

MINUTES OF MEETING
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2:00 P.M.

AUGUST 5, 2008

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

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

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Minnow Realty Investors, III, LLC, Owner and City of Portsmouth, Applicant**, for property located at **3000 Lafayette Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 13,260 s.f. footprint Fire Station, after the demolition of existing buildings, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 292 as Lot 12 and lies within the General Business and proposed Municipal District. (This application was postponed at the July 1, 2008 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 to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

David Emanuel, PE, from Emanuel Engineering, presented on behalf of the applicant. Also present was Anita Stroff, of Winter Street Architects, and Chief Chris LeClair and Deputy Chief Steve Achilles from Portsmouth Fire Department. Mr. Emanuel indicated this site was on the corner of Ocean and Lafayette Roads at the old Irving Oil site. He reviewed last month's comments.

He explained that they have been working with NHDOT regarding their driveway permit. They submitted an application approximately one month ago and updated it with some additional information that they requested. Everything is now in their hands and he has made attempts to verify when things will be processed by and he still awaits word from NHDOT but the feedback so far has been positive. He has met with David Desfosses and Steve Parkinson, of DPW, regarding their stormwater management. They have revised their stormwater management calculations and concept. There are no catch basins on the site and they have re-graded so they should not adversely effect their neighbors. The Landscape Architect met with Ms. Finnigan and Ms. Tillman and revised some landscaping details as well as integrated that with stormwater management concepts and snow storage, per DPW comments. They have shown existing trees and made notes to grade around them when possible to maintain as many trees on site as possible. They added bike racks as requested and shown additional detail on specific drainage items which had been requested. They revised their lighting plan and they updated their sign details.

Mr. Emanuel indicated that they have a few outstanding items. Traffic flow is intended to enter from Ocean Road and the fire trucks and equipment will enter from the rear of the fire station and when they have a service call they will exit from the front of the fire station onto Lafayette Road. They have a 21 space visitor parking area and a 10-12 space employee parking space area. The overall general items include the stormwater has two catch basins which are existing, one at the corner of Lafayette and Ocean Road and the other at the corner of the dry cleaners lot and Lafayette Road. They have maintained comparable stormwater discharge post development as they have on pre development. The dark areas represent their proposed paved or impervious areas. They have relocated the firefighter memorial from the existing fire station site. The landscaping has been revised per a meeting and he understands they have one more reiteration to go through, specifically in the rain garden and around the building area and they welcome feedback on that. The other feedback that they had received was to increase parking space sizes in the visitor parking area from current zoning requirements of 8 ½' per space to proposed zoning of 9' so that this will be compliant with future zoning requirements.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Emanuel to review some of the water improvements they will be making out front. Mr. Emanuel reviewed their stormwater management improvements. The roof top area of the building will drain to a rain garden concept which is basically a 4' deep crushed stone area which is behind the patio, along the front or main entrance of the building and out in front of the conference room. In that area they have soil condition which will allow some drainage through it and they are planning on using the rest of it in conjunction with the landscaping on site. From stormwater flowing from the driveway and the parking lot, it will run forward and they have a lower area that will store and detain the water so that it is discharged at approximately the same rate as the catch basin. They are not increasing any structures but are just regarding to make the water flow and slow down so that it is an acceptable rate. On the other side of the project, water will run down along a swale behind the employee parking area and the training pad and along the property line and they have specified a clay loam base for the landscaped area along the landscaped buffer between their site and the existing dry cleaner. They have proposed a one outlet structure that will control the stormwater flow off the site that will flow to the existing State catch basin. Mr. Emanuel explained they have proposed all of these items because they have minimal maintenance and minimal cost as opposed to some of the traditional stormwater management concepts. Their largest challenge was the grade and elevation on this site as it is very flat. To have a full catch basin system, if there was ever a problem on Longmeadow Road the water would back up on to the fire station site and they did not want that to happen. They worked with DPW to add one catch basin at a low point on the apron ramp because the high point for Lafayette Road is close to the intersection and all of that water flows away from Ocean Road. That catch basin will be fit with a snout and normal Best Management practices equipment.

Mr. Holden asked if it is still the intent to produce a LEED certified building? Mr. Emanuel confirmed that was his understanding.

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. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval and send this on to the Planning Board with stipulations and a work session before the Planning Board. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses requested an executive summary to the drainage study so that it is easier to read.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they took into account the Dry Cleaners roof when they sized the outlet structure for the catch basin in front of the fire station as all of his water flows to that point too. Mr. Emanuel responded that they looked at that and he has a catch basin in front of his site and Mr. Emanuel believed it actually flowed to his as opposed to across, but he indicated he will look at that. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that he should look at that.

Ms. Desfosses asked them to list the mounting heights for the luminars for the site. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that he has been in contact with the engineer quite extensively so they have worked out most of their concerns already.

Mr. Cravens noted that the water main extension that is going to be done in front of the project will run almost the full length of the project in front will be a 10" water rather than a 12" as shown on the plans. At the end, Mr. Cravens indicated he would like it terminated with a gate valve so they can extend it later if needed. Right before the gate valve, there is a 1 1/2" water line going out to the intersection and they would like to tap that into the 10" water main.

Mr. Cravens referred to the 8" fire service entering the property and indicated he would like to see a gate valve for the hydrant and a gate valve for the fire service right before it enters the building so that either one can be turned off without effecting the other for repairs or maintenance. He is recommending that the domestic water service be tapped on the downtown side of the fire service to reduce any water quality complaint.

Mr. Allen acknowledged that they had been talking to DOT about the stormwater so a stipulation would be that the City gets concurrence from DOT on the stormwater plan. Mr. Emanuel stated that has existing which he is happy to show them. He has the as built DOT drawings for the Ocean Road improvements and they compared their field data with the design plans as well as the DOT plans. Mr. Allen confirmed that was what Mr. Desfosses was talking about, needing the narrative on that drainage study. Also, Mr. Allen requested on the drainage study that Ms. Finnigan and Ms. Tillman were going to be working on some modifications to the Landscape Plan and that drainage swale in the back needs to be kept in consideration when they do planting along the back edge. The last plan he saw had some conflicts between the swale and the plantings.

Mr. Cravens referred to the Site Utility Plan, Sheet C-5, Note 12, he would like to add to the end of that note, "and NH Water Well Board Requirements". They have a close out form they make them out.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Sheet C-4 B, Note 1, C-4 and indicated that the record number was not there. The mast arm shown on this plan shall be outside the new DOT right of way line. That any the applicant should review any conflicts with the proposed or existing utilities with the proposed conduit from the mast arm next to the firehouse. That a button be included inside the building, to be determined by the Fire Chief, and added to the plan. That they get specifications for the specific equipment for approval by the City and DOT. That the face sequence diagram be fixed to represent what is actually shown on the plan. The an additional pre-emption strobe be installed on the Longmeadow Road mast arm. That the note referring to the pre-emption receivers be put on the mast arms rather than the signal poles, and that note needs to be changed. That the proposed fire signal head shall have all 12" lenses. Ms. Finnigan asked the traffic engineer why were the phases changed on the signals? The numbers changed so she is assuming that the controller will also be changed but it is not included in this plan. Ms. Finnigan will need a CMMP and approved prior to construction, including protecting the catch basins in and around the site. Just for the record, that the parking spaces will be 9' wide instead of 8.5' wide. That the Driveway Permit will be approved by NHDOT prior to construction. That the pre-emption plan also be approved by NHDOT and DPW prior to construction. She confirmed that the meeting between Ms. Tillman, Assistant Fire Chief Achilles and herself has been scheduled for tomorrow at 11:00.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa requested that the communication set up approved by the Communications Center at the Police Station.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold requested that the underground utilities are clearly identified so they have all of the proper information.

Mr. Britz was all set.

Mr. Holden asked Ms. Finnigan if one of the stipulations would be that prior to the issuance of a permit, they have approval from NHDOT on the curbcuts or any other improvements? Ms. Finnigan confirmed she already requested that.

The motion to recommendation Site Review approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1.) That an executive summary to the drainage study shall be prepared for review by DPW so that it is easier to read;
- 2.) That the applicant shall review and make certain that they took into account the abutters roof (dry cleaners) when they sized the outlet structure for the catch basin in front of the fire station;
- 3.) That the applicant shall list the mounting heights for the luminars on the Site Plans;
- 4.) That the water main extension that will run along the front of the project shall be a 10" water service, rather than the 12" water service shown on the Site Plans;
- 5.) That the water service shall end with a gate valve so they can extend it later if needed, and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 6.) That the 1 ½" water line going out the intersection, right before the water gate valve, should be tapped into the 10" water main;
- 7.) That the 8" fire service entering the property shall have a gate valve for the hydrant and a gate valve for the fire service right before it enters the building (so that either one can be turned off without effecting the other for repairs or maintenance), and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 8.) That the domestic water service shall be tapped on the downtown side of the fire service, and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 9.) That the applicant shall provide the City with a letter of concurrence from NHDOT on the Stormwater Plan;
- 10.) That the Landscape Plan shall be reviewed for any conflicts with the drainage swale in the back of the property;
- 11.) That Note 12 on Sheet C-5 (Site Utility Plan) shall include wording at the end as follows: "and NH Water Well Board Requirements";
- 12.) That Note 1 on Sheet C-4 shall include the record number;
- 13.) That the mast arm shown on the Site Plan shall be outside the new DOT right of way line;
- 14.) That the applicant shall review any conflicts with the proposed or existing utilities with the proposed conduit from the mast arm next to the firehouse;
- 15.) That the Fire Chief shall determine whether a signal pre-emption button shall be included inside the building and shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 16.) That the applicant shall obtain specifications for the fire equipment for approval by NHDOT and the City;
- 17.) That the face sequence diagram shall be revised to represent what is actually shown on the Site Plan;
- 18.) That an additional pre-emption strobe shall be placed on the Longmeadow Road mast arm;
- 19.) That the note referring to the pre-emption receivers shall be changed to indicate that they should be put on the mast arms rather than the signal poles;
- 20.) That the proposed fire signal head shall have 12" lenses and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 21.) That the Applicant's traffic engineer shall confirm why the phases were changed on the signal and as a result the controller will need to be changed;
- 22.) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by the Applicant for review and approval by the City, prior to the issuance of a building permit, to include protection of the catch basins in and around the site;
- 23.) That the parking spaces shall be 9' wide and so noted on the Site Plans;

- 24.) That the driveway permit shall be approved by NHDOT prior to the commencement of any construction;
- 25.) That the pre-emption plan shall be approved by NHDOT and DPW prior to the commencement of any construction;
- 26.) That the applicant shall work with the Police Department Communications Center to conduct a site survey regarding radio communications;
- 27.) That all underground utilities shall be clearly identified on the Site Plans;

Mr. Holden confirmed that the City now owns the property so the wording will be changed to reflect the new ownership.

Mr. Desfosses clarified that an additional work session should be scheduled after all of the new conditions have been updated on the plans. He wants to see them before they go to the Planning Board.

.....

Chairman Holden stated that TAC members have in front of them a letter from Parade Office LLC for property located at 195 Hanover Street, identified as Public Hearing C. His recommendation at this time would be for a motion to postpone it indefinitely which means when they come back, the City will notify all abutting party owners again.

II. NEW BUSINESS

C. The application of **Parade Office, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street (as proposed subdivided Lot 3)**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a four-story 67,460 ± s.f. building, plus one basement level parking garage, consisting of 158,500 ± s.f. of office space, 43,080 ± s.f. of retail space and 12,000 ± s.f. of restaurant space, after the demolition of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B District, the Historic District A and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD);

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone to a time indefinite. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to a time indefinite passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Old Tex Mex, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **3510 and 3518 Lafayette Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 4,275 ± s.f. warehouse building with a 1,400 ± s.f. mezzanine office, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 297 as Lots 7 and 8 and lies within the Single Residence A district. (This application was postponed at the July 1, 2008 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 to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton, of MSC Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors, presented on behalf of the applicant. He handed out a list of stipulations and their status for the members to follow along with.

Mr. Moulton stated that this project had been before the committee before. It is an existing site on Lafayette Road and they are proposing 4,300 s.f. additional storage with 8 new parking spaces for employees and residents. At the last TAC meeting there were several concerns which he proceeded to address.

1. An on site meeting was held with David Desfosses and David Holden and they discussed drainage, lighting, the dumpster and the general conditions of the site. It was a very productive meeting.
2. They provided David Desfosses with the lighting cutsheets and it was discussed at the on site meeting. It was asked that they provide a full mounted light adjacent to the walkway for the residence in lieu of the wallpack on that side. After the site walk it was also requested for a light at the entrance drive which was done. Otherwise, David Desfosses was satisfied with the existing lights on the site.
3. Traffic counts. They had a letter written by John Terreault giving an estimate of the traffic generation. He was in contact with Deb Finnigan today regarding the numbers and he is not sure what the final outcome of that was.
4. Water shut off note was added.
5. As a result of the site walk and discussion about general drainage, the rain gardens were eliminated so they believe this item no longer applies.
6. They have added a sign detail to the plans.
7. The plans they submitted showed a row of bushes and in lieu of that they have proposed that some of that be used as a split rail fence which will take care of two issues. One was the barrier to people accessing the site and using the fence to mount no parking signs. In their discussions with DOT they determined that if the sign were placed within the right of way it required their permission and inspection, etc., however, if it is placed outside of their right of way then it is basically up to the applicant to provide the sign without the State's required permission or authorization.
8. Stormwater easements. They looked at stormwater generation for the site and very carefully modeled what was out there to determine the exact flow pass and as a result of proposed development, there would be a net increase of stormwater volume towards the Wrens Nest property at the far corner of the long building. That is the low point so the catch basin on the Wrens Nest property which suggests that there is some stormwater flows present. To mitigate this they have proposed that a berm be constructed along that side around the wetland to contain the stormwater a little more with the with the riprap outlet located such that it would mitigate the stormwater flows and volume up to the 50 year storm. One of his handouts is a spreadsheet showing the existing condition and the flow going in that condition and what would happen in the proposed condition with a berm constructed. The berm has to be constructed across property line onto Ricci property and John Ricci has reviewed the plan and is satisfied with what they are proposing and will sign a letter to that effect and provide easements as necessary.
9. Dumpster. After the site walk it was agreed that the dumpster would remain where it was so this concern could be removed.

Mr. Moulton added that the handicapped parking spot at the end of the row in the middle has been relocated to the corner which provided direct access to the ramps on that side of the building.

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 was concerned about just receiving the drainage information today as it was fairly significant to the site. He would make a motion to postpone this application until they have a chance to review that information. Some issues that are involved is there would have to be some sort of agreement with the neighboring property owner regarding the proposed berm as it would be on the

neighbor's property. Mr. Britz seconded the motion to postpone and added that he has a concern about the size of the wetland and how the wetland will change.

Mr. Britz was concerned about whether the wetland was going to expand if they put a berm in. He wanted to know how that will affect the wetlands in the area. He asked who did the wetland consulting? He would at least like some indication of whether the wetland is going to change. Mr. Holden asked if Mr. Britz was concerned that it might expand? Mr. Britz stated he wanted to know whether they knew if it will or not. He has not had time to really think about it.

Mr. Allen also noted, in regarding the drainage item, there are a lot of call out boxes on the plan that fall over contour lines so you can't tell where a proposed contour is supposed to be tying in so they need to make sure any grading is clearly identified.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that she called the applicant's traffic engineer this a.m. about some concerns she had about the one page traffic study. He sent her an email and answered her questions so she will forward that to the Planning Department to be placed in the file, for the record. She was satisfied with the information. She also had a question about the length of the fence. The No Parking signs on the very ends of the fence should have a left or right arrow, as appropriate, for no parking and the one in the middle can have the double arrow. She also asked what "revegetated" means. Will it be loam and seed, flowers, low bush? It needs to be more specific.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa did not have any issues.

Mr. Cravens was all set.

Mr. Desfosses stated that he felt the applicant has come a long way, in part due to the meeting that they had on site. He had a few specific requests. The plan that was passed out showing the berm should be part of the plan set and he asked to have the berm shaded so that it is clear that it goes beyond the 53 contour because the top of the berm is at 53 ½. He wants the contractor to be very aware that otherwise the water will try to weep around the ends of the berm.

Mr. Desfosses wanted the applicant to be aware that the standard no parking sign is half the size of the no parking sign on the fence and it would look better for the house. Otherwise, he felt they were getting close and he would like to review the revised plans.

Mr. Holden asked if it would be appropriate for the applicant to meet with Staff in Pre-TAC next month and advised Mr. Moulton that he should request that.

Mr. Holden asked if the actual improvement be on the adjacent property? Mr. Moulton confirmed that it will partially be on the adjacent property. Mr. Holden confirmed they will need to have the owner of the property join the application and for the next meeting they will have to notify abutters for that property as well. Mr. Holden asked if there was any way to have that structure placed entirely on one lot? Mr. Moulton stated it could not as they would have to run it through the wetland. Mr. Holden did not feel this was a major issue but he needs them on the application and they need to do abutter notification. Mr. Desfosses added that they need to show the drainage easement as well. Mr. Holden confirmed they will be looking for easement language at the Planning Board.

The motion to **postpone** to the September 2nd TAC meeting passed unanimously.

Concerns of the Committee:

- 1.) That an agreement with the neighboring property owner regarding the proposed berm will be required for review and approval by the City;

- 2.) That the owner of the adjacent property will be required to join the application for the next meeting and abutters will need to be notified;
- 3.) That the applicant should address the issue of how the berm will affect the wetlands in the area;
- 4.) That the proposed berm should be shaded so that it is clear that it goes beyond the 53 contour;
- 5.) That there are a lot of call out boxes on the plan that fall over contour lines which make it difficult to determine where a proposed contour is supposed to be tying in. Grading needs to be clearly identified;
- 6.) That the No Parking signs on the ends of the fence should have a left or right arrow, as appropriate, and the sign in the middle should have a double arrow;
- 7.) That the standard parking sign is half the size of the proposed parking signs on the fence and the smaller signs may fit better with the house;
- 8.) That the “revegetated” area needs to be more specific and should identify exactly what will be planted;

.....

D. The application of **Seacoast Trust LLP, Owner**, for property located at **150 Route One Bypass**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 5,208 s.f. one-story addition to an existing building, relocate a storage shed, and add two parking spaces to an existing parking area, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 231as Lot 58 and lies within a Single Residence B (SRB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Peter Weeks, on behalf of Seacoast Trust LLP, addressed the Committee. He indicated that this project has been seen many times. They received Site Review Approval in 2002 for the expansion of the parking lot shown in grey area on the site plan. All of those improvements were made except that the 5,200 sf addition to the building was not constructed. After looking at a lot of other alternatives it was determined that the best thing for the practice would be to continue with the 5,200 sf addition, however, by that time the variance approval had expired. They have gone back to the BOA and received approval once again. Because the parking lot construction had been completed, all they are asking for now is to move the storage shed, which was part of the approval in 2002, and to construct two additional parking spaces to conform to the City’s parking requirements. All other stipulations from the 2002 Planning Board approval have been done, such as Mr. Holden’s request for the permanent closure of the access to Middle Road, except for allowing PSNH access as that how they trim the trees because that is where the electricity comes. All of the lights have been downshielded. The recent BOA meeting approved the addition. The three items that are being asked for are the landscaping along the new addition with arborvitae, the relocation of the storage shed, and the addition of two parking spaces. Mr. Weeks apologized that they were back five years later to do the same project but he felt at this point it will be the best thing for them and he asked for their approval.

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

Michael Donah, 152 Hillside Drive. He asked if the mobile cat scan MRI unit was going to be brought into this facility? Mr. Holden indicated he would ask that of Mr. Weeks when Mr. Donah was done. Mr. Donah stated that it was part of the BOA approval to move it out of the parking lot and he had a hand out for the Committee expressing his concerns. His concern was safety with the radiation equipment. He is concerned about the employees who work on the site.

Mr. Holden was not sure that was a Site Review issue.

Mr. Donah stated that his voice is a result of radiation exposure and he has very strong concerns about that.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Weeks if the mobile coach was part of this application? Mr. Weeks stated that this application is not for the mobile diagnostic coach. He did receive BOA approval but it is not part of this application.

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:

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to approve with stipulations and indicated that she was not employed by the City in 2002 so she had some questions. She noted there was a circle (38.62) at the back of the building and asked if that was an entrance into the addition? Mr. Weeks confirmed it is an emergency egress. Ms. Finnigan asked about the arborvitae on the side of the building and whether they are proposed or existing? Mr. Weeks explained that they were part of the 2002 approval by the BOA and he refers to them as the "LeBlanc Arborvitae" as Chairman LeBlanc requested them because the vegetation in that area, between the building and the houses on Hillside Drive is very minimal. Therefore, for the length of the new addition, so that the new addition would not be visible to the houses on Hillside Drive, they asked for an 8' row of arborvitae. There are some trees there now but no arborvitae and he wanted more of a screen. Ms. Finnigan asked as the plan makes it look like they are already there. They should be removed from the plan as they are no existing at the moment. Mr. Holden pointed out to the Committee that they should be looking at a three page set of plans rather than the one page plan that was originally provided to them. Ms. Finnigan referred to where they had emergency egress to the right of the plan, it says "remove curb and pavement". She asked what will they replace it with as it looks like they are doing curbing all the way up to the door. Mr. Weeks indicated there will be a sidewalk and entrance walk into the new addition. Ms. Finnigan noted that it was not shown on the plan. She also pointed out a No Parking sign that needs to be removed. Mr. Weeks stated that the new addition is going is currently parking for the physicians only. Mr. Weeks confirmed they will remove that sign. Ms. Finnigan added that there should be a painted crosswalk from the parking lot on the left side of the plan to get over to the building and a stop line at the end of the driveway, 4' from the road, or adjacent to the stop sign. She acknowledges that there are places in the City where you have to nose out after the stop to see. Ms. Finnigan also confirmed she will need a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan, to be prepared by the applicant and approved by the city prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion to approve.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa, Deputy Fire Chief Griswold and Mr. Britz were all set.

Mr. Cravens felt the water was probably a 2" copper going in and they are constructing a new building over it although it is just a slab. As it comes out an existing building, he recommended that they make it straight and have it turn once it comes out the foundation, rather than having it turn underneath the building.

Mr. Desfosses asked about Note 12 on the Site Plan that read "Raise water line into building at new wall. Do not continue to run below new floor" Mr. Weeks indicated that Mr. Cravens had made a stipulation on the old approval, requesting that the contractor protected the line coming in during construction and he wanted an outside water meter.

Mr. Allen asked if they were putting in a new utility room or was this just going to come out the wall and pipe it through the wall to get to their old meter? Mr. Weeks confirmed that was correct, they will

go into the old utility room but he will go above slab rather than through the building rather than the floor.

Mr. Holden stipulated that the stipulations from the February 21, 2002 approval shall be included as a condition of this approval. This went through a fairly exhaustive review back in 2002.

Ms. Tillman asked if increased landscaping will happen when mobile coach is added? Mr. Week confirmed that was correct and was currently on the agenda for the next TAC meeting in September.

The motion to recommend Site Review approval with stipulations passed unanimously.

- 1.) That the arborvitaes along the southwest side of the property shall be removed from the Existing Conditions Plan;
- 2.) That the Site Plans should reflect a sidewalk and entrance walk into the new addition where it currently says "remove curb and pavement";
- 3.) That the "No Parking" sign shall be removed from the Site Plan in front of the proposed addition;
- 4.) That a painted crosswalk from the north parking lot to the existing building shall be added to the Site Plan;
- 5.) That a stop line shall be added to the Site Plan at the end of the driveway, 4' from the road, or adjacent to the stop sign;
- 6.) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by the Applicant and approved by the City, prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 7.) That the water line should come straight out of the building and turn once it comes out the foundation, rather than having it turn underneath the building, and be so noted on the Site Plan;
- 8.) That the stipulations from the February 21, 2002 approval shall be incorporated as part of this Site Review approval, and are as follows:
 - a.) That the water meter be relocated to where the existing water line enters the new foundation;
 - b.) That if a fire service is needed, the applicant shall acquire the necessary easements over private property for the fire service to come in from Hillside Drive;
 - c.) That in terms of site lighting, all lighting shall be down-shielded, including the PSNH light; and
 - d.) That the site plan indicate a "no parking:" sign in an appropriate location to ensure direct vehicular access to a public way.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 2:55 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant