

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

2:00 PM

MAY 1, 2012

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman; Steve Parkinson, Director, Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Carl Roediger, Fire Inspector; Steve Dubois, Deputy Police Chief; and Jon Frederick, Director of Parking & Transportation

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Michaels Realty Trust and ESUM Realty Trust, Owners, and 4 Amigos, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **1390 and 1400 Lafayette Road** requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 2,500 s.f. one-story bank building with two drive through lanes, a 4,500 s.f. retail building and a 11,944 s.f. Rite Aid Pharmacy store with two drive through lanes, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 252 as Lots 7 and 9 and lie within the Gateway (GW) District. (This application was postponed at the April 3, 2012 TAC Meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Frank Monteiro, of MHF Design Consultants, representing the applicant, was present along with Jeff Dirk, of Vanasse Associates. At the April 3rd TAC meeting they discussed several plan changes and the project was postponed to allow them adequate time to provide a full set of plans reflecting those changes. They were also asked to attend the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee on April 12th. At that time, the driveway on Peverly Hill Road was a right-in only access point and the PTS Committee requested that they take another look at putting the right-out back into that driveway. Subsequent to that, they met with some members of TAC and some members of the PTS Committee to come to an agreement on how to configure the driveway. It was agreed to put the right-in/right-out back on Peverly Hill Road but to also add a deceleration component. They were also asked to take a look at an acceleration lane as you exit the driveway and a shoulder widening on that side of Peverly Hill Road.

Also, as a result of their meeting, Mr. Monteiro stated that they added an exclusive right turn lane and the plans have been revised with respect to drainage and utilities to incorporate that feature into the plan.

At the TAC Work Session last week there were some minor changes that were discussed with the Committee. In the revised set of plans, the VAI Roadway Plan now coordinates the lot line adjustment

that is planned between their lot and the hotel parcel. They coordinated the Easement Plan with respect to the proposed roadway easement that will be required along Route 1 and Peverly Hill Road to construct these roadway improvements. They were asked to look at providing a motorcycle parking area and they added that next to the restaurant, which is central to the development, and close to the proposed restaurant for the middle building. They also added a motorcycle parking sign. They talked about detectable warning pads on handicapped ramps which were removed from all accessible ramps except at the crosswalk at the signal. There was a gate valve which they added to the hydrant connection behind the pharmacy. They looked at the Lighting Plan with respect to the light pole at the main entrance adjacent to the pharmacy and they revised it to a single fixture and added another single fixture pole further down the driveway. The Photometric Plan was revised to reflect that change.

Mr. Monteiro stated that they were asked to change the sidewalk material on Peverly Hill Road to concrete with a 3' wide grass strip and a 5' wide concrete sidewalk. As a result of the shoulder widening they were forced to rebuild the sidewalk.

There was a question about grading which they modified at the driveway to provide better flow to a catch basin that is planned at the island. He noted that Route 1 is very flat in that area so they added another catch basin to help drain the widening.

They were asked to extend the double yellow centerline on the internal driveway all the way back to the connection to the hotel. They were also asked to extend the double yellow center line on the full access driveway in the back all the way to the hotel.

Lastly, as a result of the deceleration lane and shoulder widening on Peverly Hill Road there are three utility poles and one hydrant that need to be relocated and the utility details reflect those changes as well.

Mr. Taintor asked, for clarification, if the property lines are staying the same along the rights-of-way and that will be an easement. Mr. Monteiro confirmed that all of the roadway improvements which are planned will be an easement 3' behind the proposed sidewalk. The exact location will be dictated by the final DOT roadway approval.

Mr. Taintor asked about a right turn arrow on the two-way driveway that cuts along the back of the three buildings. Mr. Monteiro confirmed that should have been changed to a straight arrow.

Mr. Taintor noticed on the site plan they have the proposed drive-through directional signs as #1, #2 and #3 but he could not find a detail for #1. Mr. Desfosses indicated it was between the retail building and the Rite Aid in the front parking lot.

Mr. Taintor asked about the crosswalk they are coordinating with the Comfort Inn site. It is crossing over on the hotel property. He asked if anything has been received from the hotel site, showing the improvements on their property. Mr. Monteiro responded that a detailed letter was sent on behalf of Mr. MacLeod that acknowledged the work on their property. He also acknowledged the lot line adjustment at that time. Mr. Taintor asked about the crosswalk extending from the back of the Rite-Aid property, across the travel lane into their parking area, and whether it made sense to do that during this phase or wait until the hotel does their plan. Mr. Monteiro stated that it doesn't matter to them. If someone is walking along that pedestrian route, they are leading them in that direction so they are more likely to cross in the aisle anyways so it might be safer to at least provide a crosswalk but they would defer to the Committee. Mr. Desfosses felt it was fine the way it is.

Mr. Taintor asked about Note 23, about performing a visual inspection of the existing sewer main on Lot 8 and what happens if they find it is not suitable for reuse? Mr. Desfosses thought that was done already. Mr. Monteiro explained that they were going to have it done at one point when they were looking for a drainage structure but once it was uncovered they decided to defer the inspection until the plans were approved so they would know the extent of what to expect. Their intent is to have it videoed and they will either clean it or replace it, depending on what they find. Mr. Monteiro indicated that they could review the video tape with DPW. Mr. Desfosses felt that would be a good idea.

Mr. Taintor indicated that there is a contradiction on the plan between two ways of looking at this proposal. They looked at the off street parking as if they are six individual businesses and they have looked at the signage as if it was a shopping center. They only get two free-standing signs if they are a shopping center so they have to choose. Understanding they are trying to maximize their parking spaces, Mr. Taintor recommended taking the second free-standing sign off the plan because it would require a variance. He also noted that although they approve the location of signs, they do not approve the signs themselves, so when they get to the sign details they have to go through the Inspection Department for the sign permit. The small directional signs are exempt from a permit but signs on stores are subject to permitting.

Mr. Desfosses requested that PSNH will need to approve the proposed pole plan and they should coordinate with DPW if changes are needed from what is on the plan.

Mr. Taintor asked them to update some of the captions on the Landscaping Plan as they have changed the plans.

On Sheet C-205, one of the detail sheets, Details A8 and E8, the square with the line through it is meant to be the bike rack. Mr. Monteiro will update that.

On Sheet C-208, Detail K8, looking at the right-hand handicapped space with Sign A and Sign B, Mr. Taintor asked if Sign B, which is an access aisle sign, was supposed to be there. Mr. Monteiro indicated it should be lined up with the actual aisle so it needs to be moved over. Mr. Taintor asked if the same thing would happen with Sign A and Sign C. Mr. Monteiro stated that Sign A with the arrow is mounted on the same pole as the handicapped sign. Mr. Taintor suggested moving both signs over so that they are both in front of the striped area.

Mr. Desfosses referred to Sheet C-207, the Concrete Sidewalk Detail and asked if there are different details for on site vs. off site. Mr. Monteiro stated this was an on-site detail. If the City has an off site detail they will have to add that. Mr. Desfosses asked for the City detail for the sidewalks within the right-of-way.

Mr. Frederick referred back to Sheet C-208 and the accessible parking stalls where the first one on the very left is labeled for van accessible. They have to have 8' stall width and 8' aisle width to be van accessible so their van spaces would be the middle and the far right one and the one on the far left would just be a standard reserved parking space.

On the Easement Plan, Mr. Taintor had mentioned last time there would have to be an easement for the off-site lighting overspill. Mr. Monteiro asked if they have to physically delineate the area for the easement. Mr. Taintor felt they could cover the whole site if they wanted but it would be helpful to

have some physical delineation of it. There will be a stipulation in the TAC vote that all easement deeds shall be reviewed by the City Attorney prior to the Planning Board action.

Referring to the same sheet, Mr. Desfosses asked why it says “relocate existing mast arm and signal heads by others”. This is at the traffic signal on the off-site improvement plan by VAI. Mr. Monteiro confirmed that should not be on there and they will delete “by others”.

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 recommend approval with stipulations. Fire Inspector Roediger seconded the motion.

Mr. Taintor listed out the stipulations:

1. The right turn arrow will be changed to a straight arrow at the cross driveway near the bank.
2. On Sheet C-101, adjust Note 23 or add a stipulation that the video of the sewer line will be provided to DPW for review, and if the sewer line needs to be cleaned or replaced the applicant will be responsible.
3. The second free standing sign (at the westerly driveway on Peverly Hill Road) shall be removed, or the number of parking spaces shall be reduced to comply with the standards for a shopping center.
4. On Sheet C-103, a note shall be added that PSNH must approve the proposed pole plan and that the applicant shall coordinate with DPW if any changes are made.
5. On Sheet C-205, Details A-8 and E-8 regarding the bike parking area shall be corrected.
6. On Sheet C-208, the location for the handicapped parking signs shall be corrected and the designation of the van accessible space.
7. On Sheet C-207, a City standard sidewalk detail shall be added for off-site sidewalks.
8. An easement for light trespass onto the adjoining (Comfort Inn) lot shall be added to the easement plan or described in another manner.
9. All easements shall be reviewed and approved by the City attorney prior to Planning Board approval and recorded prior to the issuance of a building permit.
10. On the Conceptual Improvement Plan – Lafayette Road (Route 1) at Peverly Hill Road and Elwyn Road”, the wording “(by others)” shall be deleted from the note regarding relocating the existing mast arm and signal heads.
11. A Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by the City.
12. The applicant shall pay for the services of an oversight engineer, to be selected by the City, to monitor the construction of improvements within the public right-of-ways.

This recommendation of approval to the Planning Board also includes the granting of the waiver for the four driveways.

The motion to recommend approval with stipulations passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **A. Robert McGuire, Jr. and A. Robert McGuire, III, Owners**, for property located at **677 Dennett Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of two 3-unit, 3,084 s.f. (footprint) residential buildings on two separate lots, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 161 as Lot 31 for which Subdivision Approval was granted by the Planning Board on February 16, 2012; and lies within the General Residential A (GRA) District. (This application was postponed at the April 3, 2012 TAC Meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, appeared before the Committee along with the applicant and Steve McHenry. Mr. Chagnon indicated that this application was tabled last month to double check the infiltration capacity of the soil in their proposed infiltration area. They performed some tests in that area and revised the design slightly to accommodate the results of that infiltration. There was a question about the spillway and its proximity to the State Highway property. They sent to the State a set of plans and the Drainage Analysis and he handed out to the Committee the State's response which Mr. Chagnon only received yesterday. Kevin Russell, from the State, toured the site and he made some notes. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that a little clearing and grubbing was done in an area slightly beyond the right-of-way line so they have agreed that they will loam and seed that area and bring it back with suitable grasses. Mr. Russell requested that they try and use the town's closed drainage system first. He then suggests that they put in a stone lined channel or swale from the emergency spillway to an existing ditch further down the slope. Any point source concentration would have a channel that would not erode to get to the highway ditch. Mr. Russell is not concerned about quantity or quality of run-off as they are decreasing and concentrating a bit. Mr. Chagnon talked to Mr. Russell about the possibility of connecting to the City's closed drain system and indicated they would still need an emergency spillway if they were to put a pipe out to the front and that pipe could clog. Any good infiltration pond would have an emergency spillway and Mr. Chagnon asked, if that was the case, would he still require that they put in the stone-lined swale. Mr. Russell stated that even if it was an emergency spillway he would want that swale. Therefore, they would much rather keep the plan as is and put in the stone-lined swale out to the Bypass ditch.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the rest of the site plan components have been discussed previously.

Mr. Desfosses stated he was satisfied with constructing the channel.

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. Chagnon added that as a part of this plan they will be replacing the fence along the right-of-way to keep the pets out of the road and the applicant would like to do that work sooner rather than later. They would like to do that work prior to the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Taintor indicated he would have to get back to them on that. Mr. Chagnon stated it was also for the DOT as they would like their road secured.

Mr. Britz made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations. Fire Inspector Roediger seconded the motion.

Mr. Taintor indicated that the only item carried over from their last work session was the question about the drainage. Therefore he would request a stipulation that they address NHDOT’s comments regarding the stone fabric lined structure to convey the stormwater. Mr. Britz asked if it needs an easement. Mr. Taintor was not sure but it would be the State’s issue. Mr. Britz thought that the drainage looked fine.

Mr. Desfosses requested a CMMP. He asked that the final plan shall be approved by PSNH and that the applicant consult with DPW on any changes.

Mr. Taintor stated that another point NHDOT raised was replanting outside the property line but that is not a City issue.

Mr. Desfosses asked for clarification on whether the sewer laterals are existing or proposed. Mr. Chagnon stated they are tying into existing laterals. There are no new laterals proposed for this plan.

Mr. Taintor asked if this fell under the capacity use surcharge. Mr. Sheehan confirmed that it did and that calculations needed to be provided to DPW.

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

1. NHDOT’s comments regarding the stone fabric lined structure to convey stormwater shall be addressed.
2. A Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by the City.
3. The final plan shall be approved by PSNH and the applicant shall consult with DPW on any changes.
4. The sewer Capacity Use surcharge data shall be submitted to DPW.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

As no one was present for Item A, Wright Avenue, a motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to move this application to the end of the Agenda.

.....

B. The application of **Summit Land Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **108 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the construction of a 1-story, 21,000 s.f. office building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lot 3 and lies within the Pease Business/Commercial District

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Matt McCormack, of Hoyle Tanner, was present with Chad Kageleiry, of Summit Land Development, and Michael Mates and Maria Stowell of the Pease Development Authority. Mr. McCormack indicated this project is for the proposed development of a one-story 21,000 s.f. building located at 108 Corporate Drive. They appeared before the TAC Work Session last week and received some comments which they have addressed.

Mr. McCormack stated that they discussed re-routing the proposed drainage system to convey stormwater to the detention area at the corner of Rye Street and Corporate Drive. Fortunately, the elevations allowed them to do so. The proposed catch basin originally directed stormwater out and around to Hodgson Brook. They were able to tie that catch basin into the other proposed catch basin.

Mr. Taintor asked if these changes were made to a new plan that the Committee did not have. Mr. McCormack confirmed that they did not provide the new plan to the Committee but he explained the structures have basically stayed in the same location and there is only one new structure that he discussed with Mr. Desfosses yesterday that will be added just in line of an existing drain line that was on the previous design. Basically they broke the connection from the catch basin to the existing system and tied it into the proposed drainage and carried it over to the wetland pocket where it ultimately directs stormwater down to the detention area.

Mr. Taintor asked if that was the only change to the plan. Mr. McCormack confirmed that was the only change to the stormwater system. Mr. Desfosses stated there were lots of changes. Mr. Taintor was concerned with the Committee being able to address this without having new plans in front of them. This was unusual and wondered if they should postpone this to the next meeting. He asked Mr. Desfosses if he had seen the plans. Mr. Desfosses stated he had a meeting with the applicant yesterday and has seen the plans but he understands Mr. Taintor's point. Mr. Parkinson asked if there were other changes to the original plan. Mr. McCormack confirmed there are other changes but nothing related to drainage. There was a change to the sewer line as they were asked to tie the sewer into the system down at Rye Street as opposed to tapping into the existing sewer in Corporate Drive. Mr. Taintor asked Mr. McCormack to run down the changes and they will then figure out how to deal with this.

Mr. McCormack stated that in addition to the sewer and drainage plans that he mentioned, they were asked to show the existing drainage pipe along Corporate Drive and that is now shown on the plan. They were also asked to locate the existing manholes prior to construction and to bring the existing covers to grade. That note will be added to the plans. It was suggested to show the PSNH lighting conduit and the handholds on the other side of Corporate Drive. That is something that he has been coordinating with the PDA and PSNH. They were asked to add a new hydrant at the entrance of Goosebay Drive and that hydrant has been added off the existing water main. It is about 50' of pipe. It was requested that they add wetland conservation seed mix to the grassed area within the wetland buffer. It was suggested that they add a lighting table to show the minimum average and maximum lighting to the proposed lighting design which has been added to the plan. Lastly, they were asked to coordinate fire monitoring with Frank Ott but he was unable to make contact today.

Mr. Taintor felt that these are well defined issues and if DPW and the Planning Department received revised plans by the end of this week, and if they look good, they could provide the final revised plans to the Planning Department by next Tuesday for the Planning Board.

Mr. Britz asked if PCB1 will now flow to PCB2. Mr. McCormack confirmed that PCB1 will go to a new drainage manhole in the big island and then it goes to PCB2 and the elevations work for that.

Mr. Britz asked if they had a spec sheet on what they will be planting behind the wall. Mr. McCormack stated they will be providing that.

Fire Inspector Roediger requested that two notes be added to the Utility Plan. One note would be regarding the fire alarm system and a knox box and the second would be for the standard terminology about the radio strength test.

The Chair opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application

Philip Katz had a question about the proposed uses in the building.

Chad Kageleiry, the applicant, stated that the building will be used as an emergency response building for the owners of the nuclear power facility. They will have a training exercise one a month and there will be a very light daily office use.

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. Britz made a motion to recommend approval if the Planning Director does not receive any objections from the TAC members in the next week. Mr. Taintor suggested that they require that the plans be submitted by Friday for review and final plans for the Planning Board much be submitted no later than Tuesday, May 8th.

Mr. Parkinson made a motion to recommend approval with the above stipulation. Mr. Frederick seconded the motion.

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

1. That revised plans, as presented at the May 1, 2012 TAC meeting, shall be provided to the TAC members for their review and comments on or before Friday, May 4, 2012.

.....

Mr. Taintor stated that this next application was going to be granted administratively rather than moving on to the Planning Board as the proposed plan was for a single season of use. The applicant also needs to go to the HDC for fencing and liquor review.

Jim Reid, who is a direct abutter on State Street, asked if there were different requirements for a seasonal use. Mr. Taintor responded that there was always the possibility of approving applications administratively but the larger projects would go to the Planning Board. As this was temporary it was determined that they would not require a full set of plans.

THE COMMITTEE TOOK A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.

A. The application of **Wright Ave, LLC, Owner, and Fresh Local, LLC, John Lanahan, and Michelle Lozuaway, Applicants**, for property located off **Wright Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the renovation of an existing building for restaurant use with indoor and outdoor seating, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 105 as Lot 18 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Josh Lanahan, one of the applicants, addressed the Committee and apologized for arriving late. Mr. Lanahan stated one outstanding issue from the TAC Work Session was the dumpster and its enclosure and they have decided to have curbside pick up instead. They are also currently going before the HDC for the other fencing. Mr. Taintor stated that the TAC had expected a revised plan for this meeting. Mr. Lanahan did not realize that. Mr. Desfosses added that the parking didn't work and needs to be revised. Mr. Lanahan thought that the parking did not work because of the placement of the dumpster. Mr. Taintor indicated there were other parking spaces that did not work. Mr. Britz pointed out that they could not back out of parking space #6 and both #4 and #5 created issues. Mr. Britz pointed out that the note on the plan stating that all conditions on this plan shall remain in effect in perpetuity needs to be removed because this is a temporary plan.

Mr. Desfosses felt that because they had inadequate aisle space, their spaces will need to be bigger just to get the cars out without hitting the curbing and walkway. Mr. Lanahan asked if that was the case even if the parking spaces were existing. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it was because the protective curb and the fencing is non-existing. Things have changed over the years.

Mr. Lanahan stated that the new curb they are putting in is further away from the parking spaces than the original parking spaces so the aisle is actually wider than before. Mr. Desfosses assumed that the parking was valet before and that is why it is substandard. He felt they could still park all along the front line, foregoing spaces #5 and #4. They need to measure and make the spaces a little bigger.

Michelle Lozuaway, the other applicant, recapped that they need to have a minimum of 12 parking spaces because the building is 1,200 s.f. and they need to be at least 9' wide and 19' deep.

Mr. Desfosses asked what they meant by curbside pickup. Mr. Lanahan stated it would be like the Black Trumpet Bistro where a private company comes every night to pick up their garbage.

Mr. Desfosses reminded them that the grease trap will need to be cleaned ahead of time.

Ms. Lozuaway asked if the parking spaces were of adequate size and width would that alleviate the issues for the Committee. A discussion was had regarding the individual parking spaces. Mr. Desfosses added that they need to add one handicapped space.

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

Jim Reid, of 93 State Street, spoke as a direct abutter. He stated he has not seen the plan but he has had discussions with the applicants. They have discussed a fence by the parking area, which is right next to his home which would give a little buffer between his house and the restaurant activity. Mr. Taintor indicated that a fence was not shown on the plan. Mr. Desfosses believed it was on the plan but it was not labeled. There does appear to be fencing all the way along State Street.

Mr. Reed would like to have that added to the plan.

Mr. Taintor stated that they clearly need to have a new plan that is better labeled and with information they can read.

Mr. Reid went on to state that he discussed some other things that seemed reasonable and gave him a comfort level but he wants to make sure they are addressed by the applicant. He is looking forward to a peaceful environment this summer. He does not want to get into a situation of being a nice guy and finding that it may take until the fall to get an issue dealt with. He wondered if there will be music and how loud will it be and he would like that in writing. This is a new use and has never been a restaurant before.

Mr. Taintor confirmed that there has been no representation to the City that there will be any outdoor music at all so that will not be part of this Site Plan Review.

Mr. Reid stated that restrooms were a concern for him because when the restaurants close people tend to relieve themselves all around the buildings. The idea of a beer garden type facility without appropriate restrooms was a concern to him from the beginning.

Mr. Reid did not understand the curbside pick up process. Mr. Desfosses responded that typically most companies come first thing in the morning before there is activity on the street; However, the applicant will have to explain how they will arrange their pick-up.

Mr. Lanahan confirmed that is how his pick-up will work and he can arrange to have them come into the parking lot so that they don't have to put anything out on the street.

Mr. Taintor asked if there was an ordinance about indoor storage of trash. Fire Inspector Roediger confirmed that the Health Department would deal with that.

Ms. Lozuaway mentioned that, if trash was going to be an issue, they would be happy to remove it every night to their other two restaurant location or to their home. As for music, they will not have bands and were only thinking of having a little stereo inside one of the bays. If they were considering any music in the future, they would speak to Mr. Reid first and then approach the City for any required approvals. As for the fence, they had spoken to Mr. Reid but not knowing whether this was going to be approved or not it seemed premature. They are happy to speak to him about a fence at the front end of the parking spaces, next to spaces #1, #2 and #3.

Mr. Taintor stated it was obvious that this plan needs a lot more work within the next week.

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. Britz felt that as they were going before the HDC, they could come back before TAC next month. Ms. Lozuaway confirmed they are on the May HDC Agenda so they were hoping to get TAC approval this month.

Mr. Taintor suggested that they postpone this application to a reconvened TAC meeting next Tuesday, May 8th at 2:00 pm.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone to a reconvened TAC meeting next Tuesday, May 8, 2012 at 2:00 pm. For that meeting, they will require a revised plan, to scale, including handicapped parking, fencing, the total parking layout, appropriate notes dealing with questions that have come up tonight, trash pick up and removing the note about conditions remaining in perpetuity. Revised plans would be required by noontime on Friday, May 4, 2012.

The motion to postpone to Tuesday, May 8, 2012 at 2:00 passed unanimously.

.....
IV. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:30 pm.

.....
Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant