

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

2:00 PM

AUGUST 31, 2010

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Assistant Fire Chief, Carl Roediger, Fire Inspector and Stephen Dubois, Deputy Police Chief

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Lang and Longmeadow Development, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **126 Lang Road**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to relocate one of five proposed multi-unit dwelling units on the site, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 291 as Lot 1-1 and lies within the Garden Apartment/Mobile Home (GA/MH) District. (This application was referred to TAC by the Planning Department at their July 15, 2010 meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Mr. Taintor stated that the Department had not received any site plans or a request for postponement for this application and asked if there was someone present to speak on behalf of the applicant. Corey Colwell of MSC Engineers stated that he understood through their legal counsel that the application was to be postponed and apologized if he did not send this Committee a letter. Mr. Taintor indicated that they did not have anything before them so there was nothing to postpone. He asked whether TAC should postpone it or should they ask the Planning Board to postpone it at the September meeting. Mr. Colwell felt they should address that through a letter to the Planning Department, requesting a postponement and he thought that was all taken care of. Mr. Taintor indicated that he called Attorney Pelech yesterday and asked for a response but did not get one. Mr. Taintor felt it might be more appropriate to report back to the Planning Board that they did not receive any plans. That was agreeable to the Committee members and they took no action.

.....

B. The application of the **City of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located at **155 Parrott Avenue**, requesting Site Plan approval for the renovation and expansion of the Portsmouth Middle School, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 128 as Lot 15 & 16 and lies within the Municipal District. (This application was postponed from the August 3, 2010 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Gordon Leedy, Landscape Architect and Certified Planner, of VHB, was present along with Lisa DeStefano, of DeStefano Architects, Doug Roberts, from JCJ, and Bryant Anderson from VHB.

Mr. Leedy reviewed the revised plans. On the plan the darker brown showed the existing building to remain with the remainder of the building to be demolished. He pointed out the Middle School addition which will be built in phases, along with a youth recreation facility on the westerly side of the building which may or may not be built. They are proposing to reconstruct the existing parking lot between the Middle School and Library and the entrances will remain essentially the same. They will now be loading buses on site rather than on Parrott Avenue. Adjacent to the bus drop-off area is a generous sidewalk area and plaza area which is intended to be porous pavement to help deal with some of the run off in that area. They are also proposing porous pavement in the courtyard. Street trees and street grates will run along the parking area edge and a guard rail will help create some separation between the parking area and the recreation field. The existing parking lot will be raised 1 ½ - 2' in elevation to fix some deficiencies as well as having the correct relationship with the finished floor of the building. This is really a redevelopment so they are tied into things that would not be an issue if they were starting with a fresh slate. When they raise the grade of the parking area they can replace the stairs to the Library with a sloped walkway. Having that as an accessible connection allows the handicapped spaces to be moved from the center of the lot closer to the Library. Similarly, on the other side of the parking lot they have a couple of accessible parking spaces which directly connect to the plaza area and the main entrance of the school. On the youth recreation facility side of the parking lot they have handicapped parking spaces which directly connect to a safe pedestrian connection to the youth recreation facility. They have a small plaza area making an explicit connection between the recreation field and the school building. They are also suggesting a speed table or a raised crosswalk which will be elevated 6" from the driveway elevation. It creates a more definitive separation of the pedestrian area and the driveway. They are proposing to change the pavement to concrete pavement which would create another distinction and safety enhancement.

They discussed looking at additional opportunities for parking on site. They may be able to pick up some more spaces on site to decrease the number to be reserved in the Parrott Avenue lot. They feel there was potentially the ability to pick up 8 -10 spaces.

They submitted a Photometric Plan which was reviewed by the City and there was a little bit of light trespass in the northwest corner and they have proposed to change the fixture orientation and height to eliminate that. There was also some discussion about moving some fixtures around. They had proposed light fixtures on 12' poles and are now proposing to eliminate some pole lights and put in

bollard lights for walkway lighting and soffit lighting under the canopy areas that will serve to wash the pavement area.

They have been to the Trees and Greenery Committee and for the most part they agreed with their decisions regarding plant materials. They had some suggestions to change the plant materials along Parrott Avenue from Sugar Maple as they wanted to see something more salt tolerant. They also wanted some more information about the grade conditions to make sure the existing Norway Maples are safe. They are covering that area with additional fill material, thereby either inhibiting their roots or inhibiting their ability to get oxygen. There is quite a bit of excavation close to those trees and it was Mr. Leedy's recommendation to replace the trees.

Bryant Anderson, of VHB, continued with their presentation. He reviewed what they changed from the first set of plans. The existing sewer line crosses the existing ball field and comes out on Parrott Avenue. They will re-route one sewer service back to Rogers Street. There is an existing sewer on Parrott which will be re-routed to tie into Roger Street and will make way for the city's sewer separation project. There is a 48" brick sewer along Parrott Avenue and ultimately the sewer flow that crosses the site will be directed elsewhere and then the existing line can be abandoned or reused for drainage purposes. The electrical service has been moved out of the drive aisle based on comments they received this morning and they will do some minor re-routing to tighten it up along the edge of the field. They requested a waiver for overhead wires along the back of the site. They will maintain one existing pole and drop the rest to an underground service along the back of the site and into the building.

Mr. Anderson continued with the drainage system and explained they will install a new manhole in the 48" sewer line on Parrott Avenue and run a new drain line from the site through that new structure and across Parrott Avenue. 6 Filterra tree box units will be installed along the side and the front of the parking lot to provide stormwater treatment. They previously showed some small detention chambers; however, after meeting with the City and Underwood Engineers, who are doing the sewer separation project, they re-evaluated the site. Instead of storing stormwater on site, they are trying to get the water off the site as quickly as possible before runoff from other areas that drain into the Parrott Avenue system gets to this area. They have been made aware that there are two main areas on site which experience flooding conditions from rain. One is the front parking lot and they will raise that elevation to alleviate the ponding which occurs. The majority of the site currently goes into the combined sewer system. In order to facilitate and help out with the City sewer separation project, all drainage is being routed to the dedicated drainage system in Parrott Avenue which will help get rid of the excess flow under the combined sewer system. They have added some underdrains in the multi-use field area to keep it dry. There is a low point in the softball field near the northwestern property line that floods out and ponds. That low area will be re-graded and catch basins will be added.

They are working with Underwood Engineers to make sure the drainage design for this site ties in with the drainage design they are doing as part of the sewer separation project.

Mr. Leedy noted that Mr. Morgan had provided Committee members with documentation about an existing light fixture adjacent to his property. They were unclear that it was actually on the City's property and they have no objection to removing the light fixture. It will not be needed with the new project.

Mr. Taintor called for questions from the Committee. Deputy Police Chief Dubois asked that a note be added to the plans about removing the light fixture on the Morgan property.

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

Tom Morgan, of 39 Richards Avenue, stated that VHB listened to his concerns about drainage on site and they are trying hard to make it work. He asked for more clarification on what Mr. Leedy meant about getting more parking on site and asked whether there are more than 54 spaces proposed at this point.

Mr. Leedy stated they will attempt to find a few more spaces by restriping one area. There are currently eight parallel spaces along the rear drive aisle. They may be able to shift the curb line back and recapture those 8 spaces. They haven't defined the spaces yet but will work on it.

Mr. Morgan's final comment was regarding the light issue and he distributed a handout on that. He felt the team was doing a great job.

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 for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

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

Mr. Allen commented on Mr. Morgan's question regarding drainage. He explained that they had conducted a lengthy meeting to review drainage with the designer and the designers are required to show that the system can handle a 10 year storm. The City looked very hard at their calculations. The last three storms in the past three months have been close to 10 year storms with significant flooding in that area. This system is designed to handle those flows although much more rain would result in ponding. The City feels it is important that this drainage system be coordinated with the overall Underwood plan as part of their long term separation project. They have had some discussions on that and they will continue to look at the latest revised design which Mr. Allen felt was an improvement over what they saw before. The underdrain in the field will help that area. Currently there is no outlet for that area and it has to percolate into the ground but there will be catch basins with the new plan. He is comfortable pending the final review with Underwood. There has been a lot of work with a lot of detailed information. They have come up with a system that will work and meet their requirements of handling a 10 year storm.

Mr. Allen's stipulation was that the consultant come back with the final report that indicates that this system as well as the long term control plan for the sewer separation system will continue to function together.

Mr. Britz commented that he appreciated the improvement to the drainage plan and the addition of the Filterra system as he felt that would help the stormwater. On the stabilized construction entrance he asked them to make sure if they are including this along with other sites in the Stormwater

Management Plan that it be clearly stabilized and make sure that the contractor is aware of that. That was a comment and not a stipulation.

Mr. Desfosses requested that they keep the existing eight parking spaces on the rear driveway that are used today, and have been used for years. Also, he would like them to take a look at the front parking lot by Parrott Avenue to maximize the amount of parking spaces that can be gained. His stipulation is that the applicant work with DPW to complete a final layout and determine what the maximum number of spaces would be that they can get on this lot, thereby minimizing the number of spaces that are used in the Parrott Avenue lot. Mr. Desfosses did not hear any discussion on whether the school will use the Parrott Avenue spaces at night or whether there will be a daytime parking restriction only. Mr. Taintor confirmed there will be a daytime restriction only. Mr. Desfosses assumed they will be putting up signs for that. Mr. Taintor indicated that will be up to the City.

Mr. Taintor stated that a lot of changes need to be made to this plan before the next review and the deadline to have those plans delivered to the Planning Board will be September 8th. Therefore, they should get the plans to staff before that time for review. Mr. Taintor made a list of the changes which deal with things like drainage, fences, lighting and underground utilities. Fire Inspector Roediger asked if the revised plans could include their discussion earlier today about the additional hydrant. Also, there should be a note regarding the location of a knox box.

Mr. Allen asked if they are going to read Mr. Taintor's list of items into the record as stipulations. Mr. Taintor felt it was difficult to actually make a list of stipulations as there are so many details. His stipulation would be that revised plans be subject to approval by DPW prior to submission to the Planning Board. Mr. Allen assumed those would include the drainage structures at sewer crossings and coordination with Underwood.

Mr. Allen also mentioned it should include the removal of the light fixture adjacent to Mr. Morgan's property.

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

- 1) The applicant shall submit revised Site Plans for review and approval by the Department of Public Works and Planning Department prior to submission to the Planning Board, including revised drainage, lighting, utilities and parking plans as described in the TAC meeting, and specifically including the following:
 - (a) Revising the parking layout to maximize the number of on-site parking spaces, thereby minimizing the number of spaces required in the Parrott Avenue lot;
 - (b) Removal of the pole light adjacent to Mr. Morgan's property.
- 2) The applicant shall consult with Underwood Associates and shall prepare a report demonstrating that the project drainage system will be compatible with the Parrott Avenue drainage system planned in the wastewater system long term control plan.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **HarborCorp, LLC, Owner**, for property located **off Deer Street, Green Street, Russell Street, Market Street and Maplewood Avenue**, for an additional one year extension of Site Review Approval which was granted (amended) on October 16, 2008 for the construction of an 83,118 ± s.f. 6/7 story structure consisting of a hotel, convention center, parking garage and 21 residential condominiums, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lot 28, Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 1-1A, Lot 1-1C and Lot 4, Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 12 and Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 21 and lie within the Central Business A (CBA) District, the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Malcolm McNeill, attorney for developer, presented. Also present was Chris Thompson, of Harborcorp, Giles Ham, traffic consultant from Vanesse & Associates and Corey Colwell from MSC, site engineers. They are looking for a second one-year extension of their Site Review approval. Attorney McNeill explained that the amended site review approval was initially issued on October 17, 2008. They appeared on September 17, 2009 and obtained a one year extension. The grounds for that extension were very similar to the grounds of today which relate to the economic circumstances impacting demand for these types of uses as well as the availability of capital for a project of this scale. Attorney McNeill stated this is a combination hotel, parking garage, conference center and 21 condominiums. The present extension expires on October 16, 2010. They have attempted to address various criteria under Section 2.11 of the Site Review Regulations. The plans are no different than those approved after extensive review by the City and all departments. There are no material changes and they would request an additional one-year extension.

Attorney McNeill indicated that there has been discussion about the fact that some conditions of approval are a bit dated in terms of having reference to parties who no longer work for the City as well as other phraseology that could be improved. The Planning Director provided him with a revised list of stipulations which update the conditions. The only change that Attorney McNeill requested was a change in #1 which says that all construction shall be in concurrence with current City standards and he requested that it be “building standards” or “construction standards”. His objection would be to the use of the term “zoning standards” as this project falls within a State statute which vests on an extended basis the ability of the developer to retain existing zoning.

At Pre-TAC, there was not a lot for him to say as nothing has changed. There was a question about easement and licensing plans. Another attorney in his office worked very closely with City Attorney Sullivan on those and those are no longer an issue. The deletion of any language in the prior approval that related to the public/private relationship between the City and the developer should be deleted because the garage will no longer be a public garage.

Attorney McNeill stated that the consultants were present to answer questions.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the signalization of Russell and Market Street.

Giles Ham, of Vanesse & Associates, indicated that those plans have not been completed yet and would be subject to engineering and City review.

Mr. Desfosses assumed that at the time the building permit is issued they would be asking for those plans.

Attorney McNeill agreed with that.

Mr. Taintor referred to his draft stipulations and mentioned that for #22 they will update that to use their standard language on the Motorola strength test.

Mr. Taintor was having a problem understanding what #11 means. The parking is different on the two plans and they contradict each other. The VAI plans show parallel parking on Deer Street and the AMES plan shows angled parking. He asked if the AMES plan was the current plan.

It was Mr. Colwell's recollection that the plan was revised to the angled parking and their plan was the most current and approved plan. Mr. Taintor asked if there are other significant distinctions between the plans.

Mr. Ham confirmed that overall the two plans were the same. He will give them a copy of their most recent plan which is consistent with the AMES plan.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve a second one year extension of Site Review approval, as presented, with the stipulations as shown on Mr. Taintor's handout and with the revisions as discussed above. Mr. Britz seconded the motion. Mr. Taintor confirmed changes would be made to #1, #11 and #22.

The motion to recommend approval of a second one year extension of Site Review approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

Conditions Precedent (to be completed prior to issuance of a building permit):

1. The applicant shall submit a revised Site Plan set reflecting current existing conditions and conforming to current Site Plan Review Regulations. However, it is understood that this project as approved on October 16, 2008, remains subject to the standards of the Zoning Ordinance in effect on that date.
2. All construction shall be in accordance with current City construction standards. Final construction details shall require approval by the Department of Public Works.
3. Final street geometry, paving and crosswalks shall require approval by the Department of Public Works.

4. Sidewalks shall be installed along the perimeter of the property in accordance with current City construction standards and the City Council's policy on brick sidewalks.
5. Final drainage design shall require approval by the Department of Public Works.
6. The lighting plan, including type and spacing of fixtures, shall require approval by the Department of Public Works.
7. The landscape plan shall require review by the Trees and Greenery Committee and approval by the Planning Department.
8. The applicant shall submit a signage plan which shall require approval by the Department of Public Works and the Planning Department.
9. The proposed 1,000 gallon grease trap shall require approval by the Department of Public Works to ensure that it is adequately sized for the planned cooking facilities.
10. The applicant shall provide anticipated water demand for the project and include references of where that demand came from, i.e., a similar type of store in another area or industry standard, and said report shall be stamped by a licensed engineer.
11. Automatic notification of emergency services and a knox box shall be installed.
12. The applicant shall revise the plans for traffic and parking modifications to recognize changes in existing conditions in the public and private streets surrounding the site, and to reconcile any conflicts or inconsistencies between the Site Plans and the Conceptual Improvement Plan by Vanasse Associates, Inc., dated May 18, 2007.
13. A sign shall be added to the Site Plans for the service road at its intersection with Maplewood saying "no right turn for large trucks" or other language that is agreeable to DPW.
14. The first and last angled parking spaces on Deer Street shall be shall be reviewed by the Department of Public Works for safety purposes.
15. This project shall be reviewed by the Parking Committee and the Traffic and Safety Committee.
16. All changes to traffic patterns and parking on public streets shall require approval by the City Council.
17. All easements and licenses shown on the "Easement and License Plan" dated July 12, 2007, shall be executed (and easements recorded) prior to the issuance of a building permit.
18. The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan for approval by the City Legal Department, Planning Department, Department of Public Works and City Manager.

Conditions Subsequent (to be completed prior to Certificate of Occupancy):

19. The applicant shall provide a traffic signal at the intersection of Market Street and Russell Street, subject to design approval by the Department of Public Works.
20. The applicant shall provide additional traffic calming measures at the intersection of Deer and Market Streets, subject to approval by the Department of Public Works.
21. The applicant shall review and work with the Department of Public Works to coordinate the signal timing at the intersection of Maplewood and Deer Street.
22. The applicant shall arrange to have the USGS monument off the ledge at Russell Street relocated during construction.
23. The applicant shall be responsible to perform a radio-strength test with a Motorola Service Shop to ensure sufficient signal strength within any structure included in the project to support adequate radio coverage for emergency personnel. The expense for the test shall be the responsibility of the applicant, whether or not the test indicates that amplifiers are necessary to ensure this communication. If the test indicates that amplifies are required, that cost, too, shall be the

responsibility of the applicant. All testing and installations shall be coordinated between the applicant and the police/fire communications supervisor.

- 24. The additional 2" water service to the parking garage shall not be activated until the subdivision is recorded.

.....

B. The application of **Strawbery Banke, Owner, and the Gundalow Company, Applicant**, for property located at **14 Hancock Street (Strawbery Banke)** requesting Site Plan Approval for the temporary construction of a gravel work area, a 10' x 20' tool shed and a 35' x 80' covered boat staging area, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 104 as Lot 7 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office District (MRO) and Historic District A.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Brad Mezquita, of Appledore Engineering, along with representatives from the Gundalow and Strawbery Banke, were present. Mr. Mezquita pointed out the area they were talking about on the plan. It is an open area in the middle of Strawbery Bank. They would like to remove the top soil, add gravel to stabilize the area, and construct a boat enclosure with columns and white shrink wrap to keep water off. They are also proposing a 10' x 20' tool shed and a dumpster for waste. There is an existing spigot at the intersection of Atkinson Street. It appears that the City may have had a water line that came down Atkinson and they may have put the spigot on just as a way to flush that line. They would like to add a glorified hose to that spigot to hook up to their steam box to bend wood as part of the boat construction. They will also trench that line in so people won't trip on it. They have a pedestal available with plugs. They also have submitted a simple reclamation plan. The temporary boat cover will be removed, the shed will be removed and they will loam and seed the site.

Mr. Desfosses had a question about the spigot being a metered water service. Mr. Mesquita did not believe it was and believed it was put in as a way to flush the line. Mr. Desfosses stated they will require a meter. Mr. Allen asked what the timing was for this project. Mr. Mezquita confirmed the majority of work will be done between March and October, 2011. Mr. Desfosses confirmed they will ask for a meter and they will need some sort of backflow check valve.

Mr. Taintor asked if there was a different way to deal with the final grades. Mr. Mezquita explained that they spent quite a bit of time looking at the grades. Currently, everything flows to an area in the middle. They will try to mimic that and keep it going as far as possible. Ultimately they need some drainage work done but for now they are trying to grade and keep the water as far to the left as possible so that they will have as much useful space as practical. Mr. Desfosses asked if they will leave the gravel and bury it at the conclusion of their project. Mr. Mezquita indicated that was correct. Mr. Taintor asked if that was different that what was on the plan. Mr. Desfosses responded it was but not by much.

Dan Corcoran, of 168 Marcy Street, stated he was a proponent of the Gundalow project. He wanted to discuss issues of noise and hours and days of operation. In terms of boat building, they will be using table and band saws and they are very noisy. The residents of the area are all within hearing distance and he felt they were entitled to the quiet enjoyment of their property. He would like to recommend hours of work be limited to Strawberry Banke hours and with no work on weekends.

Mr. Taintor confirmed that the City's standard regulation allows construction between 7:00 am – 7:00 pm, Monday – Friday and no weekend activity. Any exemption would have to be obtained from the Director of Public Works or the Police Department.

Gloria Guyette of 7 Hancock Street asked what the height of this structure was going to be. Mr. Mezquita responded it will be approximately 25' tall.

Ms. Guyette asked if the City defines what "temporary" is. She asked what would happen if construction continues past October. Mr. Taintor indicated it certainly has been presented as a March to October project and they would require an extension if they were to build beyond that.

Ms. Guyette stated there was an office building shown on the plans, up towards Marcy Street, and she asked what that was being used for. Mr. Taintor advised her that as it is shown as an existing condition it is not part of this proposal.

Ms. Guyette asked if any special events were planned for boat building and if parking was planned for those. Mr. Taintor confirmed that special events are not part of this application. If something unusual was happening, separate notification would be given to the City. The use of this project does not require parking under the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Guyette asked if someone could post an emergency number so that if people have concerns about vandalism they would know who to contact.

Mr. Mezquita responded to some of Ms. Guyette's concerns. He stated that the City's work hours are fine. They would not be using power tools for construction on Saturdays; however, he asked if they would be allowed to have demonstrations that were non-electrical. Mr. Taintor advised him that would be allowed through application to the City. The construction of the boat would be from March through October and prior to that, starting this winter, they would start to put up the structure and get the site ready. Lastly, Mr. Mezquita felt it was a great idea to post a contact number for residents.

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 for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Fire Inspector Roediger wanted to make sure that any non-construction activities were not prohibited as they are using this as an educational tool. Mr. Desfosses confirmed those hours only prohibited construction activity.

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

Mr. Desfosses stipulated that a contact number shall be posted on one of the outbuildings in a prominent location so that the residents will know how to contact someone in case of emergency. Also, the water service shall require a meter and a backflow device and that the applicant shall contact the City Water Division for the specifications and equipment they will need for that.

Mr. Allen added that Strawberry Banke should contact the Water Division to look at the spigot and its use relative to water metering after the project is concluded.

Mr. Taintor requested that the revised plans indicate that the temporary water line is trenched. He asked if there will be revisions to the grades on the plans. Mr. Mezquita explained the grade changes would be very minor so no changes will be required.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold stated that it was important to recognize that if vandalism is going on they should call 911 right away because the police should be involved immediately. They could then call Strawberry Banke.

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

- 1) An emergency contact number shall be posted in a prominent location on the site.
- 2) The water service shall be provided with a meter and a backflow device acceptable to the City Water Division.
- 3) The owner shall contact the Water Division regarding the need for metering of the water service after this project is completed.

.....

C. The application of **Maplewood and Vaughan Holding Company, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **111 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Amended Site Review Approval for the addition of two accessible parking spaces and the construction of an accessible ramp and walkway along the northern corner of the building to the lower level, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 124 as Lot 8 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) and Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Appledore Engineering, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He explained this was an office renovation which was approved in February. A stipulation of that approval was that handicapped access be provided to the three lower level units. This site plan includes two ADA compliant spaces behind the retaining wall. The sidewalk will lead straight out to the tipdown ramp with appropriate signage to provide ADA access to the back tenants.

Mr. Crimmins indicated that the second item was an additional sewer line which was included on the plan which he distributed to the TAC members. This is a 6” sewer service to the bathrooms in the

basement level for those three units. The line will feed out to a manhole and tap into an existing 8” A/C line in Vaughan Street with an 8 x 6 sewer saddle. The line will also be constructed with a sewer check valve.

Mr. Desfosses felt they would be better off going into the line on the other side of the manhole. The reason was because there is nothing else tied into that whole line so it does not get any existing flow. The other line is the one that gets used. If they go in the manhole they would have to rebuild the whole brick shelf. They are better off going into the line and they want to go in high as opposed to going directly into it as it surcharges. The higher you are the better.

Mr. Taintor clarified for the record, the plan shows the new service going into the existing sewer line just to the right of the manhole but instead they should be going into the line just above the manhole. Mr. Desfosses also felt if there was a problem it would be much easier to clean.

Mr. Desfosses also asked if there was any way to get the check valve inside the building as it should be somewhere that someone can open an access panel and get to it. Mr. Crimmins felt they could take care of that.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Fire Inspector Roediger seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses stipulated that they shall use the sewer line on the other side of the manhole and that the check valve be accessible inside the building.

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

- 1) The sewer connection should enter the sewer line downstream of the existing sewer manhole on Vaughan Street.
- 2) The sewer check valve should be accessible inside the building.

.....

D. The application of **Regeneration Park, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **3612 Lafayette Road**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to include restaurant use in the building resulting in revised parking configuration, addition of a grease trap and the addition of two exterior doors, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 297 as Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Taintor advised the Committee that he had received a request for postponement from the applicant. He asked for a motion to postpone the hearing to the October 5th TAC meeting.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone to October 5th. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone this application to the October 5, 2010 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:15 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant