

MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

JUNE 5, 2007

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner, David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works, David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; Debbie Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Deputy Fire Chief Steven Griswold; and Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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. (This application was postponed at the May 1, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Cravens made a motion to take the application off of the table. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, was present, representing Deborah Philips. He described the plan set as having a standard boundary survey and the proposed site plan. The proposed addition is to the rear of the existing barber shop. They received HDC approval on August 2, 2006 and a variance was granted as it is only one story high. The proposed building coverage with the addition is 54% open space is 17% and the project will add roughly two chairs to the existing shop, creating a water and sewer increase of approximately 300 gallons per day. Mr. Chagnon handed out copies of the letters of decision and photos of the rear of the property. He stated that the area is currently paved and the addition roof will not cause an addition in impervious area. The roof will slope to match the existing addition that is there and it will shed the water down. There is a catch basin behind the parking spaces where the run off will slope down. There will be no increase in run off. They will work on a Construction Management Plan and they do not expect to close the street at any time.

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:

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

Ms. Finnigan asked about the overhang roof where the addition is going and whether it is being removed, as she did not see it on the plans. Mr. Chagnon confirmed it would be removed and he will add a note to the plans. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that there was no new lighting.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Desfosses if there were any concerns about the drainage from the roof or concerns about sheetflow? Mr. Desfosses did not have any concerns.

Ms. Finnigan stipulated that a Construction Management Plan must be submitted for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the applicant should be required to upgrade the sidewalk? Mr. Chagnon stated it was brick along the Court street side and on Pleasant there is brick up to the property line and then it is concrete. Mr. Chagnon showed a picture of the front of the building to Mr. Desfosses.

Mr. Holden asked if they are looking at parking counts? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they will complete that for the City and the unmet parking will be addressed. Mr. Chagnon believed they will need two additional parking spaces.

Mr. Finnigan confirmed that a note will be added concerning the overhang into the parking lot that it will be removed in its entirety.

The motion to recommend approval with stipulations passed unanimously.

Mr. Allen indicated that they did not get a chance to make a stipulation regarding the sidewalks. He would like to make a stipulation that the sidewalk be brought into conformance with the downtown area sidewalks. Mr. Chagnon indicated that would cost more than the entire construction project. Mr. Allen confirmed that would be their recommendation to the Planning Board.

Just to be clear, Mr. Holden asked for a vote to add the sidewalk stipulation. The Committee unanimously agreed.

Stipulations:

- 1) That a Construction Management Plan shall be prepared for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a Building Permit;
- 2) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans indicating that the small roof overhang in the rear of the building over the parking lot will be removed in its entirety;
- 3) That the applicant shall confirm any unmet parking needs with Lucy Tillman and a note shall be added to the Site Plans; and
- 4) That the sidewalk shall be brought into conformance with the downtown area sidewalks.

.....

B. 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; (This application was postponed at the May 1, 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. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Robert Iafolla, of Myriad Management Group, coordinators for the project, stated that this project should be no stranger to this Committee as they have worked with staff and DPW for two years. This includes a Site Specific Permit and Wetlands Permit, from DES, as well as a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Board. This is an expansion of the recreation facilities at the campus, including playing fields and parking. They are going to briefly mention items that were brought up previously and then they will answer questions.

He stated that in 1997 the Foundation received an easement from the City for the construction of a road to connect the DPW garage to Constitution Avenue. The Planning Staff asked them to show that clearly on the plan.

DPW asked them to extend the concrete sidewalk around the cul-de-sac and that is now shown on the plans.

One issue that arose at the Planning Board was the possibility of using a parking garage and they determined that the cost of a parking space would be 10 times that of open parking and they don't see that as a fruitful alternative.

Also brought up at the Planning Board was whether field turf should be used rather than natural grass on the multi purpose field. As they evaluated this, it would require an underground piping system and would have a dual effect of not only raising the whole surface but also essentially providing some kind of drainage for the existing wetlands. For those reasons, it does not appear to make sense to them.

The Planning Board also brought up whether the drainage from this project would enhance the flow across Banfield Road. They submitted a packet demonstrating that all drainage from the site flows into what used to be the old ice pond, adjacent to Banfield and Peverly Hill and ties into the City drainage system. No water from this site crosses Banfield Road at any time.

Finally, subsequent to the time the plans were submitted, the Planning staff mentioned the travelways in the parking lot were not wide enough for two way travel and they suggested that they make it one way in the parking lot and the revised plans reflect that. They also opened the radius so that they have a full 24' wide travelway from Campus Drive, which is a private road, to the parking lot.

They have tried to develop something that is both practical for them and kind to the environment and the Campus is trying to continue their environmental sensitivity.

The Chair opened up the public hearing and called for speakers.

Harold Ecker, of 422 Banfield Road, was not speaking against the application but rather was speaking to it. He stated that water does not go uphill and he has lived there for 50 years. Since West Road was constructed and Seacoast Foundation was built, he has doubled his culverts and the water is coming from someplace. He wonders if they could pipe it down to Pike's pond, into catch basins, so he doesn't get any more water. He simply wants to see it done right. Mr. Holden asked Mr. Ecker if he believes this project will increase the flow of water towards his property? Mr. Ecker stated that he believes it will, if it is not done properly.

Phil MacDonald, project engineer, was asked by Mr. Holden the same question. It was his opinion that there would be no more water going to Mr. Ecker's property. He has been design engineer for Seacoast Health since 1996 and has done a drainage study of the entire area. The drainage plan was submitted to Committee members. The drainage is comprised of several areas through the Seacoast property to the corner of Banfield and Peverly Hill Road. They have done several things to direct the

water to holding areas which are controlled with smaller pipes for discharge. That discharge is directed towards the large maple swamp and there are some culverts and a road which chokes the flow back. None of the ponds have ever exceeded capacity. This project involves playing fields which are changing from one pervious area, being woods, to another pervious area, being lawn. There will not be a significant increase by cutting down trees and planting grass. Mr. Ecker's property is not in the same watershed as this drainage so it is unlikely that he would see any increased flow from the ballfield. Concerning the paved areas, one of the things which they worked with the Conservation Commission on was to look at mitigation as far as run off to the paved surfaces by using a pervious asphalt surface. The water goes down through the pavement, is collected by an underdrain and is slowly released off the site to a 20 acre maple swamp. They do not anticipate a significant amount from the paved surface. Mr. Ecker is correct that a significant amount of ledge is on the site. There is a high water table in the site so the ground does not have a lot of room to absorb. But this is an unchanged condition where the water is now going through the asphalt. Mr. MacDonald stated he would be happy to meet with Mr. Ecker and walk the site with him.

Mr. Iafolla stated that one thing in the past that created a flow of water on Mr. Ecker's property was the gravel parking area in Water Country. Also, the gravel parking lot, when it gets dense in a storm, acts just like pavement. That has created a problem for them at the Foundation as well. This plan has been developed in conjuncture with Water County in developing drainage swales. In that sense, the project will actually decrease the flow across Banfield Road. Secondly, he was associated with Iafolla Industries for many years and subsequent to that time the elevation borings opened up additional channels for water to flow down to Banfield Road. He owns property at the end of Banfield Road and it was not uncommon in a 5 year storm for that intersection to be under water in the 1980's and 1990's. Since 1997, The Foundation as taken a series of steps to decrease the water that flows to Banfield Road. He is the first to admit that sometime ago there were some increases.

Mr. Ecker did not want to hold this project up but asked for a condition that if he has a need for three culverts then the Foundation would be responsible for resolving the problem. He knows that Water Country is being sold to Six Flags and being combined with the Southgate Plaza. He recognizes that what Mr. MacDonald has done is good but he asked if it was good enough? He would like a little relief.

Attorney Peter Loughlin indicated that if there is any showing that they are causing an increase in flow then they are responsible but he would need some evidence of that. Mr. Holden asked if it was his position that there is no evidence right now that the Foundation is creating this situation? Attorney Loughlin agreed with that. He sympathizes with Mr. Ecker but does not believe they are responsible.

Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. MacDonald if they have any idea where the water is coming from? Mr. MacDonald thought there were multiple things that are working against those folks. When you have areas that store water and over time it gets filled in with leaves and debris, changes happen with the drainage. If an area gets filled in, it loses it ability to pound water. A study would need to begin on Mr. Ecker's property and maybe he should hire a consultant for a second opinion. There are things downstream that could be happening, channels get filled in with debris and there are many things that may be contributing to Mr. Ecker's property. He is confident it is not the Foundation property.

Mr. Iafolla added that at the time between 1996 – 1998 while they were planning Community Campus, they concurrently filed with the State and City for the quarry closure and there were a lot of concerns. The City owns a lot of drainage studies that were done at that time. 95% of the drainage on the property flows into the "Ice Pond", across from the Jewish Cemetery. His common sense opinion is if they study that area and realize there is no impact then the impact must come from the south.

Mr. Ecker stated the water that comes from his culvert has no backflow. He would like to take the ditch out and make a bigger culvert under his driveway but he can't because of the topography of the swamp. It is not backing up in his ditch either.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen referred to the detail sheets and noted that they are showing both porous pavement and turfstone uni eco-stone porous paver blocker. He asked which one are they using? Mr. MacDonald indicated that they are both on the plans and they are both impervious but they haven't entertained which they will be using. It will probably have to do with cost. Mr. Allen asked if they would both have similar infiltration characteristics? Mr. MacDonald confirmed that they would. Mr. Allen asked if the tennis courts are paved? Mr. Iafolla confirmed they are paved courts and the reason they are not porous pavement is because they are also used for basketball.

Ms. Tillman indicated that the Fire Department asked if the pathway from the sidewalk around the tennis court to the ballfield was accessible to fire department equipment and a stretcher? What is the surface? Mr. Iafolla stated that is a paved sidewalk and it would not be a problem for them to get through with a stretcher. Mr. MacDonald confirmed there is a 5' paved surface around the tennis courts and that can be widened if necessary. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold confirmed that 5' will be adequate as long as it is maintained. Mr. MacDonald stated that it ends at the tennis court and then continues on with gravel.

Mr. Holden asked if by not using artificial turf they are dramatically increasing the benefits of the soils? Mr. MacDonald stated that the retention of stormwater was not an issue but the issue was the water table elevation and they would have to raise the fields quite a bit above that. Aside from a little more impact, the bigger thing is that there would be a lot more earthwork activity with hauling and leveling and trucking in and out and they didn't think it was a good fit for this area.

Mr. Cravens noted eight monitoring wells on the site and he asked if it would be beneficial to take some levels of the ground water to see what the ground water contours are in the area? Mr. MacDonald stated that was why they put in the perzometers in, for monitoring the water elevation. They were trying to determine where all the water was coming from. Gillespie submitted a report which helped them support their drainage system intercepting the water. Most of the water was coming from Water Country. Mr. Cravens asked how deep below grade the water was? Mr. MacDonald stated it was anywhere from 12 – 36 inches.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa recused himself from the vote as he is on the Board of directors for the Child Advocacy Center.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen asked that they define on the plan that the pavement in the parking lot is porous pavement and it should be defined on the detail sheet. Also, it doesn't define what the surface is and they should note that the tennis courts are paved and also note that porous pavement is going in the parking lot and which detail they are going to use will be part of a bid. Mr. Holden suggested that the Site Plan be amended to show the choice they select. Mr. Britz added that they label it on the plans.

Mr. Holden asked about site lighting? Mr. Iafolla stated that the current plans to not call for night lighting as the parking requirement is for daytime use. Mr. Holden asked for a note on the plans stating that no lighting was approved for the parking lot, and the same note for the tennis and softball courts.

Mr. Britz asked what the X's are on the plans. Mr. MacDonald confirmed those are trees. There are two that they want to box out and save.

Mr. Holden asked that Mr. MacDonald prepare a site plan that delineates the drainage patterns of this parcel, for review by DPW and to be available for the Planning Board. He felt they needed an exhibit that better delineates what they are representing happens on this site so the Planning Board can be educated. Mr. Allen felt that the exhibit exists as part of their packet but it needs to be bigger.

Mr. Holden also requested that the applicant meet with Mr. Ecker to review the better delineated exhibit.

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

- 1) That the Site Plan shall label the surface type that is being used for each section of the plan (i.e. parking lot, tennis court, softball field);
- 2) That a note shall be added to the Site Plan Detail Sheet, indicating that only one of the porous pavement details will be used, to be determined at the time of bid;
- 3) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans indicating that no site lighting for the parking lot or ball fields was approved;
- 4) That the applicant shall prepare a site plan that delineates the drainage patterns of the parcel for review by DPW, to be available for the Planning Board;
- 5) That the applicant shall meet with Harold Ecker to review the revised drainage site plan.

.....

Mr. Holden requested to take Item G out of order and hear it next due to a conflict. Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take Item G out of order, Mr. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

G. The application of **82-86 Congress, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **82-86 Congress Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to add a 4,712 s.f. 3rd story to an existing building, renovate storefront and add mechanical equipment, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 45 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Historic District A and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD);

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, appeared representing the applicant. Mr. Chagnon stated that the plan set consists of a Boundary and Existing Conditions Plan which was updated to reflect the construction of the 3 story addition on the south end of the property in 1999/2000 which was previously a parking lot. The second plan is the Proposed Site Plan, showing where they are adding 4,712 s.f., placing an addition on the third story on the footprint of the existing building. All utilities will be connected inside the building. Both buildings are sprinkled and the new building will be too. They will have building coverage of 89%, resulting in open space of 11%. Included in the project is the renovation of the store front along Congress Street, placement of an awning on Chestnut Street extending 4' over the property line to the City right of way with a 10' clearance. There is also some rooftop HVAC equipment. They will require scaffolding on the Congress Street side which will provide for continuous sidewalk access during construction. Chestnut Street is due to be closed by the City for an experimental period and will coincide with their construction period and that is where they will do any heavy lifting.

Mr. Holden asked how will their use of Chestnut Street as a laydown area demonstrate the benefits of closing Chestnut Street? Mr. Chagnon indicated it was not meant to demonstrate the benefits but rather will coincide with the street closure. Ms. Tillman asked if that had been coordinated with the Music Hall? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they will coordinate with the Music Hall. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa added that Chestnut Street is supposed to be closed as a pedestrian walkway. He asked what type of construction equipment do they expect to have in that area? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they will not be using the area as a platform but during the construction process they may need to bring in a crane for a day or two. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa reiterated that they need to talk to the Music Hall about this. Mr. Allen stated they will need a detailed Construction Management Plan and it will be coordinated with Public Works, Fire, Police, almost on a daily basis, depending on what their activity is going to be. They would also need an encroachment permit through DPW for scaffolding, etc., and that permit gets advertised. Mr. Holden felt they would also have to advise the Council that there might be something else going on in this area that they didn't contemplate.

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. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Ms. Finnigan requested that a Construction Management Plan be prepared for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stated that if a Knox box does not exist, it should be installed. He was not sure of what the regulations require for automatic notification of emergency forces but it is required per City ordinance.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they will need to pay for the cost of the sidewalks? Mr. Holden stated if they damage anything on Congress Street they would have to repair it. He asked about the status of the sidewalks on Chestnut Street. Mr. Desfosses indicated they were installed 4-5 years ago. They are sunken and in need of repair. Allen suggested a pre construction site visit with DPW to assess the condition and make a report. Mr. Holden asked for a recommendation for the Planning Board on June 21st. Mr. Desfosses agreed with the Congress Street side but the Chestnut Street side need repairs as they are sunken. Mr. Chagnon stated if the City decides to close the street permanently and it is reconstructed, he would hate to have the sidewalks ripped up later so he was looking for some sort of future coordination. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa indicated that the closing of Chestnut Street was in an experimental phase and it will end on New Years Eve.

Mr. Allen indicated they should have the issues of the sidewalk on the Chestnut Street side addressed with this project. He would like to have it documented. Mr. Holden confirmed that the applicant is responsible for addressing any deficiencies in the sidewalk on Chestnut Street. Mr. Holden asked if they needed to have the on-site before the Planning Board meeting? Mr. Allen felt it was sufficient for now. Mr. Desfosses wanted to make sure it was understood that the Congress Street sidewalks are brand new and any damage whatsoever will have to be repaired.

Mr. Cravens noted there are two domestic water services on this lot and asked if they should convert over to one? Mr. Allen asked if there were two meters and if there are condos? Mr. Chagnon confirmed it was single ownership. Mr. Holden suggested only allowing one meter and that would force a discussion. Mr. Cravens also requested that the water service be reviewed to determine that the water service can handle the additional floor.

Mr. Holden requested that they verify that address with Thomas Richter, from DPW. The parking calculations must be approved by Lucy Tillman. The project is subject to a license for the awning on Chestnut Street. All HVAC equipment shall comply with city standards on noise. A note shall be added to the Site Plan that no restaurant is proposed in this structure and as such no grease trap is required. Mr. Allen added that if in the future a restaurant goes in, then exterior land would be required for the installation of an external grease trap.

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

- 1) That a Construction Management Plan shall be prepared for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 2) That a Knox box and automatic notification of emergency services are required and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 3) That the applicant shall be responsible for the reconstruction of City standard sidewalks along the Chestnut Street side of the property and it is further understood that the Congress Street sidewalks are brand new and any damage whatsoever will have to be repaired
- 4) That a note shall be added to the Site Plan that only one water meter will be allowed for the site;
- 5) That the water service shall be reviewed by a mechanical engineer to determine that the water service can handle the additional floor, and a report shall be provided to Thomas Cravens and the Planning Department for review and approval;
- 6) That the applicant shall confirm the address of the property with Thomas Richter of DPW;
- 7) That parking calculations shall be reviewed and approved by Lucy Tillman, and a note shall be added to the Site Plans;
- 8) That the proposed awning on Chestnut Street shall be subject to a City license;
- 9) That all HVAC equipment shall comply with city standards on noise; and
- 10) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that no restaurant is proposed in this structure and, as such, no grease trap is required. However, if in the future a restaurant goes in, then exterior land would be required for the installation of an external grease trap;

.....
II NEW BUSINESS

C. The application of **Pike Industries, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **650 Peverly Hill Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to demolish two existing asphalt plants and replace with one new 6,353 s.f., 66.5' high asphalt plant, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 254 as Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bernard W. Pelech, Attorney for the applicant, addressed the Board. He indicated that Pike Industries plans to replace the two old existing asphalt plants at the site which, combined, have a 400 ton per hour capacity. The plan is to demolish the two plants and bring a new plant on site resulting in the same amount of output. The plants will be in the same existing footprint, there will be no changes to the impervious surface, and no changes to traffic flow or stormwater run off. Attorney Pelech indicated he would turn the presentation over to Corey Colwell of AMES MSC. Also present was a team from Pike Industries, including Brian Slevin, Special Project Manager, Jonathan Oakes, Plant Manager, Larry Major, Regional Coordinator, Derek Hill, Regional Manager, and Al D'Antonio, Consultant.

Corey Colwell, of AMES MSC, indicated that the parcel was located in the industrial zone and was 26 acres in size. The front portion of the lot is behind the A&M Paint building and the existing DPW building is just to the south of the plants. Truck traffic comes in from Peverly Hill Road between DPW and A&M Paint, and accesses the asphalt plant to the west of the entrance. There are two existing asphalt plants on the site. The plan set contains two sheets – the Existing Features Plan and the Proposed Asphalt Plan. The two existing plants will be removed and the new plant will be constructed in the same location. The plant contains various components, including silos, conveyers and retaining walls to facilitate truck unloading. The plant is mobile and can be moved. They will relocate one existing hydrant and it will be moved 100' easterly and the old water line to the hydrant will be abandoned. They will remove some existing retaining walls and they will be reconstructed. There are some transformers that will have to be relocated. The proposed location of the plant is entirely paved so there is no change in imperious area. The plant is approximately 68' high and they are maintaining all set back requirements.

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:

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to approve. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Ms. Finnigan asked when the project is being built, the loading and unloading and weighing of trucks bringing materials to the site should not be on the driveway of DPW but should be on their site.

Mr. Desfosses asked what the capacity changes were? Mr. Oakes stated there will be no capacity changes. The intent is to break ground in November for plant operation in April of 2008.

Mr. Cravens asked if the control room and quality control lab are new or existing? Mr. Colwell confirmed they are existing. Mr. Cravens noted that the quality control trailer says it is to be relocated and he asked where it will be going? Mr. Colwell did not know exactly but it will be part of the new plant.

Mr. Allen indicated that Peverly Hill Road southbound going up hill, has some serious delamination happening and he proposed that their paving contractor look at milling and overlaying that section of road coming up to the site.

Mr. Holden asked if they made a requirement that the air quality permit be included prior to the issuance of the building permit, does that mess up their scheduling? Larry Major, of Pike Industries, stated that normally air permits won't be issued until they receive approval from the City. Mr. Allen indicated that he was not concerned with that. Mr. Holden indicated that would not be a condition then.

Mr. Holden asked how did the land use records reflect the termination of the 60' wide easement for the future right of way? Mr. Colwell stated that all records indicate it was terminated as shown on the plan at the cul de sac. To connect the two may be a good planning move but on record that is the terminus. Mr. Holden asked him to show the terminus on the plan. Mr. Colwell confirmed that it is currently shown on the plan.

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

- 1) That when the project is being built, the loading and unloading and weighing of trucks bringing materials to the site should not be on the driveway of DPW but should be on their site; and

- 2) That the applicant shall be responsible for milling and overlaying the section of Peverly Hill Road southbound going up hill road coming up to the site.

.....

D. The application of **Millennium Borthwick, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **155 Borthwick Avenue**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to install an 18.5” x 11’ above grade concrete emergency generator pad, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 259 as Lot 14-1 and lies within the Industrial (I) District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Eric Weinrieb, of Altus Engineering, representing the applicant, North American Dialysis Services, who are proposing to construct a 11 x 18 concrete pad for an emergency generator which is critical for the tenant’s operations. They have identified the area of detail and referred to a second plan which shows where the pad is going on the site. The pad is 4’ off the building and 10’ off of the non-jurisdictional wetland. They are proposing a 360 KW 450 volt emergency generator, needed for back up power for dialysis. It will be auto tested once a week and once a month they will run a 20 minute test. There is a double wall fuel container tank holding 676 gallons. Additionally, subsequent to Pre-TAC they decided to include a curb around the outside of the pad to prevent any spillage from the tank. The generator is only going to be filled once a year so that will be a precaution. They asked for approval from the Committee.

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:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses asked if this unit coincides with the decimal ratings in the Zoning Ordinance? Mr. Holden confirmed this was an emergency generator so it is exempt.

Mr. Chmilariski, of AHK Consulting Engineers, stated that the decimal level is 75 at 23 feet of the unit. The unit is in the back of the building so there are no pedestrian walkways next to it.

Mr. Holden asked if Mr. Weinrieb indicated that he is having a lip on the foundation and he asked him to please describe it. Mr. Weinrieb stated there will be a rim around it of 12”.

Mr. Holden asked about the fences and if they were going to provide to the Planning Board a photo showing the fencing that is up there for their approval.

Mr. Allen stipulated that the exercise hours are within the normal working hours, i.e. 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m., weekdays. He asked if they are doing weekly exercises? Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that would be fine.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Weinrieb to put all stipulations on the site plan.

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

- 1) That the applicant shall provide a photo of the proposed fencing to the Planning Board for their review; and
- 2) That a note shall be added to the Site Plan indicating that the weekly test exercises shall be done during normal weekday business hours.

.....

E. The application of **David F. Mahoney Martial Qtip Trust, Owner, and Granite State Minerals, Applicant**, for property located at 227 Market Street, wherein in Site Review approval is requested to relocate an existing 24' x 58' scale building and to install a second scale, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 6 and lies within the Waterfront Industrial (WI) District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernard Pelech appeared on behalf of the applicant and indicated that due to a change of requirements of weights and measures, they are going to place a second scale on site, next to the existing scale and entrance. As a result the existing office building will be relocated and they have received the necessary variances to move it back 15'. A new 10 x 17 scale will be constructed. They are doing this as weights and measures as they require trucks to be weighed on site and also weighed before they exit. The only change to the site is the relocated sewer line and 1" and 2" water line to service the relocated office building. Traffic flow will not change and the existing scale will be used for trucks leaving the site.

The Chair opened the public hearing and called for speakers.

Don Peterson, representing Sheraton Harborside and Harborcorp, indicated that he was hoping to see a plan to review. David Desfosses gave him his plan.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair kept the hearing open.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses indicated that there is a major drainage outfall on the lot which needs to be shown on the plan as it is very important to the City.

Mr. Holden referred to page 5 of the Site Review Regulations which lists a minimum of 16 things that should be included. He suggests postponing this matter until a plan depicting those items is submitted. That being said, Mr. Desfosses needed to know whether they have a drainage easement for that drainage pipe and whether or not that exists for that function.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone this matter. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Ms. Finnigan stated that they need to label the traffic pattern coming in and going out and the truck turns coming into and out of the site.

Mr. Britz would like to know what the edge of the Piscataqua River is, whether it is the high or low tide line?

Ms. Tillman asked for more detail concerning Market and Deer Street where the driveway cuts are, by the brick wall. Also, abutters should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Cravens asked for clarification on what is going on with the existing and proposed water. They should provide both an Existing Features and Proposed Conditions plan.

Mr. Desfosses mentioned that typically they ask the applicant to upgrade the sidewalk in front of the site.

Mr. Holden assumed the motion to postpone would be until July 3rd.

The motion to postpone to the July 3rd TAC meeting passed unanimously.

Mr. Holden suggested meeting at Pre-TAC that morning to further discuss this plan.

Comments from the June 5, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1) The applicant should comply with the Site Review Regulations. See Page 5 which lists a minimum of 16 items that should be included;
- 2) The major drainage outfall on the lot needs to be shown on the plans as it is very important to the City;
- 3) The applicant should confirm whether they have a drainage easement for the drainage pipe;
- 4) That the Site Plans should label the traffic pattern coming in and going out of the site, as well as truck turns;
- 5) The edge of the Piscataqua River should be identified on the Site Plan (i.e. high tide line or low tide line);
- 6) That more detail should be provided concerning the intersection at Market Street and Deer Street where the driveway cuts are, by the brick wall;
- 7) That abutters should be shown on the Site Plan;
- 8) That the Site Plan Set should consist of an Existing Features Plan and a Proposed Conditions Plan;
- 9) That the water service needs to be clarified, both existing and proposed;
- 10) That the applicant will be responsible for upgrading the sidewalk in front of the site.

.....

F. The application of **Parade Office, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street** (aka Parade Mall) wherein Site Review approval is requested to demolish the existing building and construct four buildings, consisting of the following: 1) construct a 10,000 ± s.f. 5-story 28-unit residential building; 2) construct a 25,800 ± s.f. 5-story hotel, restaurant and retail building; 3) construct a 45,600 ± s.f. 4-story office, restaurant and retail building; and 4) construct a 24,600 ± s.f. 4-story office, restaurant and retail building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Historic District A and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD);

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Gregg Mikolaties, of Appledore Engineering, addressed the Committee. Also present were Jeff Johnston and Joshua Anderson from Cathartes Investments, Tom Kinslow, from Elkus/Manfredi Architects, Robin Bousa from VHB Traffic Engineers, Attorney Alec McEachern and Patrick Crimmins from Appledore Engineering. They have attended a Pre-TAC meeting on February 2nd and April 3rd, and their goal at those meetings was just to show them where they were and where they were going and to solicit their input. They have had a number of meetings with DPW staff, they have met

with Verizon, PSNH, the City fire department, Dave Allen, Deputy Director of DPW and they have had pre-scoping meetings with Steve Parkinson and Deb Finnigan. They had a work session on May 10th. They are present before them with a Site Review Application and they are trying to obtain their building permits as soon as possible.

Mr. Mikolaities noted that the public notice lists the building footprints so he reviewed the square footage and uses of the four buildings.

Tom Kinslow, of Elkus/Manfredi Architects, pointed out an aerial photograph showing the existing building and he stated they are looking to consolidate that site with the greater downtown Portsmouth. In the middle of the project they are extending Vaughn Street through the site, which would be a private way. Retail would face all fronts of the private way and the hotel would have an entrance off the private way. The private office entries are also off the private way. They feel that most people will enter via Russell Street. They will have a one way double lane parallel parked street with a narrow sidewalk on one side of the street and a wider sidewalk on the other side and vehicles will move through the site. The parking entry is on Hanover Street into the underground garage, which helps them by consolidating all of the cores of the building down into the basement. The vehicles can be internally queued on site without backing up Maplewood Avenue.

He showed the upper stories where it really becomes four buildings. They are separating the office buildings with a 50' cut which allows the sun to penetrate into the area. They pull back to a one story along Maplewood.

Mr. Mikolaities walked them through the five Site Plan handouts. He felt that a tremendous amount of thought went into the layout of the site and pedestrian connections.

The Existing Conditions Plan has the three building footprint superimposed on the existing conditions plan. The existing curbcut will be closed and there will be one new curbcut for one way in, one existing curbcut on Maplewood Avenue will be closed and the exit from the garage will be a new curbcut. Hanover Street would have the exit from the private drive, the entrance to the garage and the exit from the hotel/residential area.

The second sheet was the proposed site plan and was described by Mr. Kinslow. They are proposing to extend the Portsmouth City standard sidewalks and lighting all around the perimeter. They are also extending the same brick color and pattern up the private way. The Landscape Architects came up with the darker brick banding for something a little different inside the site. They are also using a different light fixture up and down the right of way.

There are four boxes on the Plans which represent proposed outdoor seating of about 2,700 s.f. on the east side and two on the west side. There is some parking behind the residential and hotel. There is a 24 car lot that will be gated and landscaped and is designated parking for the Hill. There are several cross sections leading to The Hill.

They submitted a Site Plan Summary with their application which Mr. Mikolaities walked them through. The minimum open space requirement is 5% and they are proposing 19%. Structure coverage maximum is 95% and they are proposing 59%. Parking that goes with the five proposed uses require 1,027 spaces and they are providing 1,088 spaces. Those do not include the 24 spaces for the Hill nor does it include the 7 valet spaces.

Mr. Mikolaities addressed grading and drainage. This is one item they need to meet with David Desfosses for further discussion. He pointed out the existing water shed which showed what flows in which direction. They are matching for square foot the same drainage and they are balancing it so half goes each way. Mr. Desfosses indicated that the more they can send to Deer Street the better off they will be. Mr. Mikolaities next reviewed the utility plan. They will be recommending an off line

meeting with DPW to work through the details. They prepared a proposed utility exhibit showing dark red as the extent of the parking garage. They are trying to get grease traps and drainage structures outside of that red line. The purpose was to show that there is a lot of detail and thought going into this. Regarding water, there will be one domestic tie in off of Maplewood. They will have individual fire connections for the individual buildings shown in blue. They added a hydrant by the hotel and another on the raised island by the Hill parking lot. They had a discussion yesterday with Mr. Allen to tie sewer into Hanover Street. The proponent is willing to repave the section they disturb. They will sit down and talk to Peter Rice, Dave Allen & Dave Desfosses about the sewer connections on Hanover Street. They show electrical transformers and Mr. Mikolaities indicated they have had numerous meetings with PSNH. They have already met with Verizon and Comcast. Yesterday they met with PSNH and the intent is to install an upgraded panel out to Maplewood Street. They are proposing 7 grease traps and they want to have a discussion with the City about consolidating some of those grease traps. There will be a continental breakfast in the hotel, coffee shop, café and larger restaurants on the site. Landscaping and lighting was done by Sasaki. They have come up with a very interesting pattern with the granite bands and the granite curbing and they have a raised traffic calming table through the site. They will sit down and talk to Lucy about some of the species of trees as they are proposing trees all along the project perimeter.

Mr. Mikolaities reviewed the Site Plans very quickly. On Sheet C-1 they show existing easements and on C-4 they show the relocation of some of those easements. They are creating nine off site parking spaces on Deer Street. They coordinated their plans with the Westin plans and they brought the sidewalks inside the property lines. They have shown the ground level site plan showing the entrance and exits. They have added some signage and striping to the exit which is right turn only. They have moved their loading which will only be allowed between 6:00 a.m.– 9:00 a.m. and have a special loading area for residential. There will be trash shoots down to the basement. They talked about the utilities and he knows they need to meet with the City. There are erosion control notes on the plans. The last two sheets are landscaping and lighting plans.

Robin Bousa, Director of Transportation Systems from VHB addressed traffic. They submitted a very thick traffic study to the Committee. They recently spent quite a bit of time reviewing the Westin Hotel plans. They reviewed all of Russell Street from Market Street and Deer Street to Maplewood Avenue. They also went the next block over to Hanover to Market Street. They took a conservative approach to the study and they took a very conservative look at trip generation. They used ITE rates for all different land use codes. It does assume any interaction from users and uses a straight rate approach. The ITE rates do not consider the downtown approach to the project. They are assuming it is all vehicle trips to the site. The raw data quickly identified that weekday peak hour is the critical time. The traffic flow is predominantly coming in the morning from I-95 Market Street and it's the same in the evening. That works very well with their traffic flow on site. Traffic comes down Market and takes a right on to Hanover, right into the garage. They take a right out of the garage and back out to the interchange. It is one directional traffic flow on site. They found with the study that traffic trying to get out of the city at the end of the day is faced with long delays. The Westin decided to put a signal in at Maplewood and Market. They looked at what would be in the best interest of the City. They will make it an attractive route for everyone by doubling up the left turn lane coming out of Russell on to Market and cutting back the median. The pavement is currently very wide and the Westin narrows up the entry way but they suggest widening it up a little bit. There are minor construction issues but they buy significant life until year 2020. The analysis takes traffic and reassigns it and gives them a Level B in 2020.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the application.

Don Peterson, of the Westin/Harborcorp, stated that they have a revised plan that has been approved by the City and he asked Ms. Bousa to call Giles Ham to get a copy. He asked a question regarding stormwater and which way the City would like it to be directed. Also, if the applicant has reviewed the existing capacity and what is their opinion of the existing condition?

Sharon Somers, Attorney for The Hill Condominium Association. They have been in a number of meetings before the HDC and she submitted a letter to the Traffic & Safety Committee. The Hill residents are direct abutters in the midst of this project and they have some concerns including on-site traffic issues and loading and delivering. They have been working with the applicant and will continue to do so and hope to report back on the results of those discussions.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair kept the public hearing open.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses indicated he had not had a chance to digest the plans as there is so much information but he had some questions. He asked about retail in the four buildings. He asked if the hotel building had retail on the first floor. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that it does, predominantly on the right of way side. Mr. Desfosses asked if buildings 1, 3 & 4 had retail all the way around? Mr. Kinslow displayed the color Site Plan and described the different areas. Mr. Desfosses indicated that he looks forward to reviewing their private street details. They are really creating a connection to the Vaughn Mall and he would like to see how they are going to connect to the Vaughn Mall so that it is more seamless. How are they going to move and adjust the other side of Hanover Street and where are pedestrians cross. That is going to be a very large pedestrian thoroughfare and they need to put more thought into that.

Mr. Cravens did not have any comments at this time but he looks forward to a meeting to discuss water issues.

Mr. Allen has an aesthetic item that may help them with future presentations. Their architectural plans and engineers plans are flipped 180 degrees and they should be the same. Snow removal could be an issue in their private way and their parking lot as they cannot drop it on the City street. Mr. Allen noted that the utility plans have already changed since yesterday and are different from what was submitted in their packets so he wants to make sure they don't have confusion over which plan is current. He feels that going the gravity route going out to Hanover with sewer is much better than a pump system. Regarding the PSNH issue, Mike Coffey has been in contact with them and they will have to sit down and discuss it. Overall the plan should include defined paving limits and limits of work when they are refined.

Ms. Finnigan stated that the Westin project is proposing one way on Deer Street and that impacts their traffic analysis. She is not sure if they can request for that to be looked at or wait until the Planning Board approves the Westin project? Mr. Holden stated that the Planning Board is reviewing the Westin project on June 7th. Mr. Peterson made offer to meet with Mr. Ham to see where they are at. Ms. Finnigan stated that at some point they will need a detailed Construction Management Plan and it needs to be approved prior to construction. She would like to see a plan of trash pick up and hours of pick up and 7:00 – 9:00 a.m. is not an opportune time and 4:00 – 6:00 pm is also not good as that intersection is busy at those times. She indicated that this needs to be referred to Traffic & Safety and she can put them on next week's agenda, with an on-site. Ms. Finnigan indicated that they will also need to look at how trucks will access that area based on the fact that they are going one way to a left turn from Market to Russell and they show a left turn lane.

Ms. Finnigan noted they are basing a lot of their mitigation on the fact that the Westin is already done but if the Westin doesn't go through, it would change their entire impact. She asked what happens if the Westin does not get done? Mr. Holden suggested having Mr. Mikolaities report back to Ms. Finnigan on that eventually.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Plan C-5-A, on Deer Street there are no pavement markings shown and crosswalks should be added. They need to look at what it looks like and show it on the plan. She

requested that a warning system coming out of the garage be included. She did not believe that pavement markings and a sign coming out of the garage are not enough. She asked why that accessway wasn't angled more and if they are they having signage on the garage or not, and if it exists, it needs to be submitted. The right of way line is too vague. Either make a detail or make a smaller right of way to make it clearer. She doesn't see any construction project signs detailed on the plans. On the parking lot for the Parade Mall, there are stairs and she asked if they could do a tip down instead. It does not appear that they are ADA accessible for the Hill and that needs to be addressed. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed the islands are flush with the pavement. Tim Lavine from Olympia Development stated that there is a controlled traffic device. He also confirmed that there is ADA accessibility to the parking for The Hill as there is a grade change and the ADA component is from the other side where the grade is flush.

Ms. Finnigan asked if the crosswalks on private property need to be city standard and Mr. Mikolaities is to report back on that. She requested that they make sure the tip down units are on private property. She asked for a better detail of the traffic intersection as she does not know what the slope is, how wide it is, whether brick pavers are an appropriate use, etc. Ms. Finnigan also asked them to keep in mind on the Landscaping Plan that all trees need to be a minimum from the ground to the first limb 6-8 feet.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa indicated that they are trying to tighten up construction issues. They are getting bogus 911 calls because retail stores use 9 to get an outside line. He asked if they could please contact the City's Communication Supervisor, Gil Emery, to see if another digit could be used. Concerning the hotel, the City does not know if a repeater needs to be installed inside the building. They ask that new buildings go through a Motorola carrier to see if a repeater needs to be installed to facilitate communication. Any expense of this should be picked up by the applicant and should be coordinated with Gil Emery.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold was concerned about the turning movement of fire trucks into the site. He was looking at the potential of entering from High Street and then being forced to make a sharp turn to get to the first parking space. The alternative is to enter off Hanover Street and through the parking lot. It looks like there is a section that might prevent a vehicle from entering that way and making a sharp left turn and then a sharp right turn. He noted the addition of a hydrant to the traffic island which is appropriate but he wants to make sure it provides maximum available flow. He also noted that they propose to relocate a hydrant on the Deer Street side, there is an existing hydrant at Deer and Maplewood and then there is another one on the Hanover Street side. Somebody did mention having a wall hydrant installed on the interior of the pedestrian private road way and he thinks they really need to look at that. He would like to see a proposal with detail specs.

Ms. Tillman had a question concerning the restaurants. She asked if the outside dining area is included in the gross square footage? Mr. Mikolaities stated it was not included and he will change that. Ms. Tillman also advised them of the Liquor Review Committee which reviews all service of alcohol and they report to the State. If there is any place that needs screening under the State Liquor Commission, that needs to be reviewed by the HDC. Mr. Mikolaities stated he will update the outdoor seating and the parking plan.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that the right of way should be labeled and signed to make it very clear that it is one way.

Mr. Holden indicated that they could use a profile on the proposed private way. Also, they should submit some specification on the pavement and include something to differentiate it other than just the signs, to show that this proposal is not for a public street. He asked if they are going to be doing meters on the private way and they should show what they are thinking of using. Mr. Holden confirmed that they will re-advertise for the next hearing and he asked Mr. Mikolaities to contact Jane Shouse to make the legal notice more encompassing. He also felt that since the Vaughn Mall is so

important, a section of the plan should show the physical tie in issues so they will know what it looks like across the street. Also they probably need to do that on the Maplewood side so they can see the complete connections. He asked them to report back on whether they are doing anything with Mass Transit Facilities or bikes? He asked them to look at the Agreements and approved Site Plans for the Hilton Garden Inn to avoid and address any potential easement conflicts. In particular, he would like to hear how the applicant will address the easement and their conformance of it. He asked if they are proposing gates or bars to the right of way? Mr. Mikolaities stated they are not. Mr. Holden asked if the street would be open 24/7? Mr. Mikolaities stated there would be special events where it would be closed off. Mr. Holden stated they would need details on how that would be done.

Attorney Alec McEachern confirmed he will address those issues to the City Attorney and they will go on the Site Plans.

Mr. Holden requested that they add a section on the site plan to list the appropriate State and Federal permits so the City can maintain the status. He knows that Attorney McEachern is also working on that and in particular there are several DES permits that will be required. Mr. Holden assumes they will have trash receptacles, and they should add a detail for those. Planting plan should show any public benefits.

Mr. Holden suggested tabling this matter to the July 3rd TAC meeting, with a Pre-TAC that morning. Mr. Mikolaities confirmed that they are trying to meet with City staff next week.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this application to the July 3rd TAC meeting. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the July 3rd TAC meeting passed unanimously.

The following is a list of general comments from the Committee of items which they are looking for additional information on. As these are refined further, more information and specific conditions will be identified.

- That a detail profile of the street shall be prepared for presentation to this Committee;
- That the connection to the Vaughn Mall shall be detailed and the applicant should attempt to make it more “seamless”;
- That the applicant meet with Tom Cravens regarding water issues;
- That the orientation of both the Site Plan and the Architectural Plan be the same;
- Snow removal should be addressed;
- The current utility plan should be more clearly marked;
- That the gravity sewer route going out to Hanover Street is preferred over a pump system;
- That a meeting with Mike Coffey of PSNH will be required;
- The Site Plan should define paving limits and limits of work;
- That the Harborcorp/Westin Site Plans, proposed land conveyances and traffic analysis should be reviewed by the applicant;
- That a detailed Construction Management Mitigation Plan will be required;
- Plan of trash removal, including hours, to be identified;
- Add detail showing the type/location for trash receptacles
- Referral to the Traffic & Safety Committee;
- A plan delineating truck movements to access loading areas needs to be submitted;
- A plan delineating turning movements of fire trucks needs to be submitted;
- That the applicant report back to TAC on what would happen if the Harborcorp/Westin does not go through;
- That Plan C-5-A should include pavement markings;
- That a warning system be proposed for exiting the garage;
- That the applicant consider angling the garage accessway more;

- That the right of way line is vague and should be identified as a detail;
- Construction project signs should be added to the Site Plans;
- That the applicant should report back to TAC on whether crosswalks located on private property need to be done to city standards;
- Identify if tip downs are located on private property
- Provide a better detail of the traffic intersection to include slope, width, etc.;
- Coordinate with Gil Emery, City Communications Supervisor, regarding using a digit other than “9” for outside calls;
- That testing be done at the expense of the applicant to determine whether a repeater needs to be installed and said analysis to be coordinated with Gil Emery;
- Confirm that the proposed hydrant on the traffic island provides maximum available flow;
- Provide details for review by TAC of a wall hydrant installed on the interior of the pedestrian right of way, with detail specs;
- Restaurant square footage to be refigured to include outside dining areas;
- Any outdoor screening required by the State Liquor Commission will require HDC review;
- That the private street should be labeled and signed to make it clear that it is one way;
- Provide specifications on the pavement and include ways to differentiate that the proposed street is not a public street;
- Details should be provided on the type of parking meters/monetary systems;
- That the physical tie in to the Vaughn Mall should be added to the plans, as well as on the Maplewood side;
- Report back on Mass Transit Facilities and accommodations for bicycles;
- Review Site Review Agreements and approved Site Plans for the Hilton Garden Inn so as to avoid and address any potential conflicts with prior stipulations;
- Report on how applicant will address all easements and their conformance of it;
- Report on how/when closing the private street for special events;
- List State and Federal permits on the Site Plans;
- Planting Plan should show public benefits;

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:45 p.m.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant
Planning Department