evaluate if a swale is required at western property line to route offsite flows around the pavement. It appears that the offsite flows are being directed to the BMP.
- Sheet 7: Check spot grades as grades around the facility appear to be less than 1 % raising ponding/icing concerns.
- Sheet 7: Provide additional detail on the ADS system as the plan/details do not indicate the isolator rows or header pipes on the western side. It appears that crossing of drainage pipes could be avoided.
- Sheet 7: Provide flared end sections and rip rap aprons on the ends of all pipes.
- Sheet 7: It appears that there is not enough room for the 15" HDPE pipe in the 1:1 slopes along the entrance drive. Evaluate whether the Filteras can be connected in series. If 15" pipes are to connect into a culvert, a DMH should be provided.
- Sheet 7: The side slopes along the driveway are listed as 1:1. Recommend a minimum 1.5:1 slope. At a minimum, a shoulder should be provided at the edge of the driveway.
- Sheet 7: Applicant to verify that all pertinent NHDES setbacks for leach fields (Env-Wq 1008.2) are met with this design.
- Sheet 8: Driveway Cross Section: Provide minimum shoulder required for guardrail.
- Sheet 8: Driveway Cross Section: Cover over HDPE pipe is insufficient. Lower pipe or provide different material for culvert.
- Sheet 9: Recommend removing leach field on adjacent property (approx. age based on our records is 29 years old). Assess whether abutter can tie into the proposed sewer force main.
- Sheet 9: Recommend that forcemain be continuous from PS to SMH (remove cleanouts). At a minimum cleanouts within City ROW are not allowed.
- Sheet 9: Provide connection detail for tie into Elec and Communications. Will a vault or other structure be required within the City ROW?
- Sheet 9: Fire service should have a mechanical tee joint to the 6 inch pipe. Indicate the size of the fire service with the revision.
- Sheet 9: Indicate the inv out for the PS.
- Sheet 12: Cape Cod Berm detail has a dimension that is obscured. Please revise.



**CITY OF DOVER**

## TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – P22-62

Application Type: Site Plan Review  
Applicant(s): TSB Properties, LLC  
Owner(s): TSB Properties, LLC  
Location: Production Drive (Assessor's Map D, Lot 12-1)  
Date: September 8, 2022

- Sheet 12: Identify on the plans where accessible parking spaces are located or remove details
- Sheet 12: Depth of wooden guardrail may be insufficient without a shoulder and along 1:1 slopes.
- Sheet 12: Provide City's trench patch detail.
- Sheet 12: Clarify the bedding materials for the utility trench and whether concrete encasement within City ROW will be required. Revise note to read Eversource not Public Service of New Hampshire.
- Sheet 13: Provide additional detail for the infiltration basin including subgrade soils note 3 (missing) and specification for fill including infiltration rate.
- Sheet 14: Hydrant shall be a fire hydrant not a yard hydrant and Eddy style opening left.
- Sheet 15: Add shut off valve just downstream of the PS.
- Sheet 15: Provide stone backfill above forcemain.
- Sheet 16: Indicate location of fence on plans.
- Sheet 19: Box truck crosses over the curb radii. Increase radii per previous note.
- Sheet L1: Landscape plan note provided.
- General Comment: The City recommends that the applicant source out ductile iron piping, which is the City preferred material, in advance commencing construction.

### Police:

- Sheet 4, Utility note 26: note refers to a "security alarm system". An "alarm" is not necessarily required, ordinance language merely refers to a "security system". Obviously you are free to install an alarm.
- Sheet 17, Lighting Plan: security lighting on the side and rear of the three smaller warehouse buildings seems unnecessary; consider eliminating to reduce residential abutter impact
- Provide a concept sketch of a southbound left turn lane on Sixth Street at Production Drive

### Fire/Inspection Services:

- Clarify use
- What is proposed to be stored in buildings?

- Who will be renting these units?
- Fire suppression may be needed depending upon use.
- Bollards should be used to protect utilities near traveled way.
- Need count of number of units.
- Restrooms need to be shown on floorplan.
- Clarify accessibility
- Where is proposed parking?

### Business Development:

- There is a demand for manufacturing and assembly space, consider those tenants for the larger buildings.
- How do you enter these warehouses?
- Building elevation looks like self-storage and not warehouse, please revise and correct
- Floor plan notes mini-storage building. Please replace with warehouse
- Suggest no Saturday construction (building or site)
- Parking requirements are incorrect. Should be 30 spaces. None are shown
- Are all buildings 150' from existing residential?
  - Warehouse 3 looks close

### Planning Board: None

### Next Steps:

Resubmit full application package for a 2<sup>nd</sup> TRC review with a response letter addressing all issues and comments by the TRC.

### Pause TRC at: 11:06 am