

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

2:00 P.M.

MAY 1, 2007

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; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Debbie Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief; and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Icon Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **1303 Woodbury Avenue**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct an 11,186 s.f. 1-story retail pharmacy, with prescription drive-through window, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 217 as Lot 1 and lies within the General Business and Mixed Residential B District. (This application was tabled at the April 3, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to take the application off of the table. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Malcolm McNeill, representing Icon Realty, presented. Also present were Ken Linseman, of Icon Realty, Emile Pierides, Civil Engineer of BL Engineers and Eric Eby, Traffic Consultant from Greenman Pedersen. Attorney McNeill stated they have met with Traffic & Safety who had significant concerns with regard to the access point off Woodbury Avenue as well as the intersection of Woodbury Avenue and Granite Street. There were numerous lesser comments regarding on-site issues which he believes they have resolved. Their goal was to refer this on to the next Planning Board meeting.

Eric Eby, of Greenman Pedersen displayed the plan showing a proposed left turn lane at the corner of Woodbury Avenue and Granite Street, which was recommended at Traffic & Safety. The plan shows they are proposing to re-stripe Woodbury Avenue to get the left turn lane in. The crosswalk at that location is not a good location as far as site distance for a pedestrian. The site distance to the left is limited due to the stone wall. They recommend that cross walk not be maintained because it was at such a danger spot for pedestrian crossings. Also there are no pedestrian signal heads at that location. That would give them enough room to re-stripe and move the stop bar up 10'. If the crosswalk remains, they don't have enough room to get the taper into the left turn lane. They also looked at the Granite Street approach to the intersection and they were requested to put a vehicle loop detector in that location. The existing loop covers the entire approach to Granite Street so there is no need for an

additional loop for a right turn coming out of Granite Street. In addition, they are proposing a “No Turn on Red” sign for vehicles taking a right out of Granite Street. Another condition of Traffic & Safety was right in only off of Woodbury.

Mr. Holden noted shading on the arrows and he asked what the different shading meant. Mr. Eby explained that the shaded/grayish arrows are existing pavement markings and the darker blacken arrows are proposed. It does not say that on the plan. Mr. Holden indicated that as this was going to be part of the final submission, that they add labels indicating that on the plan. Mr. Eby confirmed that all crosswalks are existing. The one to the left of the intersection they recommend not maintaining but it would remain and eventually fade out but they will maintain the others. Mr. Holden requested clearer labels on the plan.

Emile Pierides, civil engineer, of BL Companies, reviewed the outstanding stipulations from the last meeting.

- 1) That the applicant shall appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee, after a Traffic Report has been prepared, and shall receive a favorable decision prior to the Planning Board hearing;

This has been completed.

- 2) That the irrigation system specifications shall be provided to Tom Cravens, DPW, for his review and approval;

Tom Cravens has reviewed the plan and indicated that any further revisions that he requests could be made a stipulation of approval.

- 3) That the white pine trees that are being planted to comply with the BOA stipulation regarding screening shall be reviewed and approved by Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner, and Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer;

The white pine trees are gone.

- 4) That a photometrix plan be added to the plan set, for review and approval by David Desfosses, DPW;

Mr. Desfosses indicated he has not seen a final photometric plan.

- 5) That the BOA stipulations from the June 27, 2006 approval be complied with:
 - 1.) That the applicant work with the Planning Department and the Planning Board to address height, siding, overall design of the building and hours of operation;
 - 2.) That appropriate vegetative screening be provided to shield the business property from the residential abutters on Granite Street;

These have been covered.

- 6) That a turning radius be provided for the rear where there is two way traffic and the loading dock;

This has been completed.

- 7) That the drive thru aisles that connect to the second driveway shall be adjusted;

This has been completed.

- 8) That the applicant provide information regarding the grade at the first driveway going onto Woodbury Avenue;

That is a moot point now.

- 9) That sidewalks on site as well as both sides of Granite Street shall be added to the Site Plans;

Mr. Pierides pointed out the ADA sidewalk that was added along Woodbury Avenue and another along Market Street. Ms. Finnigan referred to where the sidewalks match down and stated she would like a better detail as there appears to be a conflict. She wants assurance that they have appropriate ADA clearance.

- 10) That the 2nd driveway off of Granite Street should be increased from 15' to 18' for one way traffic;

That has been completed.

Stipulations from the April 3, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 11) That an Intrusion Alarm System be added to the Site Plans;

That has been completed.

Mr. Holden asked DPW if they were satisfied with the sidewalk. He added that they concluded that it was only going to be one side. Attorney McNeill indicated that was his understanding as it was a very limited street. Mr. Desfosses noted the sidewalk was only shown to the driveway on the plan. It should go down the frontage of the property on Granite. Mr. Holden asked the applicant if they would be adverse to having the sidewalk along the frontage of the property along Granite Street? Attorney McNeill confirmed that would be fine.

Attorney McNeill stated that concluded their presentation.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the public hearing was closed so he looked for a motion.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

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

Mr. Holden confirmed that Stipulation #2 on the letter dated April 9th, regarding irrigation, was still outstanding. Also, Stipulation #4 regarding a photometrix plan was outstanding. And, Stipulation #9

will be amended to a sidewalk on the project side of Granite Street extending along its frontage, rather than two sidewalks.

Ms. Finnigan asked for a detail showing the new ADA sidewalk from the corner of Market and Woodbury Avenue.

Mr. Holden asked that the Conceptual Improvement Plan clarify what is being removed and placed in so that they have it for a permanent record.

Mr. Allen requested that the applicant provide anticipated water demand for the project and include references of where that demand came from, i.e., a similar type of store in another area or industry standard, stamped by a licensed engineer. This is part of how they figure their connection fees.

Ms. Finnigan asked them to make sure “do not enter” signs get placed at the one-way entrance off of Woodbury Avenue. Mr. Holden asked if that was configured to everyone’s satisfaction? Mr. Finnigan believed it was.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the sidewalk that goes down to the intersection. Ms Finnigan indicated that Traffic & Safety asked for sidewalk that goes down to the intersection. Mr. Desfosses asked if anyone had reviewed it as it was very awkward. Ms. Finnigan stated that they requested if you were coming from Market Basket to this side and the grade of the driveway created a problem. Mr. Desfosses asked if there was a better way to tie the sidewalk in. Mr. Pierides did not believe there was any other way to tie the sidewalk in with ADA requirements. Mr. Desfosses felt it was not far enough away from the other sidewalk.

Mr. Holden requested a stipulation that DPW needs to review the sidewalk connection prior to the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there had been any discussion regarding the controller at Traffic & Safety? Ms. Finnigan indicated there was no stipulation although there might have been a discussion about the possibility of looking into that. Mr. Desfosses indicated that light was originally set up for a school. He asked if there was any discussion about mainlines taking preference so it would not be a nuisance. Mr. Eby stated that minimum times were set in on Woodbury. It’s a 15/30 second minimum. There are no loops on Woodbury. Mr. Desfosses felt that the minimum time should be longer than that. Ms. Finnigan stated that she was comfortable with it.

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

Stipulations from the January 2, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1.) That the irrigation system specifications shall be provided to Tom Cravens, DPW, for his review and approval;
- 2.) That a photometrix plan be added to the plan set, for review and approval by David Desfosses, DPW;

Stipulations from the May 1, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 3.) That sidewalks shall extend along the frontage of the property on Granite Street and shall be added to the Site Plans;
- 4.) That a detail be added to the Site Plans showing the new ADA sidewalk from the corner of Market and Woodbury Avenue;
- 5.) That the Conceptual Improvement Plan be revised to clarify what is being removed and what is being proposed;

- 6.) That the applicant provide anticipated water demand for the project and include references of where that demand came from, ie., a similar type of store in another area or industry standard, and said report shall be stamped by a licensed engineer;
- 7.) That “do not enter” signs shall be placed at the one-way entrance off of Woodbury Avenue;
- 8.) That the applicant shall meet with DPW to review the sidewalk connection prior to the Planning Board meeting;

.....

B. The application of The Home Depot, Owner, and Bed Bath & Beyond/Christmas Tree Shops, Applicant, for property located at 100 Durgin Lane, wherein Site Review approval is requested to demolish the existing building and to construct a 113,865 ± s.f. one-story, three-tenant retail plaza, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 239 as Lots 16, 18 & 13-2 and lie within the General Business district. (This application was tabled at the April 3, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz made a motion to take the application off of the table. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Malcolm McNeill was present with Greg Mikolaites and Joe Perschino from Appledore Engineering and JimWinn, Traffic Engineer, from GPI. Attorney McNeill stated that the on-site issues have been substantially at rest but the issue of greatest consequence has been the effect of traffic as it related to the Woodbury corridor and access to this site. They had an extended meeting before Traffic & Safety. They also had significant involvement with DPW. When they came to Traffic & Safety and TAC they delineated a list of concerns with regard to areas that they felt this applicant was responsible for. Copies of the list were distributed to the TAC members. There were also areas on Woodbury that are not attributable to this project. In discussions with Steve Parkinson and other, they have estimated \$500,000 in repairs in the Woodbury Avenue area. The applicant originally offered \$215,000 which is what they felt was their fair share based on what they felt were attributable under the rational nexus test. That was not convincing to Mr. Parkinson so they have agreed to \$250,000 towards improvement. The list that the TAC members was given is the same list that went to Traffic & Safety. The City indicated that these repairs will probably not be activated until the spring of 2008 and this facility may be operational before that time. As such, they presume the payment of this donation will satisfy their off-site donations as they do not control what is done by the City or how they prioritize their improvements. Secondly, although the list represents what they believe their obligation was, they wish to have it used for improvements to benefit this project and not some other section of the City. He would like to work with Mr. Parkinson before the Planning Board meeting to make an acceptable list of where these funds will be utilized. The applicant is asking that they will be assured that they will derive benefits in traffic mitigation. Traffic & Safety passed this along with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. Mikolaities, of Appledore Engineering, reviewed the stipulations as addressed in the Memorandum dated April 17th from their office.

- 1. That the applicant shall prepare a Traffic Study for review by the City Traffic Engineer and the Planning Department;
- 2. That the applicant shall appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee;

These have been complete.

3. That a Knox Box and automatic notification of emergency forces shall be added to the Site Plans;

A note was added to Sheet C-3.

4. That all signage shall be added as part of the traffic mitigation plan for review and approval by City staff;

This related to traffic.

5. That the applicant shall explore paving the entire access road, including extending past their property line;

This related to traffic.

6. That the applicant shall consider a fence or screening around the loading docks;

Screen walls have been provided at the rear of the loading docks. Mr. Mikolaities displayed renderings showing the screen walls that will blend into the back of the building. Also, a note was added to Sheet C-3.

7. That a note shall be added to the plans that any restaurant use would require an external grease trap;

A note was added to Sheet C-5.

8. That the Operational Maintenance Plan shall be added to the Site Plan Set and a schedule for a reporting mechanism back to DPW shall be agreed upon;

That a note was added to Sheet C-4.

9. That the applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan and a Driveway Management Plan, for review and approval by the City Legal Department, Planning Department, City Traffic Engineer and City Manager;

They will submit this plan at a later date.

10. That the Construction Management Plan shall include how work will effect the Hampton Inn and Saturn Dealership and how access shall be provided;

They agree to have a description of coordination between abutters. Discussions are currently on going.

11. That the applicant shall use native plantings to avoid the need for irrigation;

They have added a note on Sheet C-1-1.

12. That the applicant shall work with the City's Police and Fire Departments to verify that they can communicate with their base station;

A note has been added to Sheet C-12.

13. That the applicant shall clean up the area entitled "Trash Area" on the Site Plans and add a note in their Operation Plan on how they will maintain that area;

Notes have been added to Sheet C-3 and C-4.

14. That traffic shall be one way around the building and appropriate signage and pavements markings shall be added to the plans;

They have created one way circulation to the rear of the building and signage and pavements markings are shown on Sheet C-3.

15. That all trees proposed shall be no lower than 5' above the ground;

A note has been added to Sheet C-6.

16. That directional signage shall be added to the detail sheet;

Directional signage was added to Sheet C-13.

17. That the striping of handicapped spaces shall be solid rather than hollow;

They clarified the handicapped detail on Sheet C-9.

Mr. Holden asked Ms. Finnigan if stipulation #1 was done? Ms. Finnigan indicated that they have appeared before Traffic & Safety and that is done. He asked about signage. Jim Winn, of GPI, stated that they have made some recommendation regarding off site signage and DPW will review and come up with final wording and placement. So, that is still pending and DPW will fine tune it.

Mr. Holden asked if they are now paving the entire access road? Attorney McNeill confirmed they are not. Mr. Mikolaities showed the plan showing the extent of the paving. Their position is that they will not pave someone else's property. Attorney McNeill further explained that they looked at it and it's not in bad condition and he is not sure it needs to be done. The City is looking at a larger package and can pave it. Mr. Holden confirmed this would be included in the \$250,000 contribution. Mr. Desfosses asked if the City had the legal right to pave private property? Attorney McNeill did not know. Mr. Desfosses felt that if a private land owner does not want traffic going through his property he would be inclined to let it go to pot. Mr. Holden indicated they will continue to review this and keep it pending.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the \$250,000 is not a donation but will be used for off site mitigation. The monies will be spent for a controller and cabinet to be located where? Mr. Winn confirmed it would be at Woodbury & Durgin and the Emergency Preemption device would be at the same location. Mr.

Holden asked about off site directions sign which he assumed would be any street off site and they will review that with Ms. Finnigan. Mr. Holden asked about Durgin Lane improvements which were indicated on their Site Plan. The Pavement Overlay has been covered and the right turn lane is also shown on the Site Plan.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

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

Mr. Holden indicated that the outstanding stipulations that they will keep in place from the April 9, 2007 Letter of Decision are #4, #5, #9 & #10.

Mr. Desfosses noted as part of the six part listing for the off site mitigation it listed off-site directional signs. He asked if the City has ever put up signs up for a developer before? Mr. Holden indicated it has been done, although it was not a common practice. He assumed they will be partners when they go before the City Council. They will work with the applicant.

Mr. Allen referred to the Utility Plan, C-5. He described the water services which follow up from Durgin Lane where they have Domestic & Fire shown as a fire service that cuts across the parking lot. It looks like the fire service line is tied into the domestic line. It was probably a drafting error but it needs to be shown coming off the fire service.

Mr. Allen referred to the Landscaping plan, C-6, where he would like to see it call for 6" of loam in the landscaped areas. Mr. Mikolaities indicated that was noted on the plan as Note 11.

Mr. Britz asked if they were only referring to one trash area? The area that he is concerned about is not shown on the plans but was pretty extensive. Mr. Mikolaities pointed out on the existing conditions plan, at the bottom left, where they labeled a trash area. Mr. Britz referred them to the bottom right where there is a steep bank going into the wetland where there is an area with a lot of trash. He asked them to add that area to the plans for clean up.

Ms. Finnigan referred to the off-site mitigation signage and asked if they will get assistance from the applicant when they go before the City Council. Attorney McNeill confirmed they will be there.

Mr. Allen requested that the applicant provide anticipated water demand for the project and include references of where that demand came from, ie., a similar type of store in another area or industry standard, stamped by a licensed engineer. This is part of how they figure their connection fees.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

Stipulations from the January 30, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1.) That all signage shall be added as part of the traffic mitigation plan for review and approval by City staff;
- 2.) That the applicant shall explore paving the entire access road, including extending past their property line;
- 3.) That the applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan and a Driveway Management Plan, for review and approval by the City Legal Department, Planning Department, City Traffic Engineer and City Manager;

- 4.) That the Construction Management Plan shall include how work will effect the Hampton Inn and Saturn Dealership and how access shall be provided;

Stipulations from the May 1, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 5.) That the Utility Plan be revised so that the fire service line is not shown as tying into into the domestic line;
- 6.) That a second "Trash Area" be labeled on the Site Plans for clean up, located on the bottom right of the plans where a steep bank leads into the wetland area;
- 7.) That the applicant provide anticipated water demand for the project and include references of where that demand came from, ie., a similar type of store in another area or industry standard, and said report shall be stamped by a licensed engineer

.....

C. The application of **Harborcorp, LLC, Owner** for property located **off Deer Street, Green Street, Market Street, Russell Street and Maplewood Avenue**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct an 83,118 ± s.f. 6/7-story structure consisting of a hotel, convention center, parking garage and 21 residential condominiums, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28, Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1-1A, Lot 1-1C and Lot 4, Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12 , and Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 21 and lie within the Central Business A (CBA) District, the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District A. (This application was tabled at the April 3, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to take the application off of the table. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney McNeill presented with the development team present Attorney McNeill suggested a dual approach. They would like to address on-site issues today. They have appeared before the Traffic & Safety Committee and they recommended approval. There were a number of concerns expressed regarding a number of parking spaces lost on Deer Street and other issues they have attempted to address since that meeting. They wish to give the Committee and the public the assurance that they are looking into the parking issues. They would like to address these issues at another meeting.

Mr. Holden asked if they would be able to go forward with their discussion on traffic and parking at a special TAC meeting on May 8th? Attorney McNeill agreed they could be ready but they would like to go forward today with all other issues.

Dennis Moulton, of AMES MSC, reviewed stipulations from the April 3rd TAC.

- 1) That the applicant shall meet with David Desfosses of DPW to finalize construction details to make sure they meet City standards;

They hope to meet with Mr. Desfosses to address these items this week.

- 2) That the waterline connection at the intersection of Russell Street and Green Street be clarified;

That was done and the utility plan was updated.

- 3) That the 12" waterline starting at Deer Street be relocated;

They relocated the water lines and that is shown on the utility plan, Sheet C-9.

- 4) That the old waterline going down Russell Street shall be cut and capped under the direction of the City Water Division;

There is a note on the utility plan, Sheet C-9.

- 5) That the additional 2" water service to the garage shall not be activated until the subdivision is approved;

The project agrees to this and understands the reason. A note was added on Sheet C-9.

- 6) That the inter-connection of the fire suppression system shall be reviewed by Thomas Cravens of DPW and Deputy Fire Chief Griswold;

A note has been added to Sheet C-9.

- 7) That the applicant shall arrange to have the USGS monument off the ledge at Russell Street relocated during construction;

A note was added to the Site Plans and they are looking into the requirements for that. This stipulation should remain.

- 8) That the applicant shall work with DPW regarding drainage;

They have done some additional work. They investigated the outfall pipe to the North Mill Pond and there is a manhole between Bridge and Maplewood. There is a 48" pipe that goes out to the North Mill Pond. This receives drainage from a large portion of the City. They have calculated existing flow to that point of 114 cubic feet per second and the existing condition for a 25 year storm could be 122 cubic feet per second. They are looking at times the 48" pipe is partially submerged. They plan to meet with DPW so this stipulation is still outstanding.

- 9) That the applicant shall work with Peter Rice, DPW, to review the proposed 1,000 gallon grease trap to determine whether their flows from their cooking facilities are adequate;

They have done a calculation of kitchen proposed based on expected occupancy and come up with 4,000 gallons per day, generated by the kitchen at absolute maximum. They propose grease traps be sized at 4,000 gallons. They hope to have Peter Rice concur this week.

- 10) That the applicant shall work with the City's Police and Fire Departments to verify that they can communicate with their base station inside the proposed buildings;

This will have to be addressed later at the development of the building plans.

- 11) That the applicant shall review the layout at Russell and Market Streets with the City Traffic Engineer, including truck template for all turning moves, identify the commitment of design and construction with the design to follow after approval, move R3-8 near the intersection to the beginning of the additional lane and then move the second R3-8 closer to the existing hydrant;

The signs are shown. They included in their package a plan showing tractor trailer and bus movements throughout areas of the site. They are showing the service drive, a backing in motion for a tractor trailer, the tractor trailer leaving the site to Maplewood, towards Deer and Russell, the tour bus signs and the drop off areas. Ms. Finnigan asked them to move one of the signs but she was largely satisfied.

- 12) That the applicant shall add signage to show one way direction at the drop off area;

They have added a sign at each side of the drop off area and included a large detail of that area.

- 13) That the applicant shall remove the stop sign and stop bar at Deer Street;

This relates to the redesign of the intersection so they will leave it as a stipulation for now.

- 14) That the applicant shall coordinate the VAI plans with the AMES plans;

That is a continual process so they will continue to communicate and hopefully nail down the final designs.

- 15) That the Landscape Plan shall show all tip downs and add the appropriate construction detail and correct the conflict between tree placement and mid-block crossing;

Andy Ward will address that.

- 16) That the applicant shall identify truck access for truck deliveries, show templates through the site and street circulation, especially Maplewood Avenue drives, and show a truck traveling the access way and then backing into the loading zone;

That has been accomplished.

- 17) That at the intersection of Maplewood Avenue and Deer Street, the applicant shall review the pavement marking near the railroad tracks, move the left turn arrow back from the stop bar, review the timings and system coordination needs for the current coordinated system that works very well, and review the alignment of through movement on Deer Street (specifically a vehicle traveling southbound towards Bridge Street);

Those items have been addressed and they also added a sheet to the set showing the alignments of the proposed turn lanes. It now lines up a little better. It's not perfect but it is

probably as good as they are going to get it. Ms. Finnigan did not consider this done. The timing coordinations have not been reviewed.

- 18) That the Site Plans shall clearly define all on-street parking, both existing and future, and label all existing spaces being removed on Deer and Russell Streets;

This is still open.

- 19) That a Parade Mall stop sign shall be added to the Site Plans;

A stop sign has been added at the Parade Mall exit.

- 20) That a left turn storage lane, one car length long, be added at Russell and Deer Street;

That has been added to the Site Plan and the City has reviewed it. Ms. Finnigan agreed it was acceptable.

- 21) That the applicant shall identify how many cars fit in the drop off area;

Looking at the vehicle turning plan, there is an inset stacked tightly in the drop area and he was able to show 10 passenger vehicles in that area.

- 22) That the Site Plans shall show the proposed gates on the accessway and the exit from the garage on Maplewood Avenue;

Those have been added to the Site Plans.

- 23) That the crosswalks shall be City standard;

When they meet with Mr. Desfosses they will confirm that.

- 24) That the applicant shall identify how they will direct vehicles to the hotel/garage from the highway;

They have not developed a Way Finding package at this point but they show a sign at Russell and Market Street. There will probably have to be additional work on that.

- 25) That the applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the City Legal Department, Planning Department, City Traffic Engineer and City Manager, prior to permit approval;

That will be prepared as they get closer to the Site Review Agreement.

- 26) That the applicant shall appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee and receive approval;

They appeared last Thursday and received a favorable recommendation.

27) That the applicant shall identify all required permits on the Site Plans;

They have added to the plan all permits they will need to obtain.

28) That a detail be added showing the tree grates;

That is shown on the plans.

Andy Ward, of HBLA, addressed landscaping. Major changes since last time include the addition of a left turn lane at the bottom of Russell Street. Everything on Deer & Maplewood have remained. The service drive has been defined a little better with their van area. All crosswalks and tip downs are now coordinated with the drawings. Since the last meeting he confirmed with Mr. Desfosses that the paving pattern is city standard. He also communicated with Lucy Tillman regarding tree grates and guards. Conceptually the street trees need to be protected in some way and they will determine that at the regulatory phase. He reiterated that all trees shown are urban hardy and the lantern lights shown are marching down Russell Street through Deer Street and those are at a standard City spacing. He feels this plan maximizes trees and landscaping on the site.

Ms. Tillman directed Mr. Ward to landscaping in the City right of way and indicated that they should work with the Trees & Greenery Committee. She suggested that he contact the Chairman, Peter Loughlin. Ms. Finnigan asked if the trees shown in the brick area will be at least 5' from the street? Mr. Ward confirmed they will be 6'. Ms. Finnigan requested that a detail be added for the crosswalk on Green Street. She was not sure how the tree and tip down will work.

Attorney McNeill stated that they would like to defer traffic to the next meeting. Mr. Holden stated he would defer that to the Committee. Ms. Finnigan noted that the mid-block crossing still does not have the appropriate pedestrian signage and she asked that be added.

Mr. Holden stated that the public hearing remained open. What they heard today was comments back to the City on issues that were raised as a result of the original presentation. At this time, he asked if anyone was present to speak to, for or against this application. The applicant has indicated that they will continue to work on the traffic circulation plan so the public hearing will remain open. He called for public speakers.

Attorney Doug Macdonald indicated that he represents clients with issues of traffic and parking. He mentioned the Parking Committee meeting is a couple of weeks down the road so it might make sense to reschedule this after that meeting.

The Chair again called for speakers.

Mr. Holden asked if the Committee was ready to reconvene in one week to continue their review of this project? Mr. Allen added he would also like to review the drainage plan next week.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to postpone to a reconvened meeting on May 8, 2007. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to a reconvened meeting on May 8, 2007 at 2:00 pm, passed unanimously, with the following stipulations:

Comments from the April 3, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1.) That the applicant shall meet with David Desfosses of DPW to finalize construction details to make sure they meet City standards;
- 2.) That the additional 2” water service to the garage shall not be activated until the subdivision is approved;
- 3.) That the applicant shall arrange to have the USGS monument off the ledge at Russell Street relocated during construction;
- 4.) That the applicant shall work with DPW regarding drainage;
- 5.) That the applicant shall work with Peter Rice, DPW, to review the proposed 1,000 gallon grease trap to determine whether their flows from their cooking facilities are adequate;
- 6.) That the applicant shall work with the City’s Police and Fire Departments to verify that they can communicate with their base station inside the proposed buildings;
- 7.) That the applicant shall remove the stop sign and stop bar at Deer Street;
- 8.) That the applicant shall coordinate the VAI plans with the AMES plans;
- 9.) That the Landscape Plan shall show all tip downs and add the appropriate construction detail and correct the conflict between tree placement and mid-block crossing;
- 10) That at the intersection of Maplewood Avenue and Deer Street, the applicant shall review the pavement marking near the railroad tracks, move the left turn arrow back from the stop bar, review the timings and system coordination needs for the current coordinated system that works very well, and review the alignment of through movement on Deer Street (specifically a vehicle traveling southbound towards Bridge Street);
- 11) That the Site Plans shall clearly define all on-street parking, both existing and future, and label all existing spaces being removed on Deer and Russell Streets;
- 12) That the crosswalks shall be City standard;
- 13) That the applicant shall identify how they will direct vehicles to the hotel/garage from the highway;
- 14) That the applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the City Legal Department, Planning Department, City Traffic Engineer and City Manager, prior to permit approval;

Comments from the May 1, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 15) That the applicant shall appear before the City Trees and Greenery Committee;
- 16) That the appropriate pedestrian signage shall be added to the mid-block crossing;
- 17) That a detail be added for the crosswalk on Green Street.

.....

D. The application of **Michael DeLaCruz, Owner** for property located at **75 Congress Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to convert 4th floor attic space to storage, office and residential, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 5 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District A. (This application was tabled at the April 3, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to take the application off of the table. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Michael DeLaCruz, owner, advised the Board that since the last meeting he had Altus Engineering make the changes that Deb Finnigan had requested, the plans are now stamped and he added the parking calculation. He agreed to have the automatic sprinkler system looked at and the grease trap is being evaluated. A Construction Management Plan was given to him by Altus to use as a guide and he will put something similar together for the City. He believed that covered all outstanding items.

Mr. Holden indicated that Stipulation #7 would remain outstanding and asked if everything else was okay with the Committee? There were no objections.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden indicated that Stipulation #7 should remain outstanding, regarding a Construction Management Plan.

Mr. Allen indicated that in the past with sidewalk projects, knowing they will be redoing Fleet Street in the next year, he would request a contribution towards sidewalks along Fleet Street. Mr. Holden indicated that DPW would work with Mr. DeLaCruz to work out a formula for sidewalks along Fleet Street.

Mr. Holden asked that the Site Plans should note any easements or licenses for the alley extending off of Fleet Street and along the rear of the building.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the City Legal Department, Planning Department, City Traffic Engineer and City Manager, prior to permit approval;
- 2) That the applicant shall contact DPW to work out a formula for a contribution for sidewalks along Fleet Street;
- 3) That the Site Plans shall note any easements or licenses for the alley extending off of Fleet Street and along the rear of the building.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

E. The application of **Deborah Philips, Owner**, for property located at **92 Pleasant Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 9'6" x 15'6" one-story addition off of the existing one-story rear addition, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site

improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 107 as Lot 76 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District A.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

David Witham, Architect, on behalf of Deborah Phillips, addressed the Committee. Mr. Witham explained that Ms. Phillips was recovering from a fall and therefore was unable to attend. He indicated that he is not an engineer but is the designer for the project. He referred them to his letter which explained the project to the Committee which consists of a small addition off of the rear where there is an existing parking spot. He looks at this as a two part application. He asked if they would accept the site plan as submitted without a stamp and then to make a favorable recommendation for the project. He realizes the Planning Dept. is taking the position of requiring a stamped plan but he addressed this in his letter. He feels it is a small addition and the stamped plans would be expensive. There is, as part of the Site Review Regulations, a section that spells out the criteria to waive the requirement for stamped engineer plans. Mr. Witham felt they meet all of those criteria. He is respectful of the Planning Department's request to have the plans stamped but the exception is in the regulations for a purpose and this project meets that criteria. They are talking about a very minimal size and it will be a very straight forward project with no impact on traffic, utilities, sewer or pedestrian traffic. If anything pedestrian traffic will improve by removing one parking space that backs out. His main reason to request a waiver is the cost. They have received an estimate of \$4,000 for stamped plans.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the Department is recommending that the waiver not be granted but it is up to the committee.

Mr. Allen stated that it was his opinion that because this is in the downtown and the nature of what they run into on these projects, he would prefer a stamped plan. Every property in the downtown seems to have issues associated with it that they don't find out about until they have the stamped plans.

Mr. Allen made a motion not to waive the stamped plans. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion. Mr. Holden stated that unfortunately downtown is where property rights are the most controversial and this goes to the lot line which effects abutters. They have very rarely granted a waiver of this and that is usually only when they have a previous stamped plan from another project. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa felt that the downtown is special issues and he also supports the motion.

The motion to **deny** the request for a waiver of stamped Site Plans passed unanimously.

Mr. Holden requested that Mr. Witham to go through his presentation so that the Committee can see what they are proposing and make some comments on what they will need at the next meeting.

Mr. Witham stated that the Site Plans show where the proposed addition is going, which is now a parking spot. The enclosed space is 9 ½ x 12 with a set of steps to get up to a storage area. They do not get deliveries but rather the hairdresser just stores her supplies in there, mostly paper products. They will add one sink, which is minimal impact. There is no impact on drainage as it is currently impervious surface. There are no effects to signage or sidewalks. It is a fairly simple project.

Ms. Finnigan asked that the labels for the sink fixtures be clarified on the plans. She also indicated that they need to put up some sort of no parking sign on Church Street to stop someone from parking,

as she felt someone will definitely attempt it. They could put it on the edge of the building where people will see it.

Mr. Holden asked if the foundation will be on the lot line so it will extend under the lot line? Mr. Witham indicated that it would. Mr. Holden stated they will need a drawing demonstrating how the foundation will go in. Also, he suggested that Mr. Witham get with Lucy to work out the parking calculation and have it shown on the plan. Also, the plans should show that they have conforming open space.

Mr. Tillman asked if they have dumpsters on the site now? Mr. Witham referred to the photos which show 3 trash cans but he believes they are mostly used for the apartments.

Mr. Holden asked the Committee if they need anything on the utility lines so that they could give guidance to Mr. Witham. Mr. Allen asked if they were planning on changing any external lines? Mr. Witham confirmed they were not.

Mr. Desfosses asked for a snow storage note as this is often an issue during the wintertime. He asked for a note that snow will be removed and not pushed back into the City Street. Mr. Holden clarified that once you take a pre-existing building and propose a change, part of the issues are that you have to come in compliance with existing regulations. As long as you don't play with the remaining parking spaces, he did not believe they have to get into the pre existing.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone to the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 5, 2007 at 2:00 pm. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1.) That the sink fixture labels be clarified on the Site Plans;
- 2.) That a no parking sign be added on Church Street, possibly to be attached to the building;
- 3.) That the Site Plans shall reflect how the foundation will go in, in light of the foundation going in on the lot line;
- 4.) That the parking calculations, as approved by the Planning Department, be added to the Site Plans;
- 5.) That an open space calculation be added to the Site Plans;
- 6.) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that snow will be removed from the site and not pushed back into the City Street;

.....

F. The application of The **Foundation for Seacoast Health, Owner**, for property located at **100 Campus Drive**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct playing fields and ball courts to accommodate softball/baseball, soccer, tennis and basketball activities, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 266 as Lot 4 and lies within an Industrial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Holden advised the Committee that the applicant had requested that this application be postponed to the June 5th meeting.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting on June 5th. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the June 5th TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....
III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:45p.m.
.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant
Planning Department