

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

2:00 PM

NOVEMBER 4, 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; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; Deborah Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief;

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

I. NEW BUSINESS

A. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 and Chapter 400 of the Pease Development Authority Site Review Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of **Two International Group, Applicant**, for property located at **81 New Hampshire Avenue**, wherein site review approval is requested for the construction of a two-story, 27,300 ± s.f. (footprint) day care facility, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 306 as Lot 3 and lies within the Business and Commercial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dirk Grotenhuis, of Hoyle Tanner Associates, representing Two International Group, addressed the Committee. Also present were Mike Mates, Project Engineer with Hoyle Tanner, Dan Plummer from Two International Group and Rob Harborson from DeStefano Architects. They met earlier today at Pre-TAC and they discussed parking and they were remiss in being clear. After talking with Maria Stowell, of the PDA and the owner, they have reviewed the land use code and some other institute transportation manuals for day care facilities and the application was based on employees. Wendy Monroe is here from the Great Bay Kids Center also if they have some user questions. Based on that they have indicated that there is a maximum at peak 40 employees at the facility or which will allow them a maximum of 250 children. Going by a land use code which is one space for every five children in the facility, at a maximum use would be 50 parking spaces and they currently show 22 parking spaces. They have land available to expand to the total 50 if need be. The intent is not to build a parking lot that will be underutilized. It is in an area where there are other parking lots in a shared mixed use area where underutilized parking exists. They still plan to construct 22 spaces but they have the ability to expand on the lot the total requirement of 50 spaces. They can show 35 spaces in front of the facility and 15 spaces across at an adjacent facility. The applicant does control the entire site with the exception of a PDA lot. They wanted to make it clear they have reviewed the parking requirements and 50 parking spaces will meet that requirement but they are not building those at this time. They are proposing to combine two lots with this application into one lot that will encompass 74 New Hampshire and the day care facility. There is a potential for future building which would also allow

cross utilization of parking. Mr. Grotenhuis turned the presentation over to Michael Mates for the technical presentation.

Michael Mates, of Hoyle Tanner Associates, talked about the drainage first. As they have seen, they have not proposed a stormwater detention system as they are decreasing the impervious coverage in the area by 0.2 acres. Therefore, reducing peak flows in a 2, 10 and 25 year storm which is detailed in the Drainage Report. They are also decreasing volumes as well to the wetlands. With the exception of the two year storm, they are increasing by .001 acre feet which would be a negligible impact to the wetlands and it is not regulated as well. The proposed parking lot will shed run off to four proposed catch basins that will collect the run off and pipe it underground to a stormwater treatment swale that discharges to the wetlands. That is sized per DES regulations and will have a flow of less than 1 foot per second in a 10 year storm. That should be sufficient to treat the stormwater run off from this site.

Mr. Mates discussed utility work. They met with Jim Osborne to discuss connections to the electric system, telephone cable systems and a proposed route to these systems which are shown on Sheet C-6. They will be going down to New Hampshire Avenue where there is an existing cabinet which they will coordinate with Jim as construction progresses as well as an existing utility pole where they will connect telephone and cable services. He met with Frank Ott to discuss the connection of the fire alarm service. They recently installed a fire alarm service for the 75 New Hampshire site and they can easily connect into the fire alarm service. They showed this on the utility plan that was revised as a result of a conversation with Steve Griswold to make sure they addressed his fire access concerns as well as his technical questions.

Continuing through the plan set, they included a Landscape Plan which they have reviewed with Deborah Finnigan. They also have a lighting plan with full IES cut off fixtures and typical erosion control details which are shown on the Grading, Draining and Erosion Control Plan as well as Detail Sheet C-9 and then typical construction details, including drainage, treatment swales, riprap outlet protection, etc.

Mr. Mates mentioned that he met with Deborah Finnigan and Deputy Fire Chief Griswold prior to this meeting to make sure they could address any comments they may have at this meeting. He passed out a set of drawings that contain the revisions as a result of their comments. He reviewed those revisions.

On the first sheet, Sheet C-3, they adjusted Note 19 to include "the latest editions" of all manuals. Note 22 was modified to include the requirement that they submit electronic data of the site layout to Jason Wise at the City of Portsmouth so the city's CIS system can be updated. Note 26 was modified to include the City of Portsmouth as the approving regulatory agency for the CMMP.

On Sheet C-4 they added a sidewalk at the upper level of the child care center for egress from the existing doors behind and on the side of the building to the public way out to the parking lot. They called for a tip down ramp where the sidewalk would connect to the sidewalk for 75 New Hampshire Avenue. They show stop bars 4' off the edge of pavement and aligned stop signs with them.

On Sheet C-5, they show the locations of the stone check dams, which is an erosion control measure.

On Sheet C-6 they updated the Utility Plan to show the fire alarm conduit going from the building, going down New Hampshire Avenue and tying into a proposed hand hole, that will be coordinated with the City and Frank Ott during construction.

On Sheet C-7, Landscape Plan, they added a dimension to the Deciduous Tree Planting Detail requiring 6' from finished grade to the bottom of the canopy and supplemented Note 8 to include approval of plant material substitutions by the City.

On Sheet C-9 they deleted a sentence.

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. Holden asked if the drainage calculations reflect if the parking lot was expanded? Mr. Mates responded that he did not take into account the tennis courts that were previously there. If so they would decrease impervious coverage by more than ½ acre so it should not have any effect on peak flows or volumes whatsoever if they added the additional parking. Mr. Holden confirmed that right now they technically do not meet the requirements of the PDA regulations but they are taking advantage of the section that allows them to put in a certain amount of parking and if it is required, they will put in the other amount of parking? Mr. Mates confirmed that was correct. Mr. Holden also clarified that no BOA action is needed because of that section? Mr. Mates confirmed that was his understanding and he was sure Maria Stowell could confirm it. (Let the record show that Ms. Stowell was in the audience and agreed with Mr. Mates)

Mr. Allen noted that the way the water ordinance is set up, and they have been consistent with this on Pease, there is one service and one meter per property. Their water service now goes through the 75 New Hampshire Avenue building and they show another service to this building. As configured, they have some issues with this. Mr. Allen thought when they did this there was always the potential for another building on the other side of the driveway next door that they had done plumbing inside, knowing this may be the case. Ms. Stowell knew this came up with 75 New Hampshire Avenue which would be part of this lot as it is proposed, if the lots are consolidated. There is already the small Baying building on the pavement and they did allow that. Mr. Allen confirmed that was an existing building that was already there and they did have this discussion at that time also. This proposal treads heavily into a dark grey area. Ms. Stowell asked if they would prefer to see something going through 75 New Hampshire and coming out and going into this proposed building? Mr. Allen confirmed that was correct and they will then have demand issues. Fire service is not a problem as you can have a separate fire service. They did the same thing off of Oak Street. Ms. Stowell confirmed they did one meter there. Mr. Desfosses felt the domestic line is heavily undersized at this point. Mr. Holden asked if they could get a stipulation on this? Mr. Allen did not feel there was a straight forward answer to this. The stipulation would have to be that they would have to come to some agreement as to the configuration of the water system.

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

Mr. Allen stated that he does not have an answer for this right now. He will have to sit down with Ms. Stowell and the project engineers. His guess was that a domestic line coming out of the existing building would be inadequate if they start feeding those other two buildings. They either have to upgrade that entire service or put in a new service that but he's not quite sure how they would do that. He is not quite sure why they have the lot line revision happening as part of this which kicks this whole thing in. If that was a separate lot, we would not have this issue. Mr. Holden asked if one way of addressing this would be that this issue should be resolved before the Planning Board meeting and if it isn't, then the Planning Board would postpone the hearing. That is assuming they can all get together and work out the best way to proceed. Mr. Holden added that is assuming they go forward with the subdivision because that is what is creating this issue.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked what material was the building going to be made of? Rob Harberson, of DeStefano Architects indicated that they are showing the building as steel construction, probably with concrete slabs. The exterior will have a cultured stone base and will likely be cementitious boards above with a metal roof.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa proposed a stipulation that the applicant be responsible to perform a radio strength test with a Motorola service shop to ensure that the sufficient signal strength within it's structure will support adequate radio coverage to police and fire personnel if they have to go inside that building for any reason. The expense for the test is the responsibility of the applicant, whether the test indicates that a repeater is needed or not. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that expenses is born by the applicant. That should be coordinated with the Fire and Police Emergency Operations Supervisor, Gil Emery, who can be reached at 610-7411.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that in the past they have talked about he does not like to see outfalls below the level of the wetland and he wants to make sure this is 2' about the ground water or existing grade, so they need to adjust for that. On the Lighting Plan he did not see a pole height anywhere. Mr. Mates confirmed that was on Sheet C-13 of the 11 x 17 sized plans. They are 24' from base to mounted height with a 6" base. Mr. Desfosses asked Mr. Holden is that was in accordance with that they have been doing at Pease? He felt that 24' is pretty high. Mr. Holden responded that they tend to keep them lower but they have also done them fairly high along their rights of way. Mr. Mates stated that this is what they did at 180 International Drive. Mr. Desfosses stated that this was a much smaller site and it is not fitting with what they have. He felt that 20' would be more appropriate and he indicated that would be a stipulation. His second stipulation is that they need to revise where the sewer outfall is going. He does not think the sewer they are showing being attached to is appropriate for a new building unless they can TV is and inspect it and determine that it is appropriate. The other problem he has is specifically with parking on this site. He thinks they need to specify that all parking spaces on the west side of the parking lot are for parent drop off, leaving a couple on the north side and a couple on the south side for employees, and all other employees would have to park off site. That would leave about 11 spaces open for parents to drop off kids. As they have more employees than they do parking spaces, he thinks they need to leave the parking spaces for the patrons, not the employees. He will leave that for Deb Finnigan but that was his thought. Another issue for him was the two play areas, one of which is very low and near the grade of the wetland. He is not happy about the proximity of the play area to the wetlands as he does not feel it is appropriate but if it is going to be directly adjacent he felt they need to provide underdrains. Lastly, on the catch basin detail; he would like to see a proposal on what type of snout they will be using with the catch basin. It is just drawn in as some type of elbow and is not identified. As far as the run off going into the wetland, Mr. Desfosses felt it was a very modest sized site so he is not worried about detention of stormwater as long as they can get adequate treatment which he felt they could with proper design. Mr. Holden asked if those were all conditions and stipulations? Mr. Desfosses confirmed that they were.

Mr. Cravens noted that where the water service enters the building on the outside, there is a conflict with the tree planting so they may want to adjust one or the other. They talked about having a domestic service brought in from International Drive and then they did not talk about possibly coming in and going through a water meter, come back out and tie in and feed 75 New Hampshire Drive. That is something they will discuss later. His only stipulation was the water service entrance planting conflict.

Peter Britz was concerned about the proximity of the wetland to the outside play area for the children. He discussed this with the Health Department and their concerns were that we have EEE and West Nile in the State now. Children's immune systems are not as strong as an adult so they are more susceptible. The other concern is that it is not in the contract area for mosquito spraying and he does not know if the PDA has any contract for mosquito spraying. It seems to him that it is not the best location on the site to put children and he just wanted that on the record as he probably can't stop them from putting it there but he felt it was an important issue.

Mr. Britz also followed up on Mr. Desfosses' comment on the stormwater outlet to the wetland. He doesn't have a problem with it but he has a concern about follow up. He was concerned about the stormwater going into the wetland if it isn't treated. Mr. Desfosses did not think this was a particularly dirty site and he was not real worried about it and they are using sumps. Mr. Britz felt the same way

but he felt they should revisit it in a year. Mr. Mates indicated that they have some catch basins that will catch sediment and they will be maintained. They also have a 2' stone base underneath the treatment swale to promote infiltration. Mr. Britz asked if that would be down in the groundwater. Mr. Mates stated they have to take a look at that. They went out today and walked right into the wetland and it was bone dry. Mr. Desfosses felt they need to be one foot above existing grade at a minimum. Mr. Britz stated he would go out and walk the site after it was built. He was not sure what else they can do about it.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stated that his issues have been resolved and updated. Those issues included concern about the fire alarm and they wanted to make sure the conduits were shown on the plan. As far as sidewalks, Rick Hopley brought that up. In order to have a legitimate exit they have to have an exit that carries you from the place where you leave the building to a paved public street, and in this case they accepted the plowed parking lot. A note about a Knox box and fire alarm system are on the plan. They discussed the hydrant issue and they identified some new hydrants that are within the distance of the site.

Ms. Finnigan indicated that they eluded to the fact that parking at 75 New Hampshire would be used for overflow for this facility. Her question was what is the current utilization of that parking lot? Mr. Mates confirmed they were referring to 50 International Drive. Typically on a week day, that parking lot is about half full. Ms. Finnigan asked if there was any reason why they could not label some of those parking spaces now as employee parking so that they would have more parking for families dropping children off. That would eliminate her concern about parents parking across the street so they would have to cross the road with their children. It is not a busy street but still could be dangerous. They should be labeled with signage. Some sort of method should be put in place when or if parking is adequate prior to the Planning Board. Ms. Finnigan asked what is the mechanism that will trigger putting those future spaces in place? She would like some sort of suggestion to take care of that. Mr. Holden suggested that a condition be that something be proposed and approved by Deb Finnigan prior to the Planning Board.

Ms. Finnigan requested that a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) be approved by the City prior to a building permit being issued. She further requested a Traffic Generation letter or memo be approved by her prior to the Planning Board hearing. For the record, she wanted to agree with Peter Britz and David Desfosses about the location of the play area next to the wetland.

On Sheet C-3, the applicant made changes to Note 19, 22 & 26 per her request and she stipulated that this sheet be included in the Planning Board plan. On Sheet C-4 they changed the stop line and stop bar per her request and the proposed sign location for the Great Bay Kids Company be moved back to improve the site distance. She asked for the location of the stone check dam on Sheet c-5 and should be presented to the Planning Board. On Sheet C-7 she asked that the height requirement of the trees be included on the plan, which it is, and a substitution of materials should be approved by the City as well.

Ms. Finnigan asked Ms. Stowell if an easement is needed to go through 50 International Drive and 75 International Drive since they are not connected to a street at this point? Ms. Finnigan also asked if it was all one lot right now? Ms. Stowell confirmed it would not be until when or if it gets approved by the Planning Board. Ms. Finnigan asked if an easement is needed to 50 International Drive. Mr. Stowell didn't think they were going through 50 International Drive. Ms. Finnigan stated it looked like it on the plan. Mr. Mates pointed out where they were going. Ms. Stowell confirmed that they would need an easement for that. Ms. Finnigan stipulated that the easement through 50 International Drive to be finalized prior to construction. Mr. Holden added that it should be approved as to content and form by the City Attorney. Mr. Desfosses asked how they would be able to park there? Mr. Holden agreed that would be a minor detail too and they would probably require a parking easement. Mr. Holden felt that the real issue is how do they trigger the additional parking that every one feels they will need.

Ms. Finnigan asked what is the material of the ground in the play areas? Mr. Mates stated it will be grass.

Ms. Finnigan requested on Sheet C-4 that they add to the parking requirements that they are per PDA requirements since at this point she does not agree that there is enough parking but they meet PDA requirements.

Ms. Finnigan asked, for the record, if there are any trees on site on the State's invasive species list? Mr. Mates did not believe so. Ms. Holden stated that they will remove them if there are any.

Ms. Finnigan asked if there was enough lighting for the play area? Mr. Mates indicated they can review that further with the client to make sure they are satisfied with it however they didn't expect children to be playing outside in the dark. The lighting is for security purposes. Ms. Finnigan indicated, from her own experience, they will send children out in the dark around 4:00 pm.

Ms. Tillman noted on Sheet C-4 where they have the sidewalk and the fence around play area, they show it gated across the sidewalk. She asked how that works if there is an emergency and they need to get out. Are the gates operational at all times? Deputy Fire Chief Griswold indicated they would have to be operational from the inside and they would have to be operational without unlocking any padlock or key or locking device because it is in the path of an exit. They would have to have some type of single opening hardware on it. They can be locked from the outside to prevent entry but operable from the inside. They could have the handle high enough so it was difficult for a child to reach. Ms. Tillman felt that should be on the plan. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stipulated that they add that to the site plan.

Mr. Holden assumed there is a traffic impact fee associated with this project and the PDA is collecting it. Ms. Stowell confirmed that was correct and that it should be included as a stipulation.

Mr. Stowell wanted to clarify the parking requirement. The PDA required 50 parking spaces and their new requirement says if they want to provide less than 50 then they have to show evidence that they don't need 50 and show evidence to the Planning Board. Ms. Finnigan felt they need to do that in some fashion as she believes they need those spaces. Mr. Holden asked if it would be helpful if we indicate we think they need it? Ms. Stowell indicated they should if they feel they need those spaces right now. Mr. Holden felt, in a willingness to keep pervious and impervious areas under control, he asked he she felt could they figure out a trigger for adding them if needed? Ms. Stowell felt it made sense to phase it in to see if they need it as they will not need it immediately. They could figure out a trigger by the number of students or by a use and they would have to police them to see when people park on the grass. Mr. Holden felt they are going to need the parking but unlike most sites they have the available parking in the back which makes him feel better but they have to agree on a trigger. Ms. Finnigan explained that was why she said it would be good if they could find some spaces that are employee spaces that are not in that lot and however that is done is what needs to be approved and that may be enough to not trigger the need of the other parking lot. Ms. Finnigan agreed she would rather have them use what is already there then put down more pavement if it's not going to be used. Ms. Stowell confirmed that there is ample space in the 50 International lot.

Mr. Allen stipulated that the applicant shall prepare calculations on water and sewer consumption and production for the past use surcharge.

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

Stipulations from the November 4, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1) That the applicant and representatives of DPW shall come to an agreement regarding the configuration of the water service prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 2) At the expense of the applicant, he shall perform a radio strength test with a Motorola service shop to ensure that there is sufficient signal strength within the structure to support adequate radio coverage to police and fire personnel. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that expense shall also be born by the applicant. This should be coordinated with the Fire and Police Emergency Operations Supervisor, Gil Emery, 610-7411;
- 3) That the sewer outfall shall be reviewed for appropriateness for a new building;
- 4) That the outfalls shall be 2' above the ground water or existing grade;
- 5) That light poles shall be no higher than 20' from base to mounted height with a 6" base;
- 6) That all parking spaces on the west side of the building shall be for parent drop off with appropriate signage;
- 7) That a trigger shall be agreed upon between the PDA, the applicant and the Planning Department to determine when or if the additional parking spaces are needed, prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 8) If the play area remains adjacent to the wetland then underdrains shall be required and added to the Site Plans;
- 9) That the catch basin detail on the Site Plans shall identify the type of snout being used;
- 10) That the applicant shall correct the water service entrance and planting conflict;
- 11) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the Applicant for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 12) That a traffic generation letter shall be reviewed and approved by Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 13) That an easement for 50 International Drive shall be prepared for review and approval of content and form by the City Attorney;
- 14) That the PDA parking requirements shall be added to the Site Plan;
- 15) That the applicant shall confirm that there are no trees on site that are on the State's invasive species list;
- 16) That the gate in the fence around the play area shall include a locking mechanism that can be locked from the outside to prevent entry but is operable from the inside;
- 17) That a Traffic Impact Fee shall be coordinated with the PDA and the Applicant for their contribution to the Traffic Impact Fund;
- 18) That the applicant shall prepare calculations on water and sewer consumption and production for the use surcharge.

.....

B. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 and Chapter 400 of the Pease Development Authority Site Review Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of **Northeast Rehabilitation Health Network, Applicant**, for property located at **105 Corporate Drive**, wherein site review approval is requested for the construction of a two-story, 26,175 ± s.f. (footprint) rehabilitation facility, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 303 as Lot 6 and lies within the Business and Commercial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bradlee Mezquita, of Appledore Engineering, presented. He displayed the Site Plan and pointed out the access easement to Franklin Pierce in the back on the far side of the wetland is the existing waste water treatment center. He explained that the orange is the proposed building and the gray is proposed pavement and the lighter gray is existing pavement. The main entrance is off Corporate Drive for drop off. They are proposing two tiered parking lots, broken up by landscaping in the lower half and their loading is in the rear. The drive they see on the southerly side of the building is an ambulance drop off, specifically for deliveries and people that need to be transported by ambulance. On the southerly half of that section is their stormwater gravel wetland for stormwater detention and treatment prior to discharging to the existing wetland. As was pointed out at Pre-TAC, one thing that is abnormal for this site is the need for additional handicapped spaces because it is deemed a rehabilitation center ADA will require 20% of the total number of parking spaces to be handicapped accessible.

In an effort to save some time, they prepared a letter outlining the comments they discussed at the Pre-TAC meeting that morning.

One comment was to extend the proposed sidewalk on the southerly end to the southerly side of Goosebay Drive and provide a sidewalk across Corporate Drive.

They were asked to provide a sidewalk cross the entrance of what is known as Pine Street West.

They have shown sidewalk along the frontage of the property and they had to jog the sidewalk around the existing electrical cabinet. They were asked to increase taper so it was not such an abrupt change.

Additional signage was requested at the ambulance drop off to identify what it was.

They were asked to adjust all stop bars to be 4' off the curb or 4' behind the proposed crosswalk.

They will update the plan to show a conduit for the proposed fire box.

It was requested that they provide a delineation of the building canopy that will be over the drop off area. They will bring that from the architectural to the Site Plan.

They made a decision on the flush sidewalks where the accessible spaces were and move the handicapped signage forward to the front of the spaces and put them on a bollard mounted sign to prevent people from pulling too far forward and nosing on the sidewalk.

They have an outlet of drainage in the back turnaround area that discharges to the existing gravel wetland and they were asked to review it to pull is farther to the west to prevent any short circuiting in the existing gravel wetland.

Due to their conversations this morning about the future development of the parcel to the rear, the proposed water line they will be tying to on Corporate Drive will be two separate water lines run up the access drive. One will feed the proposed building and one will extend all the way to the rear for the proposed development sometime in the future.

They will revise the back loading area to show a small raised island to help delineate the travelway to the rear property line.

They will add a note regarding long term maintenance for the gravel wetland.

The Applicant, the City and the PDA will work together on a fair share agreement of cleaning the existing roadside swale along the westerly side of Corporate Drive.

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 Site Review approval with stipulation. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses stipulated that the letter from Brad Mezquita dated November 4, 2008 should be a basic stipulation as he acknowledged that those items had been included and/or revised on the Site Plans. Mr. Desfosses also asked if they would either move a couple of lights around or add a light to make sure there is adequate lighting at the two intersections where it meets the two roads. This is the type of operation that typically older people go to and they need to give them as much light as possible.

Mr. Cravens asked what type of water services are going up the driveway? Mr. Mezquita confirmed there will be a domestic and a fire for each lot. Mr. Cravens confirmed they are talking two domestic and two fire services. He referred to the area where the water line enters the building and he felt there was a conflict with a tree planting. Also they have two gate valves right outside building that probably won't be needed but if they want to put them in, they can. Ms. Mezquita explained that those gate valves were based on the assumption that they were going to be using just the two services that were going to be extended so they could shut down one but now that they are switching out he agrees they are not needed there.

Mr. Cravens talked to Gretchen at Appledore about the possibility of putting a hydrant on the driveway entrance and he thought they might want to check with the Fire Department so see if they need it or not. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold noted that the plan shows that there are two hydrants directly across the street. He was concerned that they make sure they are operational and in good condition. Mr. Allen stated that would not be the applicant's responsibility and the City will take care that.

Mr. Cravens stated that they show a hydrant at the back. Mr. Allen felt they might want to put one over on the other side. That is a private hydrant. Mr. Cravens asked about an irrigation plan? Mr. Mezquita was unsure as they had not discussed irrigation. Mr. Holden suggested that they say they are going to do it and they will put the requirement in. Mr. Cravens stipulated that if they put in an irrigation system, they want to make sure they use Smart controller which goes off between 10:00 pm and 5 am and they should use 6" of loam wherever they have the irrigation system.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa proposed a stipulation that the applicant be responsible to perform a radio strength test with a Motorola service shop to ensure that the sufficient signal strength within its structure will support adequate radio coverage to police and fire personnel if they have to go inside that building for any reason. The expense for the test is the responsibility of the applicant, whether the test

indicates that a repeater is needed or not. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that expenses is born by the applicant. That should be coordinated with the Fire and Police Emergency Operations Supervisor, Gil Emery, who can be reached at 610-7411.

Mr. Holden asked Ms. Finnigan about the sidewalk connection and what side of the street are most of the sidewalks in this area? Mr. Mezquita stated most are on the other side of the street, when they come down towards the south. They put it on this side because they control that side as their frontage. If they are going to extend further in that direction it makes sense. Mr. Desfosses agreed that is the appropriate side of the street as they don't know what will happen with the other parcel. Mr. Allen felt it might make sense to put them on both sides as a lot of people walk out there. Mr. Holden has been convinced they are on the proper side.

Ms. Finnigan requested that a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) be approved by the City prior to a building permit being issued.

Ms. Finnigan requested a Trip Generation Memorandum approved by DPW prior to the Planning Board meeting. Ms. Mezquita confirmed he will get that over to her.

Ms. Finnigan asked where the driveway is on the west side, does that have a sidewalk on it at all? Mr. Mezquita confirmed it was on the far side. Ms. Finnigan asked if there is a crosswalk across that driveway? Ms. Desfosses confirmed that he has requested a tip down on other side of street and a cross walk.

Ms. Finnigan asked them to make sure the diameter landing in the crosswalk is appropriate as these are angled and it looks like they may not met that requirement.

Ms. Finnigan stipulations that the Landscaping Plan be approved by DPW and Planning.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Sheet C-3 where it says provide inlet protection around all existing proposed catch basin inlets within the work limits and she asked them to also include on the street. Mr. Mezquita noted that they don't typically do them on the street. If they do them on the street it will be just with a silt sack inside the grate and it would also include the culvert that is technically off their site. Ms Finnigan usually says within 200' of the property line. Mr. Mezquita was fine with that being a stipulation. Ms. Finnigan indicated that should go in the CMMP. Ms. Finnigan stated that the contractor shall be responsible to control dust and wind erosion, which is Note 9 in the erosion control notes. She stated that they also need to include the public streets and sidewalks in that note.

Ms. Finnigan asked if there are any trees on the State invasive species list? Mr. Mezquita stated he would have their landscape architect double check that. Ms. Finnigan also asked for a note or a detail that all trees that they plant shall be 6' from ground to canopy. Also, if they remove any trees or die they need to be replaced in kind.

Mr. Holden assumed this site plan was contingent upon the subdivision? Mr. Mezquita confirmed that was correct. Mr. Holden stipulated that the subdivision approval shall be received from the PDA. He asked if they will have a building elevation to show the Planning Board? Mr. Mezquita confirmed that they do. Mr. Holden noted there was some discussion about the driveway in the sense that it is also serving as potential service to the back would be 60' or at least identifying a 60' right of way? He asked where they ended up with that? Mr. Mezquita stated that because it was going to be a common drive, not a public way, it will remain at 50'. Mr. Holden confirmed it will be treated differently than the one on the other side. He asked how wide will it be? Mr. Mezquita confirmed it was 50' as designated on the Subdivision Plan. Mr. Holden asked what would prevent someone from parking on that and blocking it? Mr. Mezquita confirmed it is 24', same as a typical City street. Ms. Finnigan requested "No Parking" signs.

Mr. Allen requested a capacity use surcharge calculation for the water and sewer usage. Mr. Allen also requested that they review the size of the water mains as they switched to two.

Mr. Holden requested that the applicant shall make a contribution to the PDA Traffic Impact Fund.

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

Stipulations from the November 4, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 1) That the letter submitted by Bradlee Mezquita, of Appledore Engineering, at the November 4th TAC, dated November 4, 2008, shall be incorporated as a list of outstanding stipulations; (Attached and incorporated herein)
- 2) That lights shall be moved and/or added to provide adequate lighting at the two intersections;
- 3) That the area where the water line enters the building conflicts with a tree planting and shall be resolved;
- 4) That if an irrigation system is installed, they shall use Smart controllers which irrigate from 10:00 pm to 5:00 am, and 6" of loam shall be used wherever the irrigation system is used;
- 5) At the expense of the applicant, they shall perform a radio strength test with a Motorola service shop to ensure that there is sufficient signal strength within the structure to support adequate radio coverage to police and fire personnel. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that expense shall also be born by the applicant. This should be coordinated with the Fire and Police Emergency Operations Supervisor, Gil Emery, 610-7411;
- 6) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the Applicant for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 7) That a trip generation memo shall be approved by DPW prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 8) That the diameter landing in the crosswalk shall be reviewed to make sure it is adequate;
- 9) That the Landscape Plan shall be reviewed and approved by DPW and the Planning Department;
- 10) That Note 9 in the Erosion Control Notes should include the public streets and sidewalks;
- 11) That the applicant shall confirm that no trees on site are on the State's invasive species list;
- 12) That a note or detail shall be added to the Site Plans that all trees that are planted shall be 6' from ground to canopy;
- 13) That subdivision approval shall be received from the PDA prior a building permit being issued;
- 14) That "No Parking" signs shall be added to the common driveway;
- 15) That the applicant shall prepare calculations on water and sewer consumption and production for the use surcharge;
- 16) That a Traffic Impact Fee shall be coordinated with the PDA and the Applicant for their contribution to the Traffic Impact Fund;

.....

C. The application of **7 Islington, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **40 Bridge Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 5,472 ± s.f., four story, ten unit retail/residential building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 52 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) district, Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and Historic District A.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagon, of Ambit Engineering, representing 7 Islington Street, LLC, was present with John Greenlaw, from 7 Islington Street, LLC, and Michael Witcher, of Witcher Builders. Mr. Chagon indicated that there is currently a two story wood frame building on the lot. The application went through the lot line approval process to create the lot they are proposing to build on. They also received HDC approval on October 2, 2008. He reviewed the plan set with the Committee members.

Mr. Chagon stated that the Cover Sheet shows the relationship of the project to the surrounding neighborhood in the downtown area. It is just off the downtown, across from the Bridge Street parking lot. Also on the Cover Sheet is the legal of the symbols that they use.

The second sheet is the Lot Line Relocation Plan which was approved with a stipulation that they remove the shed off the back of the 29 Tanner Street building prior to the plat being signed by the City. He included this plan in the set because it's a case of the "Chicken and Egg". They don't want to tear the shed down until they are ready to go forward and have approval for this building. That is one of the things they will check off the list as they go forward to a building permit for 40 Bridge Street.

Sheet C-1 is the Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan. It highlights the items that are being removed from the property, such as the existing building, pavement, walkways, other associated utilities will be cut and capped at the property line and it shows that they will relocate a fence along the back. The fence currently jogs out but the plan will patch in that fence back to the proposed property line so there will be a divide between the two lots.

Sheet C-2 is the Layout and Landscaping Plan. They show the first floor retail and architectural locations including doors. They show the proposed sidewalk. Right now there is a large curb cut along Bridge Street that runs 60' and they will be taking out the existing concrete sidewalk, resetting the curb along the entire length and putting in a new concrete sidewalk along Bridge Street. They are also connecting the sidewalk to the back of the building for egress to the south side of the building and then along the west side of the building to the last door on what is labeled Unit 1. They are also tying in the existing stairways at 7 Islington Street. If they look back at the Lot Line Revision Plan there was a dedicated easement left on this lot and they will now tie that in so there is a sidewalk access for those people at 7 Islington Street, which was the plan all along. They are re-configuring the parking spaces and are proposing a 40' loading zone and they would eventually go through the Council for that. A loading zone is needed in this neighborhood. The result of this project would be to create a loading zone and one parking space and if the loading zone that wasn't something that was favorably received it would be three parking spaces. They will re-stripe the last space to the north to 20' and then continue on with the existing striping. The project has a benefit as it will close a big, long curb cut and create either one parking space and a loading zone or three parking spaces. They show the parking calculation Note 4. They calculated that the existing credit is 11 spaces, based on the building that is there now. They are showing a required 42 parking spaces, leaving 31 spaces as the unmet parking need and they will pay into the parking fund for those spaces. They show a basement which is not pinned down at this point. They are doing borings to determine how much basement space they will create and suspect they will be cutting back on that basement space. The plan has 74% proposed building coverage and 25% open space. They won't add up to 100% as on the 2nd level there is an overhang to create a dry lobby entrance. They have a modest landscaping proposal with bushes along the front and some areas where the bumpouts jog and plantings on the north side.

The next sheet is the Utility and Grading Plan, Sheet C-3. Starting at the south side with utility connections, they will connect telephone and cable from NET3 from an underground. The next utility is drainage. The building will have entire roof collected and hard piped, out to the existing 15" pipe on the east side of Bridge Street. For water they are proposing a fire and domestic service, entering between Units 1 & 2. They are showing a 2" copper and 4" fire service. The sewer line is coming out of the north side under Unit 1 and it currently has a 4" pipe that is connected to the sewer at this

location. They want to replace that with a 6". They require three phase power with the elevator and servicing needs of this building will be a 1,000 amp service with three phase power. Three phase is currently not in front of the site but is available at the intersection of Bridge and Hanover. The poling is in place they will just bring the three wires up to the pole on the north side and then drop down to a transformer pad mounted in front of the building and service the building from there. Gas service will be connected on the north end of the building and the meters will be separated from the electrical components per code requirements. The Utility and Grading Plan shows the grade if there are any questions. They have notes about maintaining the curb reveal along the entire front and they work from the existing gutter line to create the sidewalk grades. Each door entrance has the appropriate flat accessibility spot.

The Detail Sheet is the last page and they are pretty standard details. It is also the beginning of a Construction Management Plan and they are showing sidewalk closures and they will be worked on as a condition of approval when construction is eminent but they are showing what could be done there to relocate the sidewalk during construction.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden noted that the application has Mr. DiLorenzo as the owner and asked if that is the same as 7 Islington LLC? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Tillman asked if this would be an appropriate area to put some street trees along Bridge Street? Mr. Desfosses did not believe there was sufficient room for that. Ms. Tillman asked about where there are indents in the building? Mr. Desfosses sees her point but the indents in the building are where the doors are. The one spot they can actually put a tree is where the telephone service is going. He doesn't want to end up with Porter Street happening again.

Ms. Tillman asked them to list the variances granted on the Lot Line Relocation plan. On the Tanner Street property they don't show the stipulation on parking and what was shown on the plan that was submitted to the BOA. Ms. Tillman explained that at the BOA they submitted a plan showing the parking as a result of that variance and it's not on this relocation plan. Mr. Chagnon indicated that that plan was showing that they could put two parking spaces on that property. Ms. Tillman further explained that that plan became part of the approval. Mr. Holden added that if they are going to include this plan then it needs to be accurate.

Mr. Desfosses had some general questions. He asked if the yellow building had been subdivided off of this lot? Mr. Chagnon explained that the 7 Islington Street building used to go back further but they relocated the lot line and they are still two different parcels. Mr. Desfosses asked if there was any parking on the 7 Islington lot? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that there is currently no parking.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the gas service for 44 Bridge Street is right next to where they are showing gas on their building. They should sketch that on as "existing" so it doesn't get Dig Safe for any reason.

Moving down, the plan, the cap to the existing gas and water services should be shown capped back at the main.

The sewer lateral to the building shows a 6" PVC and the minimum slope for that is .01 foot per foot and they are showing it as 004? Either the 6" is wrong or the slope is wrong.

The domestic service is shown tapped off the fire but it will need its own tap out in the street.

There are two water mains in that road. They will have to tap off of the 8" ductile iron, as opposed to the old main which will be abandoned sometime.

It didn't make it on the plan but the road was dig safe so he had the opportunity to see that there is actually a telephone line between the gas and the sewer lines and there is a telephone transmission duct bank in the middle of the road as well, between the gas and the sewer.

Mr. Desfosses had an issue with the grease trap. He felt they should at least put the sewer lateral in for the grease trap, if not the grease trap, but he will leave that to his supervisor to elaborate on.

Regarding the sidewalk repair, because it is the same project, even though it is subdivided off, they should repair the sidewalk near where the guy wire is at pole NETT3 because that is where the patch was for the sewer lateral that was installed for 7 Islington Street. They should probably go down all the way to where the gas patch is for 44 Bridge Street, which is a light expansion or about an additional 20' of what they have shown. Mr. Chagnon stated they will get 44 Bridge to contribute to the southerly end.

Mr. Desfosses asked them to put a detail on the plan for the connection for the sewer showing the proper alignment going into the sewer line. He asked if they will they cut the clay right out and put PVC in? Mr. Chagnon indicated that he did not show a detail on that. Mr. Desfosses requested a detail and also show a detail on either an inserted T or some other approved method of connecting the roof drain to the drainpipe.

Due to the number of utility connections that need to be made, he stipulated that the road shall be milled and paved. That road was paved 3 years ago and it already has 5 patches in it and there will be several more patched so he is going to ask the applicant to mill and pave this section of the road, starting at the crosswalk at Islington Street and going down to in front of 44 Bridge Street.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there are lights on the front of this building? Mr. Chagnon was sure there were lights under the overhang. Mr. Desfosses requested a detail for those and they will want something anti glare, dark sky friendly.

Mr. Cravens noted on the water service entering the building, he says to see Note 6 and it refers to a knox box. What was he trying to tell them with Note 6? Mr. Chagnon directed him to the note.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold's concern with Note 6 is that they don't like knox boxes inside as the fire department may be prohibited from getting in. He strongly recommended that the knox box be located on the exterior wall next to the front door. If they want to recess it to make it more attractive that is perfectly acceptable.

Mr. Allen referenced the grease trap. They have that shown at the high end of the building. They have the telephone service at that end and they may want to flip flop and bring the telephone service to the uphill side of the building and have the grease trap at the other end so that whatever future restaurant they may have can take advantage of that. Mr. Chagnon did not believe they have enough space in that corner and they are stringing three wires further, which does not look good. Mr. Allen asked if they are eliminating the overhead electric in front? Mr. Chagnon agreed that was single phase. Mr. Allen asked if they were upgrading that service to that pole? Mr. Desfosses explained that there is not three phase power on either side. There is three phase power in front of the old library on Islington Street and three phase power up to Hanover Street. So the issue is how to get three phase power up to the site and, although he agrees that the grease trap should be at the bottom of the building, but the transformer that they need is basically the only spot that is big enough to put the transformer. Mr. Chagnon stated it was a 1,000 amp service. Mr. Desfosses explained that they can't drop secondary power off the pole as it's not big enough. Mr. Holden felt that everything is getting shoe horned in and asked them to bear

in mind that there is an issue there. Mr. Chagnon asked them to bear in mind that no one is planning a restaurant here. Mr. Holden responded that, with all due respect, that is what they were told up on Congress Street too where there is a restaurant now. There is only one good time to do it and they have the space to do it. Mr. Desfosses asked how big the transformer was? Mr. Chagnon stated it was at the green box type and the pads are 8' x 8'. Mr. Holden asked if they were putting that in the front of the building? Ms. Tillman asked if a fence was around it? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that the fence is shown on HDC plan. Ms. Tillman also thought they will need City Council approval for the gates to the fence. Mr. Chagnon felt it would only be opened once every thirty years when they have to replace the transformer. That is a code item as PSNH needs that room. Mr. Holden felt that Ms. Tillman might be right and they may need permission to do that.

Mr. Allen noted this site is in the HDC so there should be brick sidewalk. Mr. Chagnon stated that Steve Parkinson indicated that this is a section that is concrete. Mr. Chagnon indicated that they specifically spent along of time asking the right people that question and the answer was concrete. Mr. Holden confirmed they will research that internally.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold noted that they intend to use the municipal fire alarm system which is fine but they need to show the conduit and connection for that fire alarm system on the plans. Otherwise, they tend to get left out and they come back later and have to have somebody rip up the sidewalk, such as 58 State Street.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there is a fire alarm on the pole on the uphill side? Mr. Chagnon was not sure. Mr. Desfosses felt that they had done a great job on the overhead utilities. He asked if they had the fire alarm on the poles and he want' sure which way was easiest. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold was not sure where it comes in as they have several boxes in the area.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa felt that the building was so close to them that he did not require an internal Motorola review.

Ms. Finnigan asked if a traffic study had been done? Mr. Chagnon stated that it had. When they were in the Pre-TAC stage they did a preliminary study but more recently it was rolled into the 51 Islington Street study which she just received today. This project and 51 Islington Street showed that every intersection was B or better except for the intersection at Summer and Islington. Ms. Finnigan confirmed that she needs to see that analysis as she did not get a hard copy of any analysis that was done for that report. She has the traffic counts from previous. Mr. Chagnon asked if Don Rhodes gave her a copy of something this morning? Ms. Finnigan stated he did not give her a copy of the actual analysis and that is what she needs.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the gas company has told them that they have adequate capacity for this building? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they have.

Mr. Holden indicated that one set of previous plans proposed underground parking and he just wonder where are the people who will be living there going to be parking? Mr. Chagnon stated that there were some prior plans but it wasn't underground parking as the lot is not wide enough unless you come off of Tanner Street but they were told that was not acceptable. The parking was redesigned to be at grade coming off of Bridge and then, because it is on the first floor, there was a pretty loud signal from the Planning Department that it would be better to have commercial space on the first floor rather than parking. People will have to park in the parking garage or municipal parking lots. The developer realizes that is a negative and is looking to provide parking for these residential units, one space each, at the 51 Islington Street underground garage. However, that project is neither in approval or under construction, it is not a part of this application at this time. Mr. Holden asked why they would put a loading berth in front of the building? Mr. Chagnon stated that they cannot drive around to the back of the building. Mr. Holden felt it might make more sense to put it on a common lot line? Mr. Chagnon felt they would then have to talk to the neighbors or just let the City Council decide what is the best

spot? Mr. Holden asked if they should start this process now? Mr. Chagnon felt that Mr. Holden had a good point but the neighbor might think it's better to have a parking space. Mr. Holden felt that seeing as they are probably going to be looking at a revised set of plans, if he wants an opportunity to rethink that, he would have time to do that.

Mr. Holden felt that the grease trap was different than Fleet Street as there is a side area where they can put one but historically in the downtown they have required that they go in. Mr. Allen asked if they want to have a grease trap that has a vac truck come up in front of two front doors, open up a manhole and suck out grease in someone's front entry way? He doesn't think so. If he was a business owner he would not want a grease access at his front door. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it is pretty nasty. Mr. Holden asked if they could do this at a staff level and then come back but if they think there has to be a grease trap, Mr. Chagnon is trying to address the idea if we are going to require it. The first one is do they think the site should have one? (General consensus from the Committee). He asked if it could be on the common sidewalk? Mr. Desfosses felt that it probably could be. That is what they did on the Parade Mall project. Mr. Holden asked if they were going to advise Mr. Chagnon it might be that they are going to look that there be a grease trap. Mr. Desfosses thinks this is a great spot for a restaurant as it has parking right across the street. He felt they have to plan for it and he agrees with Mr. Allen that it should be at the lowest part of the building. A discussion about possible locations for the grease trap was held.

Mr. Desfosses had one more reservation. They have drainage problems on Bridge Street. This is a medium size application but at the bottom of the hill is a drain pipe that floods out by the supply store and he is just mentioning this as a precaution. They have water problems down in that corner. He does not know if it is appropriate to ask the applicant to do something about it. Mr. Holden felt they would have to quantify it. Mr. Desfosses felt they at least need to look at whether it is warranted or not. To be fair to the applicant the existing lot is completely impervious as it is. Under this proposal they are proposing a direct connection to the drain. He doesn't know if it is appropriate or not but he just wanted to throw it out there. Mr. Holden asked if they could do something with the sidewalks so that they allow for more infiltration? Mr. Desfosses had some reservations with the walkway in the back when it snows out there and the back doors are 5' from the fence there will not be anyplace for the snow to go and the ice won't melt. Mr. Chagnon asked if the problem they speak of is the Redline Johnson catch basin that backs up? Mr. Desfosses indicated they have capacity problems. Mr. Chagnon did not think that infiltration was going to help. Mr. Desfosses agreed and indicated that they need more of a global solution. Mr. Chagnon indicated that they were going to hook 51 Islington Street into the intersection at Bridge and Hanover so if there is a problem downstream because they will have to work on it for that project.

Mr. Holden felt they need to have figures to look at. Mr. Chagnon suggested that they have a meeting with DPW to look at this. Mr. Holden stated that they can't have them clean up every problem that the City has but if this project is creating more of something, they have to control it. Mr. Chagnon felt this was on the edge. This a covered lot now and will be a covered lot when they are done so they are not increasing the flow. Mr. Holden felt that if it was a totally covered lot they would be in to the BOA because they would be tearing down a building and doing something new so they are doing something new which brings up the question of over-intensification too. He doesn't like the way they are approaching this and he feels they need some hard numbers. He suggested they do a Pre-TAC for the December meeting. They have a pretty good list of things they are looking at. Mr. Allen thought as a result of their meeting that Mr. Chagnon was going to look at the drainage basin to size the pipes on Hanover so they would handle future connections. Mr. Chagnon assumed they will probably postpone this. Mr. Holden thought there were a lot of comments and they have not had an opportunity to review a traffic study so there is not way this would be going forward today in one meeting. Mr. Holden assumes he will take their discussion and refine the plans further.

Mr. Holden asked if they are recommending Traffic & Safety at this time? Ms. Finnigan stated that the traffic study submitted this morning was for 51 Islington Street and not for this address. Mr. Chagnon

stated that the 51 Islington Street study included this site as well. Mr. Holden confirmed that they don't have to do another study but they have to submit a study that only covers this lot. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they will repackage the report for this lot only.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone to the December 2nd TAC meeting. Mr. Chagnon should ask for a Pre-TAC. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the meeting.

The motion to postpone to December 2nd passed unanimously.

Concerns of the Committee:

- 1) That all variances shall be included on the Lot Line Revision Plan that is included as part of the plan set;
- 2) That the gas service for 44 Bridge Street shall be labeled as "existing" so that it does not get Dig Safe for any reason;
- 3) That the cap to the existing gas and water services shall be shown capped at the main;
- 4) That either the 6" PCV or the slope for the sewer lateral shall be corrected;
- 5) That the domestic service will require it's own tap in the street;
- 6) That the 8" ductile iron water main shall be tapped off;
- 7) That the sidewalk shall be repaired where the guy wire is at pole NETT3 and shall continue to 44 Bridge Street;
- 8) That a detail shall be added to the site plans for the connection for the sewer showing the proper alignment going into the sewer line;
- 9) That a detail shall be added to the plans for either an inserted T or some other approved method of connecting the roof drain to the drainpipe;
- 10) That the road shall be milled and paved, starting at the crosswalk at Islington Street and continuing to the front of 44 Bridge Street;
- 11) That a detail shall be added for the lights on the front of the building and they should be anti glare, dark sky friendly;
- 12) That it is strongly recommended that the knox box shall be installed on the exterior of the building, next to the front door;
- 13) That the fire alarm conduit and connection shall be shown on the plans;
- 14) That a traffic report for 40 Bridge Street shall be prepared and provided to Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, for her review;
- 15) That the applicant may wish to reconsider the location of the loading berth;
- 16) That the applicant shall meet with representatives of DPW to discuss the drainage problems on Bridge Street to determine whether the applicant shall be responsible to contribute to the solution to this issue;
- 17) That the applicant shall meet with representatives of DPW to discuss the placement of a grease trap on the site;

.....

II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:55 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant

