

**PORTSMOUTH
TRAFFIC & SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING
8:00 a.m. – Thursday, January 10, 2008
City Hall – Eileen Dondero Foley Council Chambers**

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Councilor Ken Smith, Chairman called the meeting to order at approximately 8:05 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL: Members Present:

Councilor Ken Smith, Chairman	Ted Gray, Member
Steve Parkinson, P.E. Public Works Director	John Connors, Member
Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa	John Howe, Member
Assist. Fire Chief Achilles	Christina Westfall, Member
Deborah Finnigan, P.E., Traffic Engineer	Jonathan Bailey, Member
	Brendan Cooney, Member

III. ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES:

IT WAS VOTED on a Motion made by Ted Gray to accept the minutes of the December 13, 2007 meeting. Seconded by Jonathan Bailey. Motion passed.

The Chair welcomed Brendan Cooney as a new member replacing Councilor Eric Spear.

III. NEW BUSINESS:

- (A) **Intersection of Winter at Chatham Streets** - Request for a stop sign on Winter Street – Christina Westfall referred to the on-site, these two streets are heavily used, Winter St. for traffic drop off for St. Patrick’s School and used frequently during the day, there is not a Stop Sign there for either way and there is a garage located there at the corner making sight difficult.
MOTION made by Assist. Fire Chief Achilles to place a Stop Sign on Winter. Seconded by Christina Westfall.

Ted Gray stated that Chatham St. is the shorter Street, Winter St. is the through street and we do not usually put Stop Signs on through streets. Wouldn’t it be appropriate for the Stop Sign to go on Chatham?

AMENDED MOTION - Asst. Fire Chief Achilles amended his Motion to read “to place a Stop Sign on Chatham Street.” not Winter. Agreeable to the Second. Motion passed.

- (B) **Marcy St.** – Driveway Site Distance (plan attached) – Deputy Fire Chief Achilles referred to the request for a driveway between 287 and 293 Marcy St., a shared driveway. One concern was the sight distances heading north because of the rise in the road, we could not identify a safe way to exit the proposed driveway, either backing into the driveway or backing out which would be worse.
MOTION made by Deputy Fire Chief Achilles to place the request on file and not to recommend it at this time. Seconded by Ted Gray. Motion passed.
- (C) **Crossroads House** – TAC Referral (plan Attached) – Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering presented proposed plans for site improvements to Crossroad House.

Extensive site work projects where three buildings will be taken down and constructing a new building on premises. The facility needs to be open throughout the entire construction as well as maintaining access to Operation Blessings complex. The actual entrance to Rte.1 south will not be moved. A turn around for drop off vehicles will be created and a designated parking area. Some of the work includes connecting a walkway in front of Bournival to the bus stop. Plus there will be on-site pedestrian improvements by having the drop off behind the building, sidewalks to allow people to safely pass through the parking lot directly to the bus stop as well. Some things having been added to the plan since TAC meeting are stop bars, right turn only and conditional details for handicap accessible ramp.

MOTION made by Ted Gray to accept the plans as presented. Seconded by Jonathan Bailey. Motion passed.

Assist. Fire Chief Achilles referred to the turn around where it says “No Parking Fire Lane”, can a fire truck actually turn in there?

Eric Weinberg responded a fire truck can turn in there.

Ted Gray asked if 18 wheelers go in there?

Eric Weinberg responded “no” standard box trucks, UPS vehicles can access it.

Dumpster trucks will get to the dumpster.

Jonathan Bailey asked if the curb cut actually getting smaller?

Eric Weinberg responded the actual curb cut stays the same width.

- (D) **Lafayette School** – Senior Housing – TAC Referral (plan attached) – Eric Weinrieb stated that the former Lafayette School is being proposed to convert to ten one bedroom senior housing units being operated by Portsmouth Housing Authority. The proposed plan is a one-way access into the site, 15 angled parking stalls and a loop road around the building to head back out to Monroe St. Ten spaces are required through zoning for senior housing, there will be five extra spaces that will be available to the public for the playground. TAC requested that the playground clear zone is not compromised during the project. The design drawings show the limits of the timber playground area and in that area staying approx, 6 ft. from that. We are providing a timber guardrail similar to the South Mill Playground, but instead of 24” high, we are going up to 30” so that people have better potential to see the guardrail as they are driving in. Also providing 3 ft. to allow for snow storage as well as some front end buffer. There are two access ways, one to go straight from the playground out to Lafayette Road. All trash will be stored inside the building eliminating need for dumpsters. There will not be parking provided behind the building. TAC requested verification of site distances.

Ted Gray stated that trash stored inside at some point needs to come out of the building, how and by whom.

Eric Weinrieb responded he did not know, but is his understanding that Portsmouth Housing will be working with the City.

John Connors referred to site distance to the right, should exiting toward Middle Road, asked if problems were anticipated regarding cars or residents from adjoining houses parked there.

Eric Weinrieb responded “No”, the two houses there have driveways.

Ted Gray referred to the area between the school and Monroe St. currently a playground at the end of the building where the tires are, what will that be?

Eric Weinrieb responded it will be a landscaped area. The chain link fence will be taken down, overgrown areas will be cleaned up, and the two remaining trees will be pruned to have 6 ft clear.

Debbie Finnigan referred to discussion at TAC that the sidewalk from the playground to the bus stop wasn't going to be there due to snow storage, why die you decide to leave it in? Snow will be plowed up on the sidewalk on a regular basis, are you going to plow it out.

Eric Weinrieb will like to see that area stay, not use it in the winter, use it in the summer, sidewalk in the summer and storage in the winter.

Debbie Finnigan stated he needed to discuss this with Dave Desfosses.

The issue is that the snow will come up when it is plowed will go onto that sidewalk, in reality that is not a very large storage space and when plowed will be plowed onto the sidewalk. Needs to be discussed further, it was supposed to be removed and the wooden fence go to the chain link fence. This falls under site review but also is a safety to pedestrians.

John Howe asked there are no sidewalks as you come up from the Shell Station, where does the sidewalk go in.

Eric Weinrieb responded it actually starts at the bus stop.

Christina Westfall asked as far as people using the playground, is there parking for the playground, or will they continue to park along the chain link fence on Monroe St.

Eric Weinrieb responded they will be allowed to park along the chain link fence, however, according to the requirement for a space per unit, there are actually 5 extra spaces available for the public.

Ted Gray stated he sees 14 spaces on the plan, not 15.

Eric Weinrieb apologized, there are 14 spaces and 4 available to the public.

MOTION made by Jonathan Bailey to accept plans as presented. Seconded by John Connors. Motion passed.

The Chair asked that the detail brought up by Debbie Finnigan be taken care of by site review.

- (E) **Parade Mall** - Proposed Floor Public Parking – TAC Referral (Traffic Assessment and Queuing at Garage Entrance documents attached) – Patrick Crimmins and Gregg Milcolaities of Appledore Engineering, Jeff Johnston from Parade LLC and Robin Bousa, Senior Traffic Consultant VHB are here for the addition of a 2nd story second level to the previously approved portwalk project. A development of that project was a single underground level parking garage. The extra level will consist of 340 parking spaces. As part of the project there will be revisions to the previously approved first level of the garage, the garage was previously approved at 345 spaces, due to some development changes there will be 338 parking spaces. Part of this second level addition there will be no changes to the ground level which includes entrance from Hanover St. into garage and right turn only exit onto Maplewood from garage. Over the past few months we have had a number of meetings with City staff, there has been a tremendous amount of coordination with our project team and the City. Mr. Crimmins gave background of the meetings beginning in July they were approved for Broadwalk development by the Planning Board. December 4th had a pre TAC with City staff, December 11th had a follow up Pre-TAC with City staff. December 11th had a meeting with Richard Hopley, Chief Building Inspector to assess overview. December 13th a meeting with City's Parking Consultant, Steve Parkinson and their Parking Garage Consultant. December

20th met City staff at DPW to discuss associated utilities for underground garage. January 2, 2008 Pre-TAC followed by a TAC meeting and January 8th also had a pre-TAC followed by a TAC meeting receiving parking conditions with stipulations, one being we needed to meet with this Committee to receive recommendation for approval. One of the key considerations for this underground garage is traffic and turned the meeting over to Robin Bousa.

Robin Bousa, Senior Traffic Engineer, VHB referred to the Traffic Study that was submitted to the members of the Committee which is a full update of where it was left off last time taking the last step to include the 2nd level of the garage. It is the same critical peak hours. There are really no other changes to the site plan other than the extra level to the garage. The ground level is exactly the same, all access locations are the same and still function in the same way. The study took a longer look at traffic circulation in the whole area, is projected out to the year 2020. The trip generations were based on actual rates happening at the Hanover St. facility. There is no substantial change with the additional level. Regarding the queuing along the entrance and exit of the garage, a memo was presented to the Committee members which updates the calculations done the last time to improve the extra level. TAC had five comments as follows: 1. Was the analysis in the study based on the existing timing plans on Maplewood Ave. or optimized plan? Ms. Bousa responded it is based on the existing conditions. 2. A conditional of approval was the optimal signals at Maplewood for this project. Ms. Bousa stated the applicant agrees to do this at his cost. 3. The simulations that Debbie Finnigan asked at Pre-TAC. You can take the analysis in the report and use the traffic simulation models. 4. Queuing on entering and exiting the garage – Ms. Bousa was unable to find the methodology to evaluate entering the garage anywhere and if our Parking Consultant has a methodology, or an analysis that we could use we would be happy to take a look at it. 5. What happens to Russell and Market St. as this project moves forward without the Westin project? The agreement was we knew the signal needed at Russell and Market and the Westin and the applicant would help this to happen. If the Westin project is delayed what happens. That signal is needed today, we know we need a signal. The applicant knows it is needed and has always been willing to participate in it.

Asst. Fire Chief Achilles doesn't think those intersections have traffic pre-emption now and with the volume of traffic would like to see some pre-emption system that is consistent. Maplewood is a significant and critical route for emergency vehicles so pre-emption at Hanover and Maplewood and Deer and Maplewood is important. Would also like to have investigate to see if it works, on the garage out if the pre-emption is activated specifically if emergency vehicles are heading north up Maplewood how would this traffic at the garage out know not to pull out? You'll have a stop light, will there be some kind of signaling garage out so that people know not to just pull out onto Maplewood? How would they know if fire apparatus approaching?

Ms. Bousa responded there will be a control.

Asst. Fire Chief Achilles concern is someone pulling out not having pre-notification an emergency vehicle was approaching and there was an accident, how can we integrate pre-emption?

Ms. Bousa responded as far as pre-emption will see what our controllers have capacity to handle and will take a look at this.

Asst. Fire Chief Achilles stated that most of our emergency traffic is north up Maplewood and want to make sure that during peak hours someone does not pull out and would be fine if the site distances are good and wants the pre-emption at this intersection.

Gregg Milcolaities feels what might be important for this Committee if Steve Parkinson, this facility is being reviewed, scrutinized, approved by the City's Parking Consultant, we are not coming here as a private developer, this really is a public/private partnership.

Steve Parkinson stated basically this is a public/private partnership project before us with an additional level of parking. This project has already gone through an approval process, has approvals for the construction of one level of parking, subsequent to that approval, it was found that it was economically feasible to go down an additional level. The City is going to end up owning its own level of parking in this facility through whatever arrangement is made. To that end the City has on board their own Parking Consultant, Walker Parker who has worked with us in the past dealing with parking. They have reviewed the original conceptual plans for the increased parking, came back with some recommendations, the same type of level service we looked for in the Westin project we partnered on. The applicant has addressed those concerns, sent it to Walker for additional comments dealing with some changes that we made to flow patterns within the garage to get that level of service B. Level service B is for the entire facility and the operation of same. There may be some components that are A service level and some C. But the goal has always been to maintain a level service B for the total facility.

John Howe referred to Woodbury Ave. regarding a discussion of adding a new traffic light system, are we having a new traffic light system here.

Steve Parkinson stated the existing system along this corridor starting at State to Deer St. is a new system installed two years ago. We have been talking about the intersection of Market and Russell Streets which currently has a flashing light, is an intersection we've looked at through this process, the Westin to put it into a fully actuated signalized intersection.

The Chair referred to the new system running down here was going to be a software upgrade that we talked about last time.

Debbie Finnigan stated we're proposing to have Robin upgrading the timing phasing based on their project to make it run better as well as to see if we can get the side streets to move quicker.

Ms. Bousa stated it is to the City's benefit to go back and optimize that timing.

Debbie Finnigan asked about the intersection of Deer at Russell, you based that on the fact that the Westin was going to be teeing up that intersection and changing the one-way and asked we don't know when the Westin is going to be built so how does that impact processing the traffic from your project.

Ms. Bousa responded the original felt there was no impact at that intersection under the old plan and feels the additional level of garage. Stated she doubted we wouldn't find an impact.

The Chair asked does this include not only for the teeing up but the one-way portion may not happen and how would that change the numbers?

Ms. Bousa stated feels we would be looking at basically the same amount of impact from this level that we looked at in the original Traffic Study for the Parade Mall and would like to note and not sure have gone into detail last time with the Port walk project, we made the assumption that once this signal goes into Russell and Market, it actually will attract more traffic at Deer and Russell. Doesn't feel there will any substantial change.

Debbie Finnigan for the record asked do you think you'll be able to improve the system at Maplewood and Middle so that the private way on Deer St. is not blocked when the exclusive ped face comes on?

Ms. Bousa responded she could not guarantee that and does not want to go on record as saying otherwise. What she could say based on the analysis done, your looking at a really quick recovery rate when that happens.

The Chair stated during City Council meeting a Councilor brought up trying to do bicycle racks inside, shower facilities, do you know if that is going forward and if so, do we have adequate sidewalks leading in.

Steve Parkinson stated in the last round of plans in one of the levels of the garage they have incorporated a bicycle storage area, not showers, but a place for them to go into the garage and lock their bikes. There are adequate sidewalks.

MOTION made by Ted Gray to accept the proposal as presented. Seconded by Christina Westfall. Motion passed.

Asst. Deputy Fire Chief Achilles referred to the pre-emption, won't make this stipulation but would hope that our Parking Consultant and the City will work with the developer to see how they can collaboratively improve that.

IV. OLD BUSINESS:

- (A) **Taft Road** – Report back – Debbie Finnigan looked at the 20 MPH signage stating that as you come into Taft from Elwyn Road there is one sign “Restricted Speed Area All Streets 20 MPH” on a telephone pole on the wrong side of the street, this is it for 20 MPH speed limit signs in that neighborhood. More 20 MPH signs are not going to decrease the speed, the streets are very wide, and the intersections are very wide lending itself to have people travel faster than 20 MPH. Recommends putting a CIP project together to see if the width of the road can be reduced or at a minimum improve and narrow all intersections. Signs will not help.

Christina Westfall added that Safe Routes To School have projects in that neighborhood that will help to reduce the width of the road or at least the illusion of a narrower road.

MOTION made by .Assist Fire Chief Achilles to place on file. Seconded by Steve Parkinson. Motion passed.

- (B) **Meadowbrook Inn** – Proposed site Development – TAC Referral (Plans attached) – Attorney Malcolm McNeil representing the applicant for this project. Attorney McNeil progression of the plan reflecting comments by this Committee and TAC, we are hoping to return to TAC with finality from this Committee to process this. Attorney McNeil referred to the context of the plan the issues that are before you today. Primarily the on-site circulation and truck traffic in and out of the site which was subject to significant discussion at TAC. Attorney McNeil referred to the plan. Before any consideration of movement of this site into this particularly environmentally sensitive area, it is a place we can't go. It is a valuable piece of property that proposes 2 restaurants, 2 retail uses and hotel user. No waivers have been requested regarding set backs, variances and the like, we presume the site to be legally valid and appropriate for commercial use. The Chief is concerned with movement of trucks in and out of the site. It is not a full service hotel, two retail users on site and 3 relatively small restaurants. There will be truck deliveries, majority of which will be box type trucks. Will not say that a tractor trailer truck is never going to go on the property but will say we expect people making deliveries to be people that make regular deliveries and expect users of the restaurants to be national users and will tell them where to come in and where to go out. In terms of frequency of tractor trailers at the highest level, will not say we know every user here so we can tell you there will only be one tractor trailer/day or at the most two. Attorney McNeil is prepared to suggest to this Committee that is the probability and as for the remainder of the site the likelihood is that box or other trucks that are not an issue with regard to dynamics of this project will be servicing the site. Discussion regarding to pedestrian access and utilization of the intersection primarily and the effect on the general system of traffic. This will be spoken to today as well and have tried to be accommodating regarding this issue. Our hope would be that you favorably consider the onsite changes made that are directly responsive to TAC and then we'll go through the truck changes and hopefully you'll find that satisfactory as well.

Mike Leo of VHB referred to the site plan presented to TAC with a few changes relating to traffic and safety and since then made a few additional changes to the plan. Based on the last Traffic & Safety meeting did some clean up of the site, there had been comments about the 4-way internal intersection, too much pavement and tightened up driveway to retail B and retail A. Plans were presented to the Committee of changes made since TAC. Pedestrian access from Coakley to the site is a series of crosswalks and sidewalks and ADA handicap ramps that go along the entire site. Propose a sidewalk along Coakley Rd on the northerly side and crosswalk to the hotel on the opposite side. A 20ft easement is planned along Coakley Rd for future building of the overpass if built someday. There was discussion at TAC of how trucks would get in and out of the site, whether the Rte.1 By-pass or Coakley Rd or both. Mr. Leo referred to the plans explaining changes.

Debbie Finnigan asked the width of the roadway next to retail A? Mr. Leo responded 14 ft.

The Chair clarified trucks will be able to come onto Coakley but have to take a right only at that intersection, can't take a left onto Rt.1 By-pass.

Mr. Leo responded they would be able to take a left onto Rt.1 By-pass. A large truck heading north on Rt.1 By-pass can't make a left onto Coakley and would have to go up to the Circle, come around and come back down.

Attorney McNeil commented this works fully for large trucks. There is one movement to our knowledge that does not work here that would have to be addressed. Large trucks coming northbound wishing to go on Coakley Rd can't do it. It would take two minutes to go to the circle, around the circle and come back.

Steve Parkinson referred to the proposed sidewalk easement and asked if they also proposing to construct the sidewalk along Coakley Rd.

Mr. Leo responded "yes".

Steve Parkinson asked where we sit with pedestrian crossing at that light as far as dealing with the state.

Mr. Leo responded Mr. M will address that, we are not recommending that.

John Howe asked where the road between Coakley and Borthwick stood? Secondly, someone coming down Coakley making a left into the site.

Ted Gray stated it doesn't look it from your plans and we wonder why.

Mr. Leo responded someone coming from residential area of Coakley, a car would take a left turn into the development but don't expect a truck.

Ted Gray asked if the crosswalk were painted.

Mr. Leo responded either painted or a rumble strip.

Ted Gray stated this should be address so people will understand.

The Chair asked what is the purpose of the pork chop?

Mr. Leo responded to give definition to the direction most vehicles will be coming from.

Asst. Fire Chief Achilles stated it makes sense not to have the pork chop curbed, it will definitely create a problem, if you need delineation, ground level is fine. Want to make sure they take a left.

Mr. Leo stated they can eliminate the double yellow line in that area.

Debbie Finnigan stated if you look at the WB50 turns, the WB50 drives over to where that hatched area is, if you take that hatched area away, now they're potentially driving into on coming traffic and this issue needs to be resolved. If you look at the drawing they gave us they distinctly go into that hatched area.

Steve Parkinson stated if a center line comes down to a stop bar so exiting traffic is to one side of that, still leaves the whole cross hatched area in the other lane which is open.

Debbie Finnigan asked then where would you put the double yellow line.

Mr. Leo stated is would run straight.

Debbie Finnigan still debates this.

Nick Sanders, Traffic Engineer VHB went through the proposed off-site improvements. Currently, they are recommending the installation of an exclusive right turn lane into the site, right turns out the through traffic on the By-pass. Secondly, proposing to relocate the site driveway from a point approx. 50 ft. from the By-pass back 250 ft to create additional separation and the flow between the two intersections. Thirdly, is signal coordination and retiming improvement on Rt.1 By-pass, Coakley, Cottage and intersection of Borthwick including the design, construction and implementation of the proposed retiming. Mr. Sanders asked that the installation does include the emergency vehicle preemptions that was requested at the last Traffic & Safety meeting. Fourth, that we would make a voluntary contribution to the CIP for the City. VHB is recommending TSM which is intersection City-wide traffic signal operated program. We are willing to make a financial contribution. Additionally, we are providing a 20ft easement for planning in the future for potential pedestrian overpass and have extended the sidewalk along the site on the north side of Coakley Rd.

Mr. Sanders also spoke of the status of the DOT review process at traffic and safety provided at TAC. Currently, the study is next in the queue at the Bureau of Traffic and is likely being reviewed and NH DOT District 6 anticipates the review be done by mid February at which point further requests of TAC, we are going to coordinate with DOT a meeting with DOT, VHB and the City to iron out any outstanding issues. Additionally, the analysis for the coordination retiming as well as the inclusion of pedestrian phase at intersection Coakley and Cottage has forwarded this on the Mr. Ireland of District 6 who will pass along to Traffic and Design Bureaus. We should receive comments and schedule meetings in conjunction with the City to iron out the issues. The last thing is the pedestrian crossing where you asked to evaluate the potential improvement of the exclusive pedestrian phase at the intersection of Coakley and Cottage to see what the effects are on the coordination of timing plan. Our conclusion is that VHB can offer recommended as it does have some significant impacts regarding the operations of traffic flow on the By-pass. We also provided some traffic simulations which show the extent of the queueing at those signals when the pedestrian phases come up, if a couple of pedestrian phases get called up in a row or more than five in the course of an hour, substantial queues and the intersection will be dealing with longer queues as long as 30 minutes to process operations. For these reasons we are not recommending the installation and exclusive pedestrian phase, This information was passed on to DOT for their evaluation as part of their review and will get back to us, we will then coordinate with the City.

Asst. Fire Chief Achilles appreciates the preemption at Coakley intersection. The next intersection up is Borthwick and is a critical route for ambulances going to the hospital and asked they consider including this as a preemption also. Is concerned that we would preempt on one intersection and stop traffic at the next intersection where we couldn't move.

Steve Parkinson stated he believes they are proposing to coordinate both of those intersections in the signal equipment so that preemption would be integral to both intersections through that coordination.

Mr. Sanders responded "yes".

Brendan Cooney referred to the pedestrian analysis which stated they would not recommend an exclusive pedestrian phase and does that analysis also preclude a non-exclusive pedestrian phase, a pedestrian signal that would be concurrent with a Coakley and Cottage St. green?

Mr. Sanders stated that had been given consideration but ultimately felt it was a safety issue, there aren't very many concurrent pedestrian phases in the State of New Hampshire and don't feel it would be safe for pedestrians.

Mr. Cooney's concern is that there is little options for pedestrians without a crosswalk marked there.

Mr. Sanders stated the real question is is it appropriate for pedestrians to be crossing the By-pass. Pedestrian safety versus traffic mobility. They didn't feel it was appropriate to install a crosswalk.

Steve Parkinson stated that throughout this corridor, whether Rt.1 By-pass or Rt.1 itself, there are series of crosswalks with this same type of situation throughout that corridor, whether it be at Greenleaf Ave., Greenleaf Woods Drive Mirona Road, Peverly Hill, Wilson Rd. so there is the same type of crossing through this corridor and in more intense areas.

Jonathan Bailey stated for the record you are saying that this project will not provide for timing, does not provide for pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Sanders responded "we are not recommending it".

Christina Westfall thanked them for honoring our requests to put up sidewalk easement and make sidewalk go out to Rt.1. Questioned the DOT review you have pedestrian phased timing, do you also have the need for pedestrian crossing there? Are they going to be reviewing the potential for the crosswalk over Rte.1? are they looking at any solutions for these problems?

Mr. Sanders responded they are reviewing the analysis showing the condition of the retiming plan with and without pedestrian phase. They will be able to see what those differences are and evaluate the priority and recommendation.

Christina Westfall stated her opinion she feels the plan as proposed will draw a lot of people, not only from people coming off Cottage as well as the other hotels at the Circle, more amenities that what is currently offered there and feels there will be a lot of pedestrian traffic. It has come before us that we need pedestrian crossing there and do not want to see that there is a recommendation not to address this problem and will be a problem going forward with this plan as there will be people that want to get to that site and not necessarily driving. We need to realistically look at this and provide safety for pedestrians to get to your facility. This needs to be addressed, people will call the street and need to come up with a solution to allow that to happen safely. Asking for a recommendation for a possible solution.

Attorney McNeill stated that what we attempted to look at closely is what the impact would be on primary use of roadway system. Mr. Lorenzo stated to me "if they want a crosswalk, I'll put in a crosswalk, if they want the traffic to be

affected and stop to facilitate pedestrian traffic, we'll do that to. But let's make a decision. If you based on the recommendation of VHB wish to trade off infrequent pedestrian use as having an adverse effect on traffic flow, we'll do it.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa stated if it is infrequent pedestrian use then it really won't impact traffic that much.

The Chair stated before we get into specifics, make sure the presentation is complete and then continue with discussion when we have a motion.

Attorney McNeil stated the presentation is done and will answer any questions.

MOTION made by Steve Parkinson to approve the project with stipulations that a crosswalk phase, whether it be concurrent or exclusive, be included as requirement of the project unless rejected by NHDOT and when the sign packages are finalized, be reviewed and approved by the City's Traffic Engineer and Department of Public Works.. Seconded by Asst. Fire Chief Achilles. Motion passed.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa stated if it is an infrequent pedestrian use impact on the traffic will be infrequent. My sense is that we have to make some accommodation for people on foot as we do on Greenleaf. There will be people on foot and for this Committee to say "well, we'll just hope for the best" a pedestrian can cross with caution at a green light, but people will be turning and you will have an accident there and we would be remiss if we didn't say let's deal with that issue now.

Attorney McNeil stated that Mr. Parkinson's motion is fully acceptable to the applicant.

Debbie Finnigan referred to the statement that trucks cannot make a left onto Coakley and from a reality standpoint asked how are you going to prevent them from doing that?

The Chair stated that in reviewing your plans you have WB50's and WB62's making that movement onto Coakley from the northbound side which is what we talked about wouldn't happen and don't see anything where they are coming out to take the left hand turn to go up to the Circle. Asked that this be answered along with Ms. Finnigan's question.

Mr. Leo stated the intent was to have WB62's coming in and out off by By-pass. We were requested that at the TAC meeting showed the WB62 and how it would maneuver and whether it would work or not.

The Chair stated we didn't see one for the other movement. WB50 or 62.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa stated heading out and making that left on the By-pass to go to the Circle is not on the plans. In looking further it was on the plan.

Debbie Finnigan restated her question, you stated that if you're traveling northbound on the By-pass and you want to take a left on Coakley Rd., you cannot do that. How do you realistically prevent that from happening?

Mr. Leo stated that the truckers know the site and will have to be coordinated with the Manager of the site to be told which access they can use and not use. Will post signs at the loading areas instructing both managers and truckers.

Debbie Finnigan also asked when coming southbound on I-95 and get off the Circle to come to your site, how is the weave impacted as you won't be in that further most right lane and will have to come over quick, will that be doable if you're in a truck?

Mr. Sanders responded between where the two lanes come together at the traffic circle, where the right turn lane opens up going into the site approximately 400 ft distance and looking at the traffic volumes, it is a relatively low number and doesn't get any higher than 150 vehicles per hour and that's in the forecast year 2019, between 2 and 3 vehicles per minute. There are a lot of gaps in that right hand lane for vehicles coming from the north on the By-pass or Spaulding Turnpike.

Debbie Finnigan asked if the new analysis has been submitted to NHDOT for their review which also includes the pedestrian phase.

Mr. Sanders responded "yes"

Steve Parkinson asked if the sign packages have been put together for the site and the surrounding points.

Mr. Leo responded have not finalized the internal package.

Steve Parkinson made a stipulation that once the sign packages is finalized it be reviewed and approved by the City's Traffic Engineer and Department of Public Works.

Ted Gray asked Steve Parkinson if what they have done is acceptable to him. Steve Parkinson stated what they have done is fine.

The Chair referred to two issues that were brought up the last time. 1. Access coming off Coakley to go over to Borthwick, the service possibility and asked if anyone wanted to address this.

Ted Gray made a stipulation that you work with the Plumbing Supply Company there so there can be an access road going from Coakley to Borthwick.

Steve Parkinson stated that as part of the on going Rte.1 By-Pass study one of the thoughts in the project is that because of the close proximity of Cottage and Borthwick and revamping circle at some point, they actual direct Cottage across to Coakley may ultimately be cut off. Once that was looked at then how do you get this whole area whether it be Coakley Rd development or businesses, that's where that proposed connector between the two came about. That is something that wouldn't take place for a number of years until improvements are done to the By-Pass and now because of the State's funding issues, the By-Pass project is being held back to the immediate concerns of the State which are the conditions of the bridges.

John Howe commented that the intersection of Bartlett and Islington and Woodbury that Cottage left/right Borthwick is a major connecting road for anyone in that area going to the hospital and asked if this has been taken into account?

The Chair responded “yes”.

Al Romano, Coakley Road commented that the sidewalk on the north side of Coakley Road would lead you to cross By-Pass on the northern side. Traffic coming from Cottage try to beat that light. The visibility is poor due to the hedges and weeping willow tree. Mr. Romano asked the Committee and Developer, “what is more important the safety of pedestrians or not holding up vehicle traffic?: There will be more pedestrian traffic there than there is now. The sidewalk should be built on the South side.

The Chair commented coming off Coakley Rd coming onto the property, there was talk about the rumble strip, the pork chop, did we come to a final decision?

Debbie Finnigan responded the problem is the road not wide enough to handle that and this has been the problem all along. If you decide to eliminate that location you’re having a truck take up a lot of space of the oncoming lane and this concerns her.

Mr. Leo recommended leaving the paint as shown as it prohibits cars from taking left turns and better defines the entrance.

The Chair asked if there were any other concerns or comments, there being none, Motion passed.

V. INFORMATIONAL:

(A) 2008 Meeting Schedule

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine E. Boucas, Recording Secretary